

**Myakka Valley Ranches Improvement Association
Annual Member Meeting, April 2, 2013 2:00pm**

Location: Firehouse #18, Myakka Valley Ranches

**PROPER MEETING NOTICES SENT BY MAIL AND POSTED ON BULLETIN
BOARD BY THE FIREHOUSE**

DRAFT MINUTES

Deb Houston, President, called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm and declared a quorum. Board members present were: Jackie Vizzi, Bill Barrett, Bob Chenard, Jim Holthaus, Andy Behn, Vivian Zabik and Gary James

Welcome: The President welcomed Association Members. There were 43 Members present (in addition to the Directors) and 39 proxies were received.

Approve Minutes Of Last Annual Meeting Sunday April 15, 2012: DAVID HODGKINSON moved that the Minutes be approved. JOHN CORCORAN seconded. The Motion was approved unanimously.

2013/2014 Proposed Budget (Jim Holthaus): The President thanked Jim for the hours of voluntary effort he has put in (without recompense). Jim is now retiring from the position of Treasurer. Jim presented the budget which was in similar format to the previous year. It was noted that the Board had approved a 10% increase in annual dues to \$429 per property. There are 276 lots. Jim explained that the proposed budget is based on the income that the Association expects to receive (\$106,563.60) which is split between the Operating Budget and the Reserve Fund. There were a number of questions on the Operating Budget:

- a) Will MVRIA receive \$650 in estoppels? A – This is the best guess based on previous years.
- b) Will MVRIA receive \$2000 from Trails and Tails? A – We may not do so.
- c) Why is the budget for taxes and licenses \$150 when only \$6 has been spent so far this year? A – All the figures are estimates based on what we expect to spend this year.
- d) What is the landscaping request for \$1000? A – Sally Corcoran (with others) has volunteered to tidy and plant up the entrance to the Valley.

On the Reserve Budget/Fund, it was noted that the Board has no control on how this is spent. Expenditure is based on how Association Members vote. The Byelaws state that: *Fifty percent (50%) of the annual assessments shall be designated for reserves for capital projects, deferred maintenance or special projects. Further, not less than fifty percent (50%) of this reserve fund shall go into a separate fund for capital projects (as opposed to routine maintenance like filling potholes) relating to the maintenance of the roads, culverts, drainage ditches, and the bridge. Monies can be taken from capital/special projects part of the Reserve Fund and put towards the roads part. There is also a Future Road Reserve Fund that was set up in later years which currently holds \$64,068.35. We*

are short of money to fund the road maintenance requirements for next year. There is a proposal to move resources from the Future Road Fund to fund this shortfall. There were a number of questions on the Reserve Funds:

- e) Will anything remain in the Future Reserve Fund? A – it depends on what Members want to do. It is suggested that only sufficient is taken to fund the shortfall.
- f) Is the Membership voting on the road proposal line by line? A – Not as it stands. If you want all of the proposals, vote yes for the whole \$96,900 (not \$98,900 which was an error on the voting paper).
- g) Where is the balance coming from to fund the \$96,900? A – from the Future Road Reserve Fund. Note that there is no strategy in place to replenish this Fund.
DREW CUMMER moved that the Ballot be amended to allow Members to vote for the road proposals line by line. Seconded by Jim Holthaus.
Concern was expressed that some members not present had already voted by proxy, however it was noted that a proxy gives the holder permission to vote on any new issues on behalf of the originator. It was suggested that the Motion be tabled to allow David Hodgkinson to present his report and decide on the method of voting afterwards. **STAN DACAR moved that the Motion be tabled. It was seconded by JOHN CORCORAN. The Motion was carried (3 against).**

The suggestions for the Special Projects/Capital Improvements category were rumble strips at the Guard House (\$2000), and upgrades to the security camera system, also at the Guard House (\$750).

Security Report (Trudi Lawrenz): Trudi presented the report and confirmed that the Guard House had been reroofed and that there were three security cameras in place monitoring incoming and outgoing traffic. With regard to the rumble strips, it was hoped that installing these would remind traffic to slow down before entering the community. On the proposed system upgrades, the proposal was to set aside \$750 year on year to fund replacement of or improve the cameras. Questions/Comments were as follows:

- 1. What are the cameras doing now and how are they being monitored? A – The cameras are monitoring incoming and outgoing traffic. Input lasts about a month. Concern was expressed that the system cannot be properly reviewed and that the environmental conditions in the Guard House are not good enough to stop the recording equipment deteriorating. There was also some confusion about whether proxies would have voted on a one off expenditure instead of a recurring annual amount being set aside.
- 2. Are we spending money on a system that does not work? We are not receiving any feedback on what the cameras are doing. There is no report to the Board. How do we fund something for the future if we don't know what is happening now? A – if the community want something else to happen, put it in writing to the Board.
- 3. Why waste money on rumble strips? People will just go round them. A – People speed all over the Valley. This is just one possible solution.
- 4. Where is the lighted Bulletin Board with glass frontage that Members voted on last year? The post it boards do not work. A – Solar lighting was suggested and the project came to a halt. The money is still in the Budget. It was further queried

whether the project HAD to get done since members voted for it. The questioner was reminded that this is all voluntary work.

5. Do the cameras capture license tags? A – yes.

Roads Report (David Hodgkinson): David thanked Jim Alexander, Stan Dacar, Richi Dubreuil, and especially the late and greatly missed Richard Johnson, for all their help with maintaining the roads. He explained that the roads were last resurfaced in 1995 using recycled material. The projected lifespan of such resurfacing is 17 years approx. and it is now year 18. The Road Committee monitors deterioration, and maintenance work is prioritized accordingly. There is a further problem now that there is more work for the construction industry. It is becoming difficult to get contractors to come into the Valley. However, the Committee is endeavoring to get the work done properly at the lowest possible cost. For example, potholes are not just refilled as this only lasts a few weeks. The road surface is cut out and reconstructed. An annual report on the results of the road surveying and analysis is posed on MVRIA website. The proposed 300 yard overlay in next year's budget is most of the way from the arch to SR72. We also need a concrete edge to stop the road edges breaking away and we need to continue patching. The worst areas are two or three sections on Old Ranch Road and Myakka Valley Trail. This way, 25 years of life is anticipated. Currently, the last stage of resurfacing at the front entrance is in progress. (Note that the left hand turn lane from SR 72 is now programmed for 2015). Questions were as follows:

- a) Will the roads be sustainable for heavy traffic and do we seek contributions from property owners who are not Association Members? A – The weight of traffic is a factor of several times its weight but roads deteriorate faster/slower for a number of additional reasons like weather and nature of subsoil. Seeking contributions is a function for the Board. They were sought several years ago. Westwood and the Nursery each contributed \$1000. There was a court case over 30 years ago which resulted in a ruling that the lot owners who were here before the Association was formed do not have to belong and they refuse to pay towards the roads. Last time there was a road assessment (1995), each property had to pay \$3,600. Now it would be several times this cost. It is hoped we can do a piece of roadway at a time and avoid a special assessment.
- b) Why don't we do the most needed areas? A – We do. The front entrance was the most needed area this year.
- c) Why didn't we do the front entrance last year? A – Because all the money was needed for patching.
- d) Is there any financial disadvantage in letting the roads crumble completely and then fixing them? A – We leave any intervention until the road is about to crumble. We don't want to spend money for the sake of it. Patching does not look good but it is strong and will last.
- e) Why install concrete strips, why not just widen road? A – How much do you widen? Sandy soil does not hold road edges together. Also, it is difficult to roll. Asphalt pavement is flexible and benefits from an edge support.
- f) Should we spray and tar? A – The problem is pavement strength not just waterproofing.
- g) Should we scrape off the old road surface and reuse? A – recycling is a very expensive process.

- h) Will we require another \$90,000 next year? A – We plan to do only those things that need to be done. Not cosmetic. We have a data base of the condition of the roads and we will only repair when things are at the end of their useful life. But, we cannot predict what the roads will be like in a year. Depends on weather, volume and weight of traffic, etc.
- i) Is the outstanding \$4000 to be paid to the contractor in this year’s budget? A – Yes. Contract is in 3 installments. The \$4000 has not been paid yet but is shown as a commitment.
- j) Where is the overlay being done? A - The overlay will go most of the way from the Guard Shack up to the new area. 100 ft. of easement is owned by the State but MVRIA has to maintain it.
- k) Are the missing reflectors cosmetic or a necessity? A – They are a safety aid, like repainting the white lines.
- l) Why not wait until there are more contractors in the market and have a long range plan? A – we can work with the money that we have now. The plan is only to do what is necessary. Many people would not be able to pay an assessment. Next year, the works will be bundled into one larger contract instead of several smaller ones.
- m) Will the Board suggest a way to supplement the road fund? A – A matter for the Board.
- n) Is this year a good indicator of future road needs? A – Cannot predict future needs. But, we will only do what needs to be done. These needs will be assessed year by year.

The President asked for the Motion to be voted on, as proposed by DREW CUMMER **that the Ballot be amended to allow Members to vote for the road proposals line by line.**

It was noted that, if all the road work is approved for the full \$96,900 but the transfer of money from the Future Road Reserve Fund is not approved, the works would be done for the available monies in order of priority.

The Motion was NOT carried, with 37 against and 26 for. The ballot stood.

Election of Directors: **BILL STILL** self-nominated from the Floor. It was noted that there were now 4 nominations for the Board and that Members could vote for up to 4 Directors. The total number of Directors allowed on the Board is 11.

Residents’ Questions: There were none.

Adjournment

DAVID HODGKINSON moved to adjourn the meeting at 3.45pm. **WANDA MARTINEZ** seconded. **The Motion was approved unanimously.**

RESULTS OF BALLOT

The following were appointed to the Board of Directors:

- David Hodgkinson
- Deb Houston
- Vivian Zabik
- Bill Still

The following Roads Projects were approved:

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Roads | \$96,900.00 (59 yes, 13 no) |
| 2. Use Future Roads Reserve to improve roads | (56 yes, 18 no) |
| 3. Road Fund to cover road projects shortfall for 2013/2014 | (66 yes, 14 no) |

The following Special Projects were not approved:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Rumble strips at Guard House | (58 no, 16 yes) |
| 2. Upgrades to system (camera) | (40 no, 34 yes) |