

Wolfe: MPOA received generally high marks, no major deficiencies, under staffed based on expectations (recommendation of change expectations or add staff and continue expectations), no cost savings to recommend due to operating on minimum, rental and amenity need more data to arrive at a plan for income generating but may involve major capital outlay, Board Members need to decide whether MPOA is a corporation or to run the community as a government with MPOA being a hybrid of both, trends nationally and internationally are to be proactive not reactive, more creativity with communications (be positive), etc. Ms. Wolfe stated the need to work as a partnership with the developer and not constantly reacting. MPOA should pro act. Community Associations Inc. materials were circulated to the Board. Less involvement of the Board Members with committees to aid in increasing community participation and decrease apathy or lack of concern within the community was recommended. A proposal was made for the Board and Long Range Planning Committee to plan a workshop to analyze the study groups reports and report the findings within six months. Most recommendations are not expensive.

Being no further business, Board Member Brown made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 1:27 p.m.. Jill McNealy made a second to the motion and the motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,


Iva Hensley Gordon
Recording Secretary

Approved with corrections on November 16, 1996.

BOD
9-21-1996

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: October 1, 1996

Attendees: Jan Lorette, John Loeblich , Walt Pfaender, Phil Semsch, Warren Schmidt, Fred Wahlert

- I. Schmidt asked for suggestions for additional members for the group since 7 were indicated by MPOA; a few possible names were mentioned to be asked (Kent DeAngelis, Bill Heiser, Linda Hoover, Jenny Miller, and Mary Ansell.)
- II. Schmidt gave us the charge for the group from the MPOA Board. Our primary areas of concern -- POA, Incorporation, Sanitary District, and Highway Issues. A brief discussion followed about various studies that have been done already at Massanutten; we need to get copies.
- III. Highways - in Massanutten there is a question as to whether or not our roads even meet state standards (should we ever wish to turn them over to the State.) A discussion followed about what roadway responsibilities (plowing, maintenance, etc.) for the various metropolitan levels (towns get reimbursed for doing their own services; but, gates are not allowed.) One member is to call and find out what state standards are for roads.
- IV. Sanitary Districts - Shawneeland in Frederick County has recently become a Sanitary District (an official special tax district of a county); this is the fastest and easiest level to get approved. The County Board of Supervisors still maintains all control for the Sanitary District. In practice, many details are delegated to an advisory committee within the District. Lorette is to call and find out how many Sanitary Districts we now have within Rockingham County (and which was done most recently.)
- V. L&N Governance Recommendations - To better understand our committee charge, we reviewed the recommendations already made by L&N. Some of the recommendations from pages 52-56 of the report do not fall within our charge; we feel that some of them "belong" to other study committees:
 1. Covenant changes should be for the Covenant Study Committee
 2. We agree that the Board *should* amend governing documents to require an annual independent certified audit; we are not charged to change governing documents, per se, so recommend that the Board do this forthwith.
 3. Rules changes to preclude conflict with Covenants, is a responsibility for the Covenant Study Committee
 4. The MPOA Board should comply with POA Act regarding closed sessions; Schmidt said that Litton (the Atty.) says this is being done. However, notice for the Board Executive Session did not give 10 days notice per the POA Act. Therefore, we are still not in

compliance.

5. Operations Review Study Committee should follow up on the Personnel Manual.
6. On the job training (and refresher training) about safety issues should come under the Operations Review Study Committee. Also in Governance Recommendation Six, L&N says that the Board should take better advantage of CAI publications and training. We agree; one way would be to send copies of the newsletter to each Board member. Also, schedule rotating Board participation in CAI conferences and programs, as soon as possible.
7. Book of Resolution seems again to fall under Covenant Study Committee purview.
8. We agree that the Decision Matrix is a good idea for Board decisions; it will help to explain and "sell" decisions to the members. We similarly plan to use the same matrix for our Committee decisions.
9. Involving the constituents in policy development seems to fall under the Communication Study Committee.
10. Revising nominations/election process seems to fall under the Committee Structure Study Committee.
11. We feel that anyone "designated by the MPOA Board of Directors" to speak at planning & zoning, or other public hearings will sufficiently limit confusion on this matter (since the Board rarely so designates.) On the other hand, we also feel that it is important that any interested parties who happen to be MPOA members feel free to speak *as individuals* at any such meeting; we need as much involvement in local issues as we can get.
12. LRPC changes come under the Committee Study Group.
13. Changes to Contracting Procedures should come under the Fiscal Committee; we also think that the Purchase Order system should be expanded.
14. Communicating with constituents clearly comes under the Communication Study Committee.
15. Unified community image is a communication issue we feel. This may take a lot of discussion and significant coordination with Great Eastern.
16. (Same as # 9 and #14 above)
17. Reconfiguring committee structure again comes under the Committee Study Group; we agree that Board membership on committees should be reduced or eliminated to allow more participation by MPOA members.
18. We understand that A&E already has a guide book for design review requirements and procedures.
19. A Task force going to Reston to see about their design review and covenants enforcement would come under the Covenant Study Committee and/or the A&E Committee.

- VI. Incorporated Towns:
- A. In our area range from 212 people in Mt. Crawford to 1,500 in Bridgewater.
 - B. We are clearly within the size limit if we chose to go that route
 - C. As a town one is mandated to do planning & zoning; all other services are optional.
 - D. If there is any thought of trying to incorporate as a town, it is best to not have covenants in place (ours are due to expire within a year, for Unit I, and will be renewed; we need to explore this limitation quickly.
 - E. Examples of things that conflict with covenants (seen as a legal contract with owners) are A&E review, all money making activities of MPOA, etc.
 - F. Advantages:
 - 1. Costs (taxes instead of assessments) are based on property values instead of per lot -- more equitable perhaps.
 - 2. Reimbursement by State for road maintenance (our biggest expense)
 - 3. Tax all entities (property owners and businesses) within the town
 - G. Disadvantages:
 - 1. Only residents can vote (this leaves non-resident lot owners and timeshare owners with no representation -- unlikely that we could get this passed until closer to 100% build-out on lots.
 - 2. Requires State and local approvals; might be impossible to get.
- VII. Schmidt will find out which, if any, towns have incorporated lately; Semsch also asked that he find out which Assembly/Senate members are on the appropriate committee(s) for incorporation. Schmidt will invite Susan Jones, who did the Reston II Study on Incorporation, to speak to our committee as soon as possible, get the summary of the third Reston effort, and contact Shawneeland.
- VIII. Schmidt was voted as Chairman; Lorette was voted as Recorder. Next meeting is Oct. 15, at 1:30 in the MPOA building.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: October 14, 1996

Attendees: Jan Lorette, John Loeblich , Walt Pfaender, Phil Semsch, Warren Schmidt, Fred Wahlert

I. Old Business

- A. Additional Committee members - Schmidt has called some of those mentioned last month, and was not able to get additional members yet. He will continue.
- B. Highways Standards - According to Dave Meyers, almost all our roads do meet state standards (the exceptions being some roads into timeshare areas.) He suggested that if any transfer to the state were anticipated it would be wise to do so in the next 2 years since the roads have just been resurfaced. We were cautioned that the state can be slow in accepting the roads. A discussion followed about whether or not more money comes into the county for roads when roads such as ours are turned over; Schmidt will check with the VDOT Resident Engineer to find out.
- C. Sanitary District Option
 - 1. Local - Wahlert checked with Keith Fowler of the DEQ and learned that there is one such district in Rockingham County, Lawyer Road in Penn Laird; Wahlert will check further with people there to see what the process was for their case. Lorette also called the county and was told by Mr. Williams of the Environmental Health Unit that there were no Sanitary Districts in the county, and none had applied in the 8 years he has been on the job.
 - 2. Shawneeland - Schmidt spoke to Burleson (see attachment to Oct. 1st minutes) and got details of their experience in becoming a Sanitary District. They do have an advisory committee to work with the Board of Supervisors; all employees are County employees. The biggest problem is funding; the county does not enforce collection very well. They have 60 miles of roads (to our 25 miles) and they aim to bring roads up to state standards so that one day they can be turned over. This is the only community acting as a Sanitary District, and as such parallels our situation rather well. They implement planning and zoning and still "enforce" covenants as best they can under the law.
- D. Recent Incorporation (within last 25 years)
 - 1. Castlewood - is in Russell County. Lorette will telephone them to see what information we can get.

2. Clinchco - is in Dickinson County. Lorette will telephone them to see what information we can get from them also.
 3. Smith Mountain Lake - is also looking into incorporation; this will be checked.
 4. Reston Contacts - Schmidt will call Susan Jones about information from Reston II. Jack Gwynn also participated in Reston II and will be here Oct. 31; we will meet with him at our next meeting. Schmidt expects a copy of the Reston III study any time now and will get copies to the members when it arrives.
- E. Other Old Business - Lorette will draft a memo to the Board for the next meeting, to note actions and costs, if any, for L&N Governance recommendations we feel they should make forthwith.
- II. New Business
- A. Further Shawneeland Contact - the members will visit there in the second week of November; Loeblich said that he could arrange for a van so that we can go in one vehicle.
 - B. Other new business - none was brought up
- III. Next Meeting - Oct. 31, at 1:30 in the MPOA building. The meeting adjourned at 2:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

Telephone Call - October 21, 1996

To: Mr. Bud Clarence Phillips, Attorney for both Clinchco and Castlewood, VA Box 36,
Castlewood, VA 24224 (540) 762-9758

By: Jan Lorette

Summary

I was referred to Mr. Phillips by Ms. Nancy Lighthall of the Castlewood Town Hall. Mr. Phillips handled the incorporation of both Castlewood (4 years ago) and Clinchco, VA (6 years ago.) He said that the process was fairly straight forward. There are two routes: Judicial Incorporation (the most difficult) and by General Assembly (the easier and less expensive route.)

They had no problems, politically, with the state nor the county. Afterwards, the only problems have been with Castlewood; despite an early educational effort, some citizens have been disenchanted with the reality of higher taxes and are making an effort to de-incorporate.

To incorporate, you go through your state delegate who along with your state senator draft the legislation and assist in the actual process. They present the request to the General Assembly and vote on the issue. So long as you meet all the criteria in the statutes there is little to it. The biggest effort is in convincing the local constituents to go along.

There are no formal reports, nor published information that would help us to determine if this is a route that we wish to pursue. He is willing to answer further questions should we wish to ask them.

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: November 26, 1996

Attendees: Jan Lorette, John Loeblich, Phil Semsch, Warren Schmidt, Fred Wahlert, Emerson Pitts

Previous Minutes were approved.

I. Old Business

- A. Schmidt distributed a Summary of Activities November 16, 1996 Report to the Board to those present and reviewed the key points.
- B. Shawneeland Visit - Members got copies of Report of Visit to Shawneeland Sanitary District on November 19, 1996 by Loeblich, Schmidt & Semsch.
 - 1. They are satisfied with the sanitary district status. Key differences with our community were noted.
 - 2. Two main points - First, even when roads meet state standards, it requires significant work to line up support from County/State to support road maintenance. Second, some MPOA activities are not permitted by sanitary districts; therefore, we might want to keep our property owners association intact for profit-making activities, etc.
 - 3. There was a question about how we compare to the delinquency rate on payment of taxes there; Lorette will check with the County Treasurer to see if we can get that information.
- C. New Members - Schmidt introduced Pitts to the group and asked if any of us know others with a financial background who would be willing to serve.
- D. Other Old Business - Lorette will revise the memo to the Board to include the balance of the L&N Governance recommendations.

II. New Business

- A. UVA Contact - last meetings speaker, Gwynn, suggested that we speak to Larry Sabato at UVA who had helped their group very much. Semsch will call him and invite him to visit/speak at our January 14 meeting. We hope to find out if he agrees that we are going in the right direction and if he has any suggestions for us.
- B. Assumptions - What do we assume are the advantages and disadvantages of the options we might have for alternative governance structures?
 - 1. Status Quo (Property Owners Assn.) -
 - a. Advantages - Less effort because no change is needed. More control over our own community (this balanced by the built in lack of control inherent in our close proximity to Great Eastern.) The POA has a limited life span (due to covenants) that we can choose to renew or abolish. The POA is in place and working. We are free to build new amenities (eg. pool) any time we can afford to and wish to do so. We have A&E review. We can pursue profit-making ventures to offset our assessments.

Nov 26

b. Disadvantages - We have too many entities to deal with (County, State, GERM, GERC) hence fractured government. No control over Planning and Zoning nor master plan. We get no tax credit for our assessments (which are used, in part, for roads and other things normally covered by taxes.) We pay MPOA assessments per lot; this is inequitable since an undeveloped lot pays the same as one with a \$300,000 house on it. Representation is unequal.

2. Small Tax District (Sanitary District) -

a. Advantages - We would get reimbursed for a portion of road maintenance. Some administrative costs would be spread to the County. It only takes 50 residents to petition for this change. You would get credit for taxes paid. Establishment could be phased. Single voice on all matters. Tax/bond authority.

b. Disadvantages - Some would see this as the first step in becoming a town. It only takes 50 residents to object to this change. We could no longer have security gates if roads were turned over to VDOT; we need to find out if an information gate would be acceptable. The County Board of Supervisors controls the district (we would be an official subdivision of the County.)

3. Town -

a. Advantages - We would have Planning and Zoning control plus approval of master plan. We could levy taxes on commercial ventures within the town as well as ourselves. We would get reimbursed for a portion of road maintenance. We would get tax credit for many things now paid for in our assessments. We would also get back a portion of monies paid to the state for sales tax, ABC, etc. We could speak with one voice.

b. Disadvantages - Would be difficult politically (state law specifically states that township should only be pursued if the same needs cannot be met through the creation of a special tax district (sanitary district.)

III. Next Meeting - Dec.3d, at 1:30 in the MPOA building. Adjourned at 3:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

Attachments: Board Summary
Shawneeland Visit Report
Roster

Telephone Call - November 27, 1996

To: Mr. Todd Garber, County Treasurer, Rockingham County, VA
By: Jan Lorette

Summary

I called to inquire about the percent of property owners in Massanutten Village who are delinquent in paying County Taxes (so that we might compare our rate with the rate in Shawneeland, per our discussion at the Nov. 26 meeting.) The county does not keep records by subdivision, only alphabetically by taxpayer. He said that it might take several hours of time and a request to their database manager to write a program to pull out that information; he said that if we really need the information to please give him the request in writing and he would pursue getting the information for us. I told him that I would relay his response to the group and see what we think about the importance to us of having this information.

Since I was unsuccessful, I also spoke briefly with Iva Gordon at MPOA. My supposition was that the percent of property owners who do not pay MPOA assessments might correlate to those not paying county taxes. We have had a 99% successful payment rate for the last ten years. With discussion, however, it is clear that she is pursues non-payment here aggressively and that the County does not. Hence, my notion of a strong correlation may be invalid.

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: December 3, 1996

Attendees: Jan Lorette, Warren Schmidt, Emerson Pitts, Walt Pfaender
Guest: Carter Miller, MPOA Administrator

Previous Minutes were approved.

I. Old Business

- A. Tax Collection - Lorette reported on her phone call to Todd Garber, County Treasurer. The information we wanted about the percent of delinquencies for Massanutten is not easily available and would require programming the computer; we decided that we do not need to request that action at this time.
- B. Other - none introduced.

II. New Business

- A. Discussion with Administrator - Miller reviewed many areas of interest and concern for the Study Group. Topics included working with the County to improve relations, landfill concerns, and the most recent Daily News Record article about water treatment here. Other areas covered were:
 - 1. Pros and cons of township status - financial concerns, road maintenance, profit making allowed now, control of our community
 - 2. Benefits of State maintenance of roads, vs. the difficulty and costs of meeting State standards for roads:
 - a. guard rails might be our most expensive consideration should MPOA choose to transfer roads to the State.
 - b. political support from the County and State might be difficult; there are very real concerns from MPOA members about lack of control (access) should the roads be turned over to the State.
 - c. roads need not all be turned over at one time; in Grottoes some roads were turned over and others did not go to the State until a later date.
 - d. some State standards have become more stringent and we might have difficulty meeting them (8" base now instead of 6" which was the former standard; 50' wide right of ways; sufficient turning radius for cul-de-sacs, etc.)
 - e. communities must reach 3,500 population before one can meet State standards for getting road maintenance funds, etc. There is a question as to how our timeshare units would "count" for population purposes.
 - 3. Future of Rockingham County - he feels that the county treats the 7 towns (an unusually high number in VA) very well; the County encourages growth near the towns and assumes such areas will be annexed eventually. The County seeks to maintain as much agricultural land as possible.
- B. Assumptions - we will review them at the next meeting.
- C. Sabato Visit - He has been invited to come to our January 14 meeting; his

- availability will be confirmed before then.
- D. Schmidt suggested that we invite Jay Litten, the MPOA Attorney to speak with us at a future meeting.

III. Next Meeting - Dec.17, at 1:30 in the MPOA building. Adjourned at 3:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

Attachments: Telephone Summary to Garber

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: December 3, 1996

Attendees: Jan Lorette, Warren Schmidt, Emerson Pitts, Walt Pfaender
Guest: Carter Miller, MPOA Administrator

Previous Minutes were approved.

I. Old Business

- A. Tax Collection - Lorette reported on her phone call to Todd Garber, County Treasurer. The information we wanted about the percent of delinquencies for Massanutten is not easily available and would require programming the computer; we decided that we do not need to request that action at this time.
- B. Other - none introduced.

II. New Business

- A. Discussion with Administrator - Miller reviewed many areas of interest and concern for the Study Group. Topics included working with the County to improve relations, landfill concerns, and the most recent Daily News Record article about water treatment here. Other areas covered were:
 - 1. Pros and cons of township status - financial concerns, road maintenance, profit making allowed now, control of our community
 - 2. Benefits of State maintenance of roads, vs. the difficulty and costs of meeting State standards for roads:
 - a. guard rails might be our most expensive consideration should MPOA choose to transfer roads to the State.
 - b. political support from the County and State might be difficult; there are very real concerns from MPOA members about lack of control (access) should the roads be turned over to the State.
 - c. roads need not all be turned over at one time; in Grottoes some roads were turned over and others did not go to the State until a later date.
 - d. some State standards have become more stringent and we might have difficulty meeting them (8" base now instead of 6" which was the former standard; 50' wide right of ways; sufficient turning radius for cul-de-sacs, etc.)
 - e. communities must reach 3,500 population before one can meet State standards for getting road maintenance funds, etc. There is a question as to how our timeshare units would "count" for population purposes.
 - 3. Future of Rockingham County - he feels that the county treats the 7 towns (an unusually high number in VA) very well; the County encourages growth near the towns and assumes such areas will be annexed eventually. The County seeks to maintain as much agricultural land as possible.
- B. Assumptions - we will review them at the next meeting.
- C. Sabato Visit - He has been invited to come to our January 14 meeting; his

- availability will be confirmed before then.
- D. Schmidt suggested that we invite Jay Litten, the MPOA Attorney to speak with us at a future meeting.

III. Next Meeting - Dec.17, at 1:30 in the MPOA building. Adjourned at 3:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

Attachments: Telephone Summary to Garber

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: December 17, 1996

Attendees: Jan Lorette, Walt Pfaender, Emerson Pitts, Warren Schmidt, Phil Semsch

Previous Minutes were approved.

I. Old Business

- A. Schmidt will firm up the invitation to J. Litten to meet with us in January.
- B. Lorette spoke with the Bryce Property Owners Assn. attorney, Bill Allen, who filed the paperwork for them to become a Sanitary District. She will ask Allen for a point of contact in their POA so that we might meet with them. Allen mentioned that Litten & Sipes already performed the same function for the town of Maurertown, VA (in Shenandoah County) which is an advantage to us, should we ever decide to pursue that route.
- C. Semsch spoke with Sabato at UVA; he no longer works with local issues, but gave us the name of 2 other people who might meet with us.

II. New Business

- A. Assumptions - we reviewed the governance assumptions and compared them with findings from the Reston Report. We discussed the pros and cons of three options:
 - 1. POA - Status Quo
 - a. Advantages - No change needed. Local control. Architectural control. Commercial ventures okay.
 - b. Disadvantages - Fractured responsibility. No Tax Credit (for individuals who pay, nor from funds returned by the State for ABC, etc.) Unequal representation (timeshare owners and property owners.) Unequal assessments (per lot.)
 - 2. Small Tax District (Sanitary District)
 - a. Advantages - Single voice. County resources available. Legally easy to initiate. Tax Credits (to individuals who pay, and from funds returned by the State for roads). Phased startup possible. Tax and bond authority. Meets community needs without being a town. Decreased overall costs. Equitable assessments (based on property value.) Can turn roads over to State.
 - b. Disadvantages - Legally easy to dissolve. Change is required. County Board of Sup. controls it. No A&E.* No commercial ventures.* Added taxes. Another layer of government. Difficult to educate MPOA members (and the County) about advantages. No Security Gate if roads dedicated.
 - 3. Town
 - a. Advantages - Most control. Control Planning and Zoning (P&Z.) Tax Credits (to individuals who pay, and from funds returned by

the State for roads, ABC, etc.) Tax and bond authority.
Decreased overall costs (?) Equitable assessments (based on
property value.) Most political influence. Single voice.

b. Disadvantages - Change required. Opposition from County --
politically difficult. Tough sell to MPOA
members. No A&E.* No Commercial ventures.* No Security
Gate. Another layer of government. More taxes.

B. Assumptions/Issues about Highways -

1. Turning the roads over to the State is desirable if we maintain them.
2. Expensive to meet State standards necessary for dedication (shoulders,
roadbed, rights of way, and cul-de-sacs.)
3. No Security Gate - this is very important to some owners and not important
to others.
4. We now get no advantages from taxes paid to the State for our roads.
5. Phased dedication of roads is possible.

C. Semsch will call Wintergreen Resort to find out if they are also a Sanitary District.

D. Next meeting we will polish these assumptions and set up meetings with Litten
and representatives from UVA, if possible. Members are asked to
prioritize the advantages/disadvantages and review the L&N and Reston
documents for possible additions or alterations.

E. Lorette is to have these minutes mailed to the members so that we can
accomplish the above.

III. Next Meetings - Jan. 7, 1997 at 1:30 in the MPOA building. We are to meet with J. Litten
the following day, Jan. 8 at 1:30 at MPOA building. The next meeting will be
Jan. 28, 1997. We adjourned at 3:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

cc: Roy Norville
Carter Miller

* Could continue with a parallel MPOA in existence.

Telephone List: Governance Committee

John Loeblich, MVOA
PO Box 1351 Harrisonburg, VA 22801
H: 574-2461
W: 289-6303 Ext. 6179

Jan Lorette
793 Magnolia Ct.
McGaheysville, VA 22840
289-6404

Emerson Pitts
749 Flower Dr.
McGaheysville, VA 22840
289-5665

Walt Pfaender
Rt. 2 Box 1186
McGaheysville, VA 22840
289-6116

Warren Schmidt
Rt. 2 Box 963
McGaheysville, VA 22840
289-9306
(703) 860-1023

Philip L. Semsch
760 Flower Dr.
McGaheysville, VA 22840
289-5303

Fred Wahlert
Rt, 1 Box 497
Weyers Cave, VA 24426-9400
(540) 234-8111 (Local Call)

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: January 6, 1997

Attendees: John Loeblich, Jan Lorette, Walt Pfaender, Emerson Pitts, Warren Schmidt, Phil Semsch, Fred Wahlert

Previous Minutes were approved.

I. Old Business

- A. Semsch has an appointment with Mr. Payne of Wintergreen Resort to discuss their ideas about becoming a Sanitary District.
- B. Lorette will call the Bryce POA, Sky Bryce Assn., to see what information we can have about their decision to become a Sanitary District.
- C. Semsch will call UVA to firm up a date for a representative to visit with us on the matter of government form.
- D. The group reviewed the purpose of a Sanitary District again.

II. New Business

- A. Assumptions - we reviewed the governance assumptions and through this discussion put the assumptions in priority order. See the attached listing for the new order.
- B. Highway Assumptions - we prioritized these assumptions as well; also see the attached listing for the new order.
- C. We will meet January 8th with the MPOA attorney, Jay Litten. We discussed questions to ask him including:
 - 1. Benefits of a Sanitary District vs. a Town.
 - 2. How much would becoming either of the above cost in legal terms?
 - 3. What might be the impact politically (by members, and by the County) of either choice?
 - 4. What are the population requirements to be a town?
 - 5. At what point can roads be turned over for State maintenance?
 - 6. What might be the impact on/by GE to such moves?
- D. We then asked each member for ideas on which options seemed most feasible so far.

III. Next Meeting - Jan. 8, 1997 at 1:30 in the MPOA building. We adjourned at 3:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: January 7, 1997

Attendees: Jan Lorette, Walt Pfaender, Warren Schmidt, Phil Semsch, Fred Wahlert

Guest: Jay Litten, MPOA Attorney

I. Old Business

- A. Semsch reported that Mr. Payne of Wintergreen Resort knew that they had considered becoming a Sanitary District over 15 years ago. At the time there were very few permanent residents at Wintergreen. They opted not to pursue that course --
 - 1. because of concerns that the person who applied for the bond would be personally liable
 - 2. because there would be few residents
- B. Lorette spoke with Bonnie Henry of the Bryce POA, Sky Bryce Assn.; she will send us the material they gathered when they decided to become a Sanitary District rather than a Service District. They are in the midst of a budget so it may take a few weeks.

II. New Business

A. Legal Issues - Jay Litten

- 1. We reviewed our progress - read our minutes and handed out "Rough Notes" that he had made to comment on the issues we had raised.
- 2. Town -
 - a. 2 ways to become a town - petition the Circuit Court which if approved then goes to the General Assembly; or go directly to the General Assembly.
 - b. Reasonable or not? -- GE is apt to fight being included in any such effort. Would require a consensus of property owners not in evidence at this time.
 - c. Advantages - well defined powers (at this time our POA services sometime overlap or do not fall within municipal nor county authority--eg. the MPOA police); MPOA provides many services not very well covered by statutes. More local control. Planning and Zoning would be the biggest advantage. State and federal financial assistance is available. Tax authority. Save on assessment costs for members.
 - d. Population of 1,000 is needed to become a town (based on census reports) but 3,500 is needed for certain thresholds for funding returns to the town, such as road maintenance. Timeshare owners would not count since they are not residents.
 - e. Disadvantages - apt to be opposition from GE should their land be included in a proposed town. A town is run more formally than a POA; MPOA already does most of the formal procedures of a town. Taxes usually go up when an area of a county becomes a town, but the MPOA assessments already pay privately for the services a new town would usually begin to provide. Political power would move away from non-resident owners of houses to the renters who live in them.
- 3. Sanitary District -
 - a. Usually this option comes up when there is a serious need for services; since MPOA already provides most of the needed services, what is the justification for even doing this? Further, we have available a functioning water and sewer company.
 - b. Advantages - many of the same powers as a town. Only property can be taxed (a town has options to tax commercial ventures: business license tax, consumer utility tax, meals tax, and the like.) Taxes would be deductible by property owners.

Some state and federal grants might be available.

- c. Disadvantages - less local control; eg. pay levels for the police would be set by the County.

4. Streets -

- a. No need to become a town nor a sanitary district to turn the roads over to the state for maintenance. This can be done now if the state is willing to accept the roads; some roads may not meet current standards at this time. This is something that current owner/residents must agree to do, however.
- b. Roads are all completely private now, and most are owned by MPOA (a few into timeshare areas are owned by GE.)
- c. The county sets the speed limits. We control access, but do not have a "security gate" in legal terms; we have an agreement with the Developer (and its successors) that our roads are open to ourselves, all customers, guests, and invitees.

5. Further discussion of Pros and Cons -

- a. Why change at all? Home rule. Greater flexibility on cost allocation. Sanitary district has only limited benefits, and there is a much clearer benefit to town status.
- b. Can any of these measures be done piecemeal? Yes. Roads can definitely be dedicated piecemeal; Massanutten Drive and Del Webb are good candidates for dedication as soon as possible.
- c. Major litigation is likely with either a Sanitary District or a Town.
- d. Continuation of MPOA is a good idea for any services not handled by the Sanitary District/Town and specifically for any money making ventures that MPOA has.

III. Next meetings will be January 21 and January 28 at 1:30pm in MPOA. Sim Ewing of UVA will meet with us March 5, 1997.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Summary of Activities - January 18, 1997 Report To Board

Members: Jan Lorette, Walt Pfaender, Emerson Pitts, Phil Semsch, Warren Schmidt, Fred Wahlert

Resource: John Loeblich

Since its last report to the Board, the Study Group has met six times and made significant progress. Our approach has been to learn from other communities and to seek expert advice. The information received has been digested and converted to assumptions. Once these activities are completed, the financial impact of all options will be calculated and recommendations made to the board.

The learning process involved contacting Bryce and Wintergreen, which respectively have elected for and decided against the sanitary district form, and visiting Shawneeland in Frederick County, where a sanitary district operates the community. Carter Miller, MPOA Administrator, was of great help in explaining the nature of town government and road issues. Jay Litten, MPOA Counsel, gave us valuable service by reviewing our work-to-date and explaining the legal issues. On March 5th, Sim Ewing, a UVA professor and advisor to the General Assembly, will meet with the group.

To assimilate and reduce all this information, a matrix of assumptions has been created. In it the advantages and disadvantages of each governance option were set forth. Assumptions on roads were listed because they are a major expenditure and an integral consideration of any option. Over three meetings, these assumptions were defined, tested, revised and refined.

As stated above, the Study Group will begin costing the three options, projecting their impact on differently-valued homes and unimproved lots. The assumptions, cost models and recommendations for further action will constitute our final report to the Board. The Study Group has worked well together and been diligent in researching a highly complex topic. We have been helped by the addition on November 26th of Emerson Pitts and the participation of John Loeblich.

Respectfully submitted,



Warren Schmidt

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: January 21, 1997

Attendees: John Loeblich, Jan Lorette, Walt Pfaender, Emerson Pitts, Warren Schmidt, Phil Semsch, Fred Wahlert

I. Old Business

- A. Schmidt distributed copies of a report, Summary of Activities, that he gave to the MPOA Board on Jan. 18, 1997. The members discussed the possibility that a final report could be completed by March 1997. Semsch expressed concern that some of our demographic information is incomplete; he offered to try to get firmer information (on population and the like).
- B. Professor Ewing of UVA will speak with us March 5; he serves as permanent advisor to the State Legislature which is in session until then.
- C. Lorette reported that she has not received the promised information from the Bryce property owners association yet.
- D. Other Old Business -- none noted.

II. New Business

- A. Review Litten meeting -
 - 1. Roads -
 - a. some MPOA roads will never meet state standards; which are these and how many miles of our 25 total do they represent?
 - b. we need to establish a sequence appropriate for dedication of the roads (eg. first those that do meet standards, then those that are close to meeting the standards, etc.)
 - c. Highway Assumptions/Issues - we reviewed and renumbered the priorities based on new information from Litten:
 - 1) recommend that we turn over Del Webb and Massanutten Drive to the state now
 - 2) state funds will be returned here in the form of maintenance
 - 3) dedication is desirable if we continue our own snow removal
 - 4) phased dedication is possible
 - 5) it will be expensive to upgrade roads to meet state standards
 - 6) a population of 3,500 is needed to take over road maintenance as a town
 - 7) gate will be retained
 - d. Wahlert asked what the impact would be on an individual owners assessments if Del Webb and Massanutten Dr. were dedicated (the cost to maintain not counting snow removal?)
 - e. Loeblich stressed that those roads on a needed school bus route should be considered to make the expense of upgrading serve a dual purpose; some roads are too narrow now, or do not have proper guardrails to permit school bus access.

2. Sanitary District Option -
 - a. why bother to become one at all?
 - b. must prove that to become one would improve the quality of life here
 3. Town
 - a. population concerns - need to be over 1,000; guess is that we are at about 1,800 now.
 - b. discussed the non-resident lot owners concerns vs. those of residents in Massanutten
 - B. Review Assumptions vs. Litten

We reviewed the assumptions matrix and renumbered the items in view of the new information we got from Litten. We will have a new copy of the assumptions based on this discussion.
 - C. Meeting adjourned at 3:05.
- III. Next meetings will be January 28 at 1:30pm in MPOA.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: January 28, 1997

Attendees: John Loeblich, Jan Lorette, Walt Pfaender, Emerson Pitts, Phil Semsch,
Fred Wahlert

Guest: Carter Miller, MPOA Administrator

Previous Minutes were approved.

I. Old Business

- A. Wahlert brought articles about the reversion of Staunton from City to Town status that is being considered in Augusta County. He asked what Town officials are mandated by Virginia Law; Miller said that only the City Council is mandated and the number of Council members depends on the charter.
- B. Lorette called the Bryce POA, Sky Bryce Assn., but still does not have the material they promised to send about their decision to become a Sanitary District.
- C. Semsch reported that he has begun to gather demographic information to estimate the Massanutten population and number of children in School.

II. New Business

- A. Review Assumptions - we reviewed the governance assumptions as revised in our last meeting again discussing the benefits of Status Quo vs. Sanitary District vs. Town status.
 - 1. Since Miller has had experience with town roads and VDOT we asked if he felt that dedication of Del Webb and Massanutten Drive would be recommended now; he thinks it would be premature. To get maximum benefit from such dedication of roads we should meet the 3,500 population base to become a town -
 - a. at that size the town gets direct return of funding from the state, to maintain our own roads, return of ABC funds, and the like
 - b. were we to turn over the 2 roads now the VDOT schedule for paving, mowing, and snow removal would not be to the standards that we are used to, so the members might be unhappy
 - c. we would lose some control in the community (gatehouse is still an unanswered question/concern to many members)
 - d. might not need a dispatcher to do the current road count, but might have more patrolling of side roads than now
 - 2. Status Quo was discussed as possibility -
 - a. since all 3 units that have voted, have turned down even the modest changes in the Covenants, it seems that any changes at all would take considerable effort, and self-education by MPOA membership
 - b. Pfaender indicated that many people he has spoken to are not in favor of change for MPOA; he was concerned that we have

Jan 28
1997

- come full circle in our discussions (i.e. wasted our time)
- c. Lorette said that this process has been a useful one because a great deal of information has been gathered and considered; our charter was to review and evaluate the L&N report recommendations. Even if we opt to recommend no change at this time, it would be helpful to put together the information we have gathered and propose a recommended course of action for the future.
 - d. further, a report to the MPOA membership seems necessary to at least explain the pros and cons of township for future consideration; we need to at least begin to think about the possibility of becoming a town, even if that is an option that is years away. Communication, as always, is a critical concern at Massanutten; Miller agrees and hopes to improve this.
3. Miller was asked what actual funds are returned to towns - his estimates for a town Grottoes size were ABC revenues: \$3 to \$4K; and police and fire: \$16K. He will put together a short listing of the actual figures for our committee for these any other funds.

B. Critical Turning Points - some possible "trigger" points that might signal a time to consider future action on township for Massanutten might include:

- 1. reaching a population of 3,500 (there is still a question as to how/if timeshare owners might be counted)
- 2. the census is taken in the year 2,000 so that might be a time to review the options
- 3. commercial development of the acres around the MPOA building now might significantly reduce/change the demands on MPOA so again, if that occurs, township might be reconsidered

C. Costing - the structure for cost analysis was distributed; we are to all take a look at the sheet to discuss costing at the next meeting.

III. Next Meeting will be Feb. 4, 1997 at 1:30 in the MPOA building.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

MPOA GOVERNMENT STUDY GROUP

Agenda - February 4, 1997

Previous Minutes

Old Business

1. Prof. Ewing visit
2. Bryce
3. Demographics
4. Funds returned
5. Other Old Business

New Business

1. Critical Timing Points
2. Costing
3. Assumptions
4. Other New Business

Next Meeting

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: February 4, 1997

Attendees: Jan Lorette, Emerson Pitts, Phil Semsch, Warren Schmidt, Fred Wahlert
Guest: Carter Miller, MPOA Administrator

Previous Minutes were approved.

I. Old Business

- A. Semsch said that Prof. Ewing is planning to visit us on March 5, 1997; Loeblich will see if we can meet at Fareways. Semsch will find out if there is a fee for Ewing's time.
- B. Lorette called the Sky Bryce Assn. again and they are photocopying materials to send to us. Another point of contact there is Rodney McClain (540)856-2741 who runs their Sanitary District should we have further questions after we get their material.
- C. Semsch got some demographic information for Massanutten: the population is approximately 1,480.
 1. He feels that we should perform a more complete census to know our actual population. After discussion, it seems that such a count will be needed when we get much closer to the 3,500 population figure that would return significant funding to a possible town.
 2. Miller indicated that such a count might be used for amenities planning purposes by MPOA and could be done through a written survey that would be turned in.
 3. Further discussion centered on where potential town boundaries might lie; houses at Woodstone Meadows, other houses along route 644, and along 646 also might be included. Again, since we are so far from the 3,500 figure it seems premature to get into that sort of discussion.
 4. We have a total of 1,500 lots on which we have 668 houses now for our population of 1,480. We are building at the rate of 25-30 houses per year; assuming a steady growth in building and household size, it would take approximately 10 years to reach that population.
 5. Timeshare units are not counted at all in this equation; it is still questionable as to whether or not some portion (eg. each unit count as one household) might be counted for this purpose.
- D. Miller distributed a break out of funds returned to Grottoes (pop. 2,200) from various state sources and from taxes; we can use these to estimate what potential return we might have as a town.
 1. The largest comparable item would be roads (@ \$250,000 to Grottoes; Massanutten has double the number a roads so the potential return, if all the roads met state standards and were dedicated, would be \$500,000/year.)
 2. Lorette and Wahlert will meet with VDOT before the next meeting to ask some of the questions that have been raised about roads.
 3. Miller was asked which towns in Rockingham maintain their own roads. He said that Grottoes, Elkton, and Bridgewater maintain most of their

- roads while Dayton, Mt. Crawford, Timberville, and Broadway do not.
4. Wahlert reiterated the need to communicate this entire process to the MPOA members early so that members are fully aware and are included in any decision to make such changes in the community. Since we may have a 10 year time frame we should be able to accommodate this concern.

E. Other Old Business - none noted.

II. New Business

- A. Critical Turning Points - some possible "trigger" points that might signal a time to consider future action on township for Massanutten might include:
1. reaching a population of 3,500
 2. population is based on the census (due in the year 2,000)
 3. commercial development might significantly change the demands on MPOA or increase revenues to MPOA
 - a. could be in acres around the MPOA building now
 - b. could be Weast Farm area or along Rt. 644
- B. Costing - the structure for cost analysis was discussed. The figures of \$100K and \$200K assessed valuation for houses, seem appropriate for our purposes. Pitts will meet with Schmidt and create sample data for our chart.

III. Next Meeting will be Feb. 18, 1997 at 1:30 in the MPOA building.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: February 18, 1997

Attendees: John Loeblich, Jan Lorette, Walt Pfaender, Phil Semsch, Warren Schmidt, Fred Wahlert

Previous Minutes were approved with a minor correction.

I. Old Business

- A. Semsch will call Prof. Ewing of UVA when the Legislative session ends. He will let Loeblich know to confirm meeting at Fareways.
- B. Lorette has not received the information from Sky Bryce Assn.

II. New Business

- A. Wahlert and Lorette reported on the visit with Jeff Lineberry, of VDOT. (Report attached.) Wahlert is to pick up a copy of the two charts mentioned by Lineberry. Wahlert raised the issue of trade-off of greenspace from specific Units for widening of Rt. 644; Schmidt indicated that the MPOA Board has already told VDOT that such greenspace will be donated for this purpose.
- B. Schmidt asked if we should find out what is needed for a private bill to include timeshare owner in the population count (to reach 3,500) since they are such a large number of people on any given day. Such a bill would need to be proposed by our State Delegate (Del. Peter Way — who is about to retire.) We need to bring up this topic with candidates for Delegate for this area. We will also raise the issue with Ewing when he visits in March.
- C. Study Group Report - Schmidt indicated that we will have an interim (not final) report for the MPOA Board in March which they were told in January.
- D. Costing - the raw sample data for cost analysis was discussed. Data was estimated for Status Quo and Small Tax District only. Schmidt and Pitts put in some estimated data for discussion purposes. Schmidt will continue with estimates for the Town category for the next meeting.
 - 1. The sample data was favorable for Lot Owners and Timeshare owners.
 - 2. MVOA Timeshares are taxed on a \$68K per Unit to the County and each unit pays the same \$425 that a house/lot owner pays currently
- E. Reviewed reasons again to change or stay the same:
 - 1. Change (STD or Town) -
 - a. Saves property owners money
 - b. Addresses current inequity to lot owners
 - c. Inequity of MPOA Assessment (large, small, older, newer houses)

- d. Community would be able to address the future (water, sewers, Western slope, build-out, etc.
 - e. More political clout as a Town, or STD to deal with outside entities.
- 2. Status Quo
 - a. Change is difficult
 - b. Apt to be resistance --- from developer, membership, state, county, etc.

III. Next Meeting will be Feb. 28, 1997 at 1:30 in the MPOA building. We will also meet March 5, at Fareways if that date is agreeable to our guest.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

"Raw" Estimates for Cost Data: Impact of Options on Homeowners

	\$200K House	\$100K House	Unimproved Lot
STATUS QUO:			
County Tax	1360	680	68
(68cents/100)			
less 18% tax	(245)	(122)	(12)
MPOA	425	425	425
Assessment			
Trash	96	96	
	-----	-----	-----
Total	1636	1079	481
SMALL TAX DISTRICT			
County Tax	1360	680	68
(68cents/100)			
less 18% tax	(245)	(122)	(12)
MPOA (Sm. Version)	60	60	10
Assessment			
STD Tax	80	40	4
	-----	-----	-----
Total	1241	650	69
TOWN (this category will be done for next meeting)			
County Tax	1360	680	68
	-----	-----	-----
Total			

NOTE: These figures do not include developer contributions, nor funds that may come back from the State except as so noted. We also do not include Rental income nor estimates for commercial development which may occur. Similarly, there is no estimate for retirement reserves. There may be other economies such as billing for trash along with the STD or Town Tax.

Highway Assumptions/Issues

1. Massanutten and Del Webb Drives will be turned over to VDOT.
2. State funds will be returned here in the form of maintenance for the above two and any other subsequently dedicated roads.
3. Dedication is desirable if we continue snow removal.
4. Phased dedication is possible.
5. A population of 3,500 will be needed to take over road maintenance as a town. (Small tax district uncertain)
6. It will be expensive to meet state standards.
7. Gatehouse will be retained.

D R A F T

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Highway Issues: Input for the Final Report

The Government Structure Study Group has considered a variety of Highway Issues that are of importance to Massanutten Property Owners Assn. (MPOA.) The central issue is whether or not it might be beneficial to turn over some or most of the roads now maintained by MPOA to the State for maintenance. In some instances we got conflicting information.

A. Assumptions/Issues about Highways - We reviewed and established the priorities based on information from the MPOA attorney:

- 1) recommend that we turn over Del Webb and Massanutten Drive to the state (just when is debatable -- see below)
- 2) state funds will be returned to MPOA in the form of maintenance of the roads now being done privately
- 3) dedication of roads is desirable if we continue our own snow removal
- 4) phased dedication of roads is possible
- 5) it will be expensive to upgrade our roads to meet state standards
- 6) a population of 3,500 is needed to fully take over road maintenance as a town
- 7) the gate will be retained

B. A summary of the key factors to consider include:

1. Do our roads meet State Standards?
 - a. According to Dave Meyers, almost all our roads do meet state standards (the exceptions being some roads into timeshare areas.) He suggested that if any transfer to the state were anticipated it would be wise to do so in the next 2 years since the roads have just been resurfaced. We were cautioned that the state can be slow in accepting the roads.
 - b. Some of the study group visited Shawneeland (near Winchester, VA) but key differences with our community were noted. Even when roads meet state standards, it requires significant work to line up support from County/State to support road maintenance.
 - c. The group met with the new MPOA Administrator who noted some benefits of State maintenance of roads, vs. the difficulty and costs of meeting State standards for roads:
 - 1) guard rails might be our most expensive consideration should MPOA choose to transfer roads to the State.
 - 2) political support from the County and State might be difficult. T
 - 3) roads need not all be turned over at one time; in Grottoes some roads were turned over and others did not go to the State until a later date.

- 4) some State standards are very stringent and we might have difficulty meeting them (8" base now instead of 6" which was the former standard; 50' wide right of ways; sufficient turning radius for cul-de-sacs, etc.)
- 5) communities must reach 3,500 population before one can meet the State standard for getting back road maintenance funds; one can become a town with 1,000 population but the roads are maintained by the State. There is a question as to how our timeshare units would "count" to meet the 3,500 threshold population.
- d. The group met with the MPOA attorney who indicated that some MPOA roads will never meet State standards; we need to find out how many miles of our 25 total does this represent. We need to establish an appropriate sequence for dedication of the roads (eg. first those that do meet standards, then those that are close to meeting the standards, etc.)
- 2. Gatehouse -There are very real concerns from MPOA members about lack of control (access) should the roads be turned over to the State.
- 3. Snow Removal?
- 4. County: Political impact and Financial impact (i.e. political reality)
- 5. Population Requirements (3,500 for a town that gets back highway funds from State)
- 6. Financial impact on MPOA (what are the funds that would be returned to us by the State?)
- B. The Government Structure Study Group recommends that the MPOA Board consider the following action(s) concerning State dedication of our roads:

- d. Wahlert asked what the impact would be on an individual owners assessments if Del Webb and Massanutten Dr. were dedicated (the cost to maintain not counting snow removal?)
- e. Loeblich stressed that those roads on a needed school bus route should be considered to make the expense of upgrading serve a dual purpose; some roads are too narrow now, or do not have proper guardrails to permit school bus access.

Review Assumptions - we reviewed the governance assumptions as revised in our last meeting again discussing the benefits of Status Quo vs. Sanitary District vs. Town status.

- 1. Since Miller has had experience with town roads and VDOT we asked if he felt that dedication of Del Webb and Massanutten Drive would be recommended now; he thinks it would be premature. To get maximum benefit from such dedication of roads we should meet the 3,500 population base to become a town -
 - a. at that size the town gets direct return of funding from the state, to maintain our own roads, return of ABC funds, and

- the like
- b. were we to turn over the 2 roads now the VDOT schedule for paving, mowing, and snow removal would not be to the standards that we are used to, so the members might be unhappy
- c. we would lose some control in the community (gatehouse is still an unanswered question/concern to many members)
- d. might not need a dispatcher to do the current road count, but might have more patrolling of side roads than now
- 2. Status Quo was discussed as possibility -
 - a. since all 3 units that have voted, have turned down even the modest changes in the Covenants, it seems that any changes at all would take considerable effort, and self-education by MPOA membership
 - b. Pfaender indicated that many people he has spoken to are not in favor of change for MPOA; he was concerned that we have come full circle in our discussions (i.e. wasted our time)
 - c. Lorette said that this process has been a useful one because a great deal of information has been gathered and considered; our charter was to review and evaluate the L&N report recommendations. Even if we opt to recommend no change at this time, it would be helpful to put together the information we have gathered and propose a recommended course of action for the future.
 - d. further, a report to the MPOA membership seems necessary to at least explain the pros and cons of township for future consideration; we need to at least begin to think about the possibility of becoming a town, even if that is an option that is years away. Communication, as always, is a critical concern at Massanutten; Miller agrees and hopes to improve this.
- 3. Miller was asked what actual funds are returned to towns - his estimates for a town Grottoes size were ABC revenues: \$3 to \$4K; and police and fire: \$16K. He will put together a short listing of the actual figures for our committee for these any other funds.

Miller distributed a break out of funds returned to Grottoes (pop. 2,200) from various state sources and from taxes; we can use these to estimate what potential return we might have as a town.

- 1. The largest comparable item would be roads (@ \$250,000 to Grottoes; Massanutten has double the number a roads so the potential return, if all the roads met state standards and were dedicated, would be \$500,000/year.)
- 2. Lorette and Wahlert will meet with VDOT before the next meeting to ask some of the questions that have been raised about roads.

3. Miller was asked which towns in Rockingham maintain their own roads. He said that Grottoes, Elkton, and Bridgewater maintain most of their roads while Dayton, Mt. Crawford, Timberville, and Broadway do not.
4. Wahlert reiterated the need to communicate this entire process to the MPOA members early so that members are fully aware and are included in any decision to make such changes in the community. Since we may have a 10 year time frame we should be able to accommodate this concern.

Final Report -Schmidt asked that Lorette and Wahlert draft the Highway Issues section and that Semsch draft the section on Critical Timing Points. The rest of the group are to think about the other sections named in the Interim Report for input into the Final Report.

REPORT: VDOT RE HIGHWAY ISSUES (J. LINEBERRY)

1. What are the current state standards for roads?
There is a chart showing this information; Wahlert will get a copy from VDOT as they promised. It covers such items as: Road bed depth, widths, radius required for cul-de-sacs, width of shoulders and surface materials. There is a separate document that addresses guardrail standards (which are presently being revised); we will get a copy of the current standard also. Turnaround requirements for a cul-de-sac is a 50 foot radius of pavement. NOTE: we often have only a 20 to 30 foot radius in some Massanutten Village cul-de-sacs.
2. What would happen to the current police station positioned at the entrance to Massanutten? Could it remain as is, or would it have to be moved?
Lineberry was very tentative but said that we might be able to keep the gatehouse as it is, so long as we were not restricting access. According to J. Litten, there is no such access restriction now.
3. In 1995 VDOT promised to improve the shoulders; when will it be done?
The project to widen part of Rt. 644 incorporates part of the area where shoulder work is most needed; such shoulder work was in the budget, but has been postponed until the other work on Rt. 644 is done.
4. Do you have plans and a schedule yet for straightening the "s" curves on Rt. 644?
The Rt. 644 project is being developed now by Copper and Associates. The plans are being drawn for eventually having 4 lanes. Included in this project will probably be grading of the road for 4 lanes, but re-building the road with 2 lanes. The threshold for needing 4 lanes is to have 8-10,000 cars per day. (NOTE: According to Semsch we are at 4,500 cars per day now.) Lineberry feels that once Woodstone is built we will need 4 lanes.
5. What is the statute or code that mandates a 3,500 population for matching funds from the state for a town?
The appropriate codes are Virginia Code 33.1, 33.1-79 and 41.1. The first citation deals with cities. the second citation deals with towns such as Grottoes, Elkton, and Bridgewater that were "grandfathered" even though they may not be at the 3,500 population. The last citation deals with

towns and the requirement for 3,500. There is also a useful publication issued by VDOT entitled Highway Laws of Virginia: Statutes, Regulations, and Cases, dated 1996.

6. On any given day we already have a population of 3,500 including timeshare owners, but they are not full time residents; do you think it is worth a private bill to the state legislature to consider these tax-paying "owners" in a population count?

Lineberry did not seem to have a strong feeling about this issue. He did note that there is a similar problem in college towns with a larger population present most of the time who may not be full time residents. NOTE: there is a difference; the timeshare owners pay property taxes. The key part about the 3,500 population requirement is that it depends on which part of the Virginia Code the roads fall under. There are portions of Virginia Code that pertain to road requirements for a town, and a different category entirely--the Urban Highway System-- that cover roads within an urban area that may or may not fall within a given town.

7. Does the County get additional funds for additional miles of roads or is it all based on population?

VDOT is paid by number of lane-miles within each region. So additional roads added to the system would mean more money coming to that VDOT region for maintenance. On the other hand, the County gets funds based on a formula that includes both population and land area; the formula weights more heavily for population. NOTE: we could make a case that the County has already been getting additional funds for the increased population in Massanutten Village -- further growth will net the County additional funds in the future.

8. How does VDOT feel about private snow removal on state roads? Is this a problem in general?

He cautioned that any roads turned over to the State for maintenance would not be likely to get the level of snow removal that we currently enjoy. He said that a large amount of snow removal in subdivisions are now done by private contractors. He seemed to think that there would be no problem to continue snow removal on roads turned over to the State.

9. Do road maintenance schedules take into account extra usage(such as 175,000 ski visitors in one season)?

Rt. 644 is considered an arterial secondary route. As such, and because of the heavy use, any problems are handled almost as if it were a primary road. It is unlikely that it will ever become a primary road, even if it becomes 4 lane, because there are a fixed number of primary roads in the State; the heavy road use in Northern Virginia takes most funding to that area because of population.

10. What can be done to reduce the number of people who go off on side roads at Massanutten?

Lineberry suggested that we post "No Outlet" signs at the turnoff from Massanutten Drive (eg. Lanier) to alert drivers that these roads will not get them to a destination they may have in mind. NOTE: this is a very simple, but good idea that we need to put into our report.

11. What is the procedure and what is needed by VDOT to survey the roads in Massanutten to tell us which roads meet standards, and which do not (plus what they need in order to meet standards.)

VDOT needs a copy of our original masterplan for roads. They need to know what the specifications were for the roads when built. They also need repair information -- times when the roads were paved, to what depth, etc. If there are no longer any such original records, they can do

core drilling to determine road bed information and asphalt thickness, etc. NOTE: Miller indicated that such detail was not required in Grottoes, so he thinks this may not actually be necessary.

February 18, 1997

REPORT: VDOT RE HIGHWAYS ISSUES

1. What are the current state standards for roads? What will it take to bring our roads up to state standards?
 - a. Road bed depth?
 - b. Guardrail location, strength, height, etc.?
 - c. Widths?
 - d. Turning area for cul-de-sacs?
 - e. Shoulders? Width of shoulders and surface materials?
2. What would happen to the current police station positioned at the entrance? Could it remain as is, or would it have to be moved? Would any sort of resident key card entrance in addition to the current gatehouse change this? Could people still stop to ask directions at the entrance?
3. What is the status of widening Rt. 644? In 1995 VDOT promised to improve the shoulders; when will it be done?
4. Do you have plans and a schedule yet for straightening the "s" curves on Rt. 644? Do you have plans for a public hearing on that?
5. What is the statute or code that mandates a 3,500 population for matching funds from the state for a town?
6. On any given day we already have a population of 3,500 including timeshare owners, but they are not full time residents; do you think it is worth a private bill to the state legislature to consider these tax-paying "owners" in some fashion in a population count to meet the 3,500 threshold?
7. Does the county get additional funds for XX miles of additional roads or is it all based on population?
8. How does VDOT feel about private snow removal on state roads? Is this a problem in general?
9. How are schedules for mowing, shoulder work, re-paving and the like established? Are they similar to what we already do now at Massanutten?
10. Do such schedules (in 5.) for Rt. 644 now, take into account extra usage such as 175,000

ski visitors in one season? How does VDOT factor in even larger demands such as Woodstone Meadows development?

11. Would such increased usage be included in any future dedication of roads in our area?

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: February 28, 1997

Attendees: John Loeblich, Jan Lorette, Emerson Pitts, Phil Semsch, Warren Schmidt, Fred Wahlert

Previous Minutes were approved.

I. Old Business

- A. Prof. Ewing of UVA will meet with us at Fareways on March 5, 1997 at 12:15. We reviewed topics to discuss with him:
 - 1. Schmidt will introduce him and review our activities to date
 - 2. Ask him if he is familiar with the procedure for a special bill and if he feels one is needed should we ever test the 3,500 population issue (to include timeshare owners in some way.) What might be the political realities regarding this type action.
 - 3. What does he see as advantages to us for the Town vs. Sanitary District vs. Status Quo options
- B. Lorette has called again and still has not received the information from Sky Bryce Assn.
- C. Schmidt distributed sample costing data (still very raw estimates) for the 3 options. We reviewed and discussed the advantages and limitations of each option.

II. New Business

- A. The issue of Western Slope development was discussed -
 - 1. must we include it in either the Sanitary District or Town option?
 - 2. it is part of our Masterplan, but technically there are no legal lots there at this time (so it is an "undeveloped" area belonging to GE)
 - 3. there is no water and sewer available now
 - 4. development depends on water and sewer becoming available in Keezletown (at which time this development could happen quickly)
 - a) zoning is done
 - b) roads are laid out (even if in bad shape)
 - c) lots are laid out
 - 5. Wahlert mentioned a hydroponic water treatment system that he saw near Monterey, VA that may have applicability (inexpensive, but land intensive)
- B. Interim Report - Schmidt distributed a draft of the interim report and asked for comments:
 - 1. A suggestion was to expand the introduction portion, and also to address concerns about the eventual departure of GE (once timeshare development is completed in Massanutten Village.)

2. Lorette mentioned that in the Final Report we should suggest that the Board appoint a series of Task Forces to work on discrete tasks (eg. road dedication, private bill to include timeshare owners, and/or a group to continue consideration of the 3 options--status quo, sanitary district, or town.)
- C. Boundaries - Schmidt suggested that we discuss again the proposed boundary for any of the 3 options. We agreed to bring that up in the meeting following the March 5th meeting with Ewing.
- D. Final Report -Schmidt asked that Lorette and Wahlert draft the Highway Issues section and that Semsch draft the section on Critical Timing Points. The rest of the group are to think about the other sections named in the Interim Report for input into the Final Report.

III. Next Meeting will be March 5, 1997 at 12:15 at Fareways. We adjourned at 3 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: March 5, 1997

Attendees: John Loeblich, Jan Lorette, Phil Semsch, Warren Schmidt, Fred Wahlert
Guest: Sim Ewing of UVA

Previous Minutes were approved.

- I. Prof. Ewing of the Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service (UVA) met with us at Fareways; we discussed a variety of topics:
 - A. Schmidt introduced Ewing and reviewed our activities to date
 - B. The subject of reversion to town status of several cities in Virginia was discussed
 - C. We asked Ewing what he thinks the advantages are of being a town vs. sanitary district vs. status quo -
 1. He asked what factors we have already considered (A&E, control, and for profit ventures, were mentioned)
 2. He indicated that a very clear purpose is necessary for successfully becoming a town
 - a. only 2 towns have been formed in VA since the 1960's
 - b. one, Clinchco, badly needed water and sewer services; they took the process slowly and expanded services as they could afford to do so, and the community seems to be doing well
 - c. the other town, Castlewood, had a problems with a water system; when they became a town they borrowed heavily to address police, vehicle, and staff issues but never dealt with the water problem. Castlewood is in debt, has high taxes and the community may well disband
 3. Wahlert asked if Ewing was familiar with ways that greenspace might be handled for a community such as Massanutten; Ewing discussed a variety of options.
 - D. Schmidt asked what impact turning over roads to the State might have. Ewing mentioned 1981 Special Enabling Legislation that might permit us to turn over roads

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: March 11, 1997

Attendees: Jan Lorette, Emerson Pitts, Warren Schmidt, Phil Semsch

Previous Minutes were approved.

I. Old Business -

- A. Schmidt distributed a copy of the Interim Report to be given to the MPOA Board at the Board meeting this Saturday (March 15); he indicated that we are requesting that they postpone our deadline to April 1997.
- B. Pfaender has resigned from the Study Group citing the press of conflicting activities.
- C. The Group reviewed the visit by Ewing; key issues were -
 - 1. the population threshold of 3,500 was not so important as we had previously thought
 - 2. it is crucial to have a real purpose to seek township before attempting to do so
 - 3. there is real concern about the viability of our community if or when the developer completes timeshare building here; Fairfield may be the closest situation to ours and they have completed building in some areas. We need to check with Fairfield to see how continued management of amenities was handled.

II. New Business

- A. Draft input for the Final Report was delivered by Lorette (consolidated with Wahlert's comments) for Highway Issues, and by Semsch for Critical Turning Points and Definitions. The Group discussed the input. Schmidt will continue to draft the Final Report.
- B. Water Treatment and Sewage remain an area of concern; Ewing indicated that a 25 year old system probably needs considerable maintenance. Pitts will check with the management to see what maintenance is being done by MSPC.
- C. There was a question as to the 18% figure used as an average tax base for the Cost Estimates; Schmidt will check with a CPA to see if that number is reliable. We are currently using a base of \$160 million as a tax base for MPOA; \$30 million is the approximate number for GE's tax base in Massanutten.
- D. Semsch said that we should invite candidates from both parties to speak at Massanutten to let members know where they stand on issues of importance to our community; we would like to have a friend in the Legislature.
- E. We will seek to meet with a representative of GE (we assume that it may be their attorney) in order to let them know what information we have gathered and to find out what their views are relative to the three options.

III. Next Meeting will be March 18, 1997 at MPOA at 1:30 PM. We adjourned at 3:08 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: March 18, 1997

Attendees: John Loeblich, Jan Lorette, Emerson Pitts, Warren Schmidt, Phil Semsch, Fred Wahlert

Previous Minutes were approved.

I. Old Business -

- A. Semsch had suggested that we invite candidates from both parties to speak at Massanutten to let members know where they stand on issues of importance to our community. The MPOA Board approved this action now delegated to Semsch to coordinate. Lorette will find out the dates for the Republican caucus and Semsch has similar information for the Democrats. This meeting will probably be in May after the candidates are chosen.
- B. Schmidt said that a thank you letter has been sent to Sim Ewing of UVA for his visit to us.

II. New Business

- A. Schmidt reviewed the MPOA Board Meeting of March 15th:
 - 1. The Study Groups turned in Final Reports to the Board except for the Personnel Study Group and our group which both got extensions until May.
 - 2. Schmidt asked the Board to approve a meeting by Study Group with GE to let them know what information we have gathered and to find out what their views are relative to the three options. They approved our request with the proviso that we submit the questions we wish to ask to the MPOA Attorney first.
 - 3. Semsch gave some possible questions that we might ask GE:
 - a. What would be GE's reaction to Massanutten becoming a town?
 - b. If GE disagrees with this action, what are the specific points of opposition?
 - c. What specific suggestions do you have for GE to reach accommodation with MPOA?
 - d. If Massanutten does not become a town what would GE's reaction be to turning over the two major roads (Massanutten Dr. and Del Webb) to the Commonwealth?
 - e. If Massanutten does not become a town what would GE's reaction be to turning over all roads within Massanutten to the Commonwealth?
 - f. If GE does not agree with the concept of Massanutten becoming a town, what would GE propose to assist MPOA with these concerns (issues?)
 - 4. Wahlert mentioned the need to be ready to negotiate; he feels that we might be better off incorporating our residential area first and not trying to incorporate the GE area at this time. Discussion followed.
 - 5. Loeblich stressed a need to -
 - a. state clearly our non-financial reasons in favor of township to GE, and should be how we first approach GE. We need to let GE know the benefits to them for their participation in this process. We do not need to bring up the idea of taxing authority or annexation because GE is likely to do so.
 - b. He indicated that we need to determine some specific information, which

- we can get from public documents, including:
- 1) How much money GE generates for food sales, golf sales, lodging, and the like?
 - 2) What are GE's expenses for basic utilities (water, sewer, cable TV, electricity, telephone)?
- c. Loeblich also said that we want to ask them just what GE's plans are for development of the Western Slope.
6. Schmidt asked if we should mention the idea of two tier services as they have in Bedford, VA using Special Service Districts.
7. Pitts agreed with most of the questions as we discussed them. He said we need to refine just what the benefits are for GE should we become a town -
- a. the \$60K per year that GE pays to MPOA for road maintenance would be reduced considerably when roads are maintained by VDOT
 - b. when taxes become based on property value (instead of per lot and per timeshare unit, as is done now) that should benefit GE -
 - 1) since they hold 125+ undeveloped lots, now being assessed \$425 per lot; the lot tax would be much lower as a town
 - 2) the timeshare units in the GE inventory are assessed by the County at about \$60-80K so the per unit cost is lower than the typical house price in Massanutten; the "fair share" paid by house owners will go up even as the timeshare unit costs go down.
8. We need to ask GE what ideas they have for a way to handle timeshare owner disenfranchisement under township since owners are not residents.
9. Lorette questioned the status of the other POA's in Massanutten; only MPOA and MVOA are independent from developer control. Loeblich said that he will get a copy of the Virginia Timeshare Act which spells out very clearly the exact procedure for independent POA's. We have such entities as SVOA, ETOA, and SOA and we need to know the timetable for their eventual direct participation with us in some organization.
10. Boundaries for a possible town were discussed. Generally it was agreed that all of the area in the current Massanutten Masterplan (except the Western Slope), plus the area in the new Woodstone Meadows development, a buffer strip along both sides of Route 644 down to Route 33 including Weast Farm and small stores at Route 33, a strip along Massanutten Drive now not part of Massanutten, and some area along Route 646.
11. Wahlert expressed concern about how greenspace area now owned by MPOA might be handled by a town.
- B. Schmidt checked with the MPOA Treasurer about the 18% figure used as an average tax base for the Cost Estimates; the Treasurer indicated that we should not bother to incorporate a specific number since the tax brackets can vary so much. We should simply state that the deductibility of State and Federal Taxes have not been calculated.

III. Next Meeting will be March 25, 1997 at MPOA at 1:30 PM. We adjourned at 3:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: March 25, 1997

Attendees: John Loeblich, Jan Lorette, Emerson Pitts, Warren Schmidt,
Phil Semsch,
Fred Wahlert

Previous Minutes were approved.

I. Old Business -

- A. Wahlert spoke with Emmet Hanger (State Senator for our district) and told us that he would be pleased to meet with us regarding planning issues; we should let Hanger know when we might like to meet.
- B. Semsch reported that plans are underway to invite candidates from both parties to speak at Massanutten at the Ski Lodge on June 14 (tentative.) The MPOA Board approved this action now delegated to Semsch to coordinate with the MPOA Social Committee. Lorette reported that the Republican primary is June 10; Semsch indicated that the Democratic caucuses have taken place.
- C. Wahlert reported on a newspaper article about VDOT and road signs in this area.
- D. The questions prepared for our upcoming meeting with GE were reviewed. Semsch had minor changes. One question for Litten is whether or not a town can enforce covenants. The questions will go to the MPOA attorney, Litten, for review as directed by the MPOA Board.

II. New Business

- A. Schmidt reviewed the Draft Final Report.
- B. Pitts reported that MPSC has a new piece of equipment in place that has brought the ammonia levels to zero; they anticipate that as warmer weather comes they will not even need to use the new system as an adjunct to the regular system to stay in compliance. DEQ is satisfied. Regarding any future improvements, their engineers are studying the issue now. Lorette suggested that we include in our Final

Report to MPOA Board that they set up a Task Force to continue to monitor MPSC and their actions (ammonia levels, future improvements, etc.)

- C. Recommendations - we need to strengthen portions of the Final Report:
1. Highways - we think the MPOA Board should set up a one year Task Force to continue the efforts on road concerns (widening of Rt. 644, dedication of the roads, etc.)
 2. Governance - we think the Board should set up a one year Task Force on Governance to continue the actions identified by this group including:
 - a. more complete analysis of the costs and benefits of the options we have discussed
 - b. work with the Weldon Cooper Institute (UVA) to perform an analysis of the town option - get the property tax information, personal property tax, deeds etc. to generate a per lot assessed valuation on which to base further actions (if any)
 - c. get a copy of the Virginia Timeshare Act to get accurate information as to just what the process is for the other timeshare property owners associations to become independent of GE
 - d. begin the dialog with interested property owners to assess interest in and opposition to any changes toward becoming a town
 3. The Committee was unanimous regarding continuing MPOA with a phased in dedication of the roads, but with the need eventually to become a town
 4. MPSC Task Force to monitor and to assure DEQ compliance.

III. Next Meeting is TBD (tentatively set for April 15, 1997 at MPOA at 1:30 PM.)

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: April 18, 1997

Attendees: John Loeblich, Jan Lorette, Warren Schmidt, Phil Semsch,
Fred Wahlert

Previous Minutes were approved.

I. Old Business -

- A.. Semsch reported that plans to invite candidates from both parties to speak at Massanutten are tentatively set for June 14 at the Ski Lodge, but he thinks we may need more time since the Republican candidate will not be chosen until June 10; he will check on the Lodge availability for later dates and will coordinate with the MPOA Social Committee.
- B. Wahlert read his proposed revisions for the opening remarks for our upcoming meeting with GE; his changes were accepted by the group. GE is writing a response to our request to meet and we should have it by April 22.
- C. Schmidt asked Litten about the question of whether or not a town can enforce covenants. He said that legally a town cannot enforce pre-existing covenants, however, if the town is not challenged, of course it may do so. Loeblich said that many things now included in the covenants, could simply be reconstituted as town ordinances and then the town would have full legal authority to enforce them.
- D. Loeblich gave a copy of the Virginia Timeshare Act to Schmidt. The developer is required by this Act to turn over control to a POA when 90% of the units are sold. However, in practical terms ("90% + Gray") this usually depends on the willingness of the developer to so divest. The developer did not even begin to start the process for MOVA until 93% had sold, and did not actually turn over the control until 100% were sold. Shenandoah Villas was 96% sold at one point, but with those units which were re-claimed by the Developer, the percent is now down to 88%. There was much discussion about various ways that timeshare owners might be represented in the various government options. Lorette will check with Hilton Head, SC and perhaps Duck, NC to see how towns that exist handle timeshares within the town.

II. New Business

- A. Lorette distributed a copy of the previously reviewed L&N recommendations so the group could discuss the need, if any, for inclusion in the Final Report. It seems that most of the recommendations will be covered in the narrative.
- B. Schmidt distributed copies of the second draft of the Final Report which the group reviewed. The Executive Summary was new. Wahlert stressed the need to include references to the County as the basic form of government in Virginia. Semsch will expand the sections referring to the Town and City in the Definition and Discussion section. Lorette will meet later with Schmidt to review the Highway portion of the report.

III. We adjourned at 3 pm. The next meeting is yet to be determined.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

MPOA Government Structure Study Group

Minutes: May 7, 1997

Attendees: John Loeblich, Jan Lorette, Emerson Pitts, Warren Schmidt,
Phil Semsch,
Fred Wahlert

Previous Minutes were approved.

I. Old Business -

- A. Town Ordinance vs. Covenants - Schmidt reported that he discussed the issue of town ordinances vs. covenants, and J. Litten, the MPOA Attorney, indicated that the biggest difference is that an ordinance is a law, while a covenant is a contract (in this case with our neighbors.) When conflicts occur, various means are needed to resolve them; in Bridgewater, for example, when a conflict arose over land use, the land had to be condemned before the use could change. Covenants can, and do, exist within towns; there are, however instances where covenants can be illegal in nature (eg. specify limitations of a sort that is no longer legal under Federal legislation.)
- B. GERC Letter and meeting - We received a written response to our letter asking for a meeting to discuss their opinion of becoming a town vs. other options. Most of the questions in their letter are answered in our report. Lorette suggested that with permission from GE, we attach a copy of their letter to indicate the areas of interest to them. A discussion followed regarding the wording for a proposed boundary line to be included in the Final Report.
- C. Other - No other old business was raised.

II. New Business

- A. Final Report - We reviewed the last draft of the report. Schmidt reported on minor word changes. He also mentioned an addition of the proposed boundary, "the proposed new town would encompass all areas in the current Massanutten Village and Woodstone Meadows masterplans including those intervening properties along Massanutten Drive, and

Route 644, past Piney Mountain to Route 33, but excluding the Western Slope.

- B. Wahlert suggested that brief portions of the Code of Virginia be included in the appendix to the Final Report. Lorette volunteered to type these up and get them to Schmidt.
- C. Cover letter - The group agreed that a very brief letter to go with the Final Report was appropriate.
- D. Other - It was suggested that a copy of the Final Report be sent to all those people who participated in the effort. We briefly discussed the idea of Remarks to the Board, when the report is sent to the MPOA Board.

III. We adjourned at 2 pm. This was the final meeting.

Respectfully submitted by Jan Lorette

GOVERNANCE RECOMMENDATIONS BY L&N

We reviewed the Governance Recommendations already made by L&N on pages 52-56 of the L&N Report; some of them do not fall within our charge and seem to belong to other study committees. For those recommendations that are within our purview (indicated with bold text), we recommend that they be acted on forthwith by the Board. We have included cost implications where appropriate. The numbers preceding each item are from the L&N report:

1. Covenant changes should be for the Covenant Study Committee
2. **We agree that the Board *should* amend governing documents to *require* an annual independent certified audit; we are not charged to change governing documents, per se, so recommend that the Board do this now. Since you have been performing such an audit voluntarily it seems easy to accomplish.**
COST: none; the audit is already being done and paid for.
3. Rules changes to preclude conflict with Covenants, is a responsibility for the Covenant Study Committee
4. **The MPOA Board *should* comply with POA Act regarding closed sessions; Schmidt said that Litten, the MPOA attorney, says this is being done. The Board must stay vigilant to be sure that they comply.**
COST: none.
5. Operations Review Study Committee should follow up on the Personnel Manual.
6. **Besides training (and refresher training) on safety issues, L&N suggests that the Board should take better advantage of CAI publications and training. We recommend that the Board do so. First, by making copies of the newsletter for each Board member:**
COST: assuming a 10 page newsletter at 7 cents/page is 70 cents x 13 copies is \$9.10 per month or \$129.20 per year; distribution could be through the Guard Gate as is done for other matters.

Second, the Board should begin to schedule Board participation in CAI conferences and programs, as soon as possible. Some of these programs are one day and others are 2 days+ round table programs; costs are about \$200-400 to attend. Transportation is about \$75 per trip to DC area (@ 31 cents/mi. for 240 miles round trip.) Over night hotel rates are \$69 at the Marriot (conference rate.); meals \$30/day. We recommend that one Board member attend every 4 months (1 Round Table and 2 One day seminars) for an estimated cost as follows:

- COST: \$1,245 per year (1 conf. @ \$400, 2 sem. @ \$200, 3 round trips to DC @ \$75, 4 days food @ \$30)**
7. Book of Resolutions seems to fall under Covenant Study Committee purview.
 8. **We agree that the Decision Matrix is a good idea for Board decisions; it will help to explain and sell decisions to the members. (We similarly plan to use the same matrix for our Committee decisions.)**
COST: none. This is a procedural matter.
 9. Involving the constituents in policy development seems to fall under the Communication

Study Committee.

10. Revising nominations/election process seems to fall under the Committee Structure Study Committee.

11. **We recommend that the Board name a spokesperson "designated by the MPOA Board of Directors" to speak at planning and zoning, or other public hearings; this will be done rarely but should limit confusion on this matter. This could be any person whom the Board wishes to have present MPOA views at a public hearing.**

On the other hand, we also feel that it is important that any interested parties who happen to be MPOA members feel free to speak *as individuals* at any such meeting. We need as much involvement in local issues as possible and the Board should encourage citizen participation with the caveat that such parties state words such as "I am speaking strictly as an individual and I believe that ..."

COST: none.

12. LRPC changes come under the Committee Study Group.
13. Changes to Contracting Procedures should come under the Fiscal Committee; we also think that the Purchase Order system should be expanded.
14. Communicating with constituents, clearly comes under the Communication Study Committee.
15. Creating a unified community image is a communication issue we feel. This may take a lot of discussion and significant coordination with Great Eastern.
16. (Same as # 9 and #14 above)
17. Reconfiguring committee structure again comes under the Committee Study Group. However, we agree that Board membership on committees should be reduced or eliminated to allow more participation by MPOA members and to reduce the burden on Board members.
18. We understand that A&E already has a guide book for design review requirements and procedures.
19. The recommendation that a Task force go to Reston to see about their design review and covenants enforcement would come under the Covenant Study Committee and/or the A&E Committee.