

Minutes of Meeting of the HVPOA Board of Trustees

Meeting was called to order at 6:22 p.m. on Friday 01 May 2009 at the Taufer residence.

Note: The Trustees present requested that Mr. and Mrs. Meyers assist with taking minutes for this meeting because Secretary Hatch was absent. A motion to that effect was made and seconded. Trustees Walker, Taufer, and Johnson voted in the affirmative. The motion carried.

Trustees present were R. Walker, J. Taufer, and C. Johnson. Absent were K. Hatch and R. Widdop.

Members of the Association present were Annette Grant, Shelly Marshall, Tom LeFevre, Mr. and Mrs. Holzworth, Jody Taufer, Mr. and Mrs. Justin Taufer, Rita Walker, and Mr. and Mrs. Meyers.

1. Board of Trustees agenda first item was the reading of the minutes from the 22 April 2009 Meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Discussion: The minutes were not available for review.

Motion: No motion was made.

2. Board of Trustees agenda second item was to discuss the adoption by the Board of Trustees of the "Collection of Unpaid Charges" resolution prepared by the Law Firm.

Discussion: Mr. Walker was concerned that there were 27 members each owing more than \$1000.00 in unpaid assessments, totaling \$68,128.87. The total amount of past due assessments is \$124,830.00. General discussion ensued on the budget, its structure, and the wording used in it.

Mr. Walker brought the meeting back to order and reminded everyone that the issue on the floor was the adoption of the resolution. General discussion on the resolution ensued. Mr. Johnson stated that he had not reviewed the resolution; and as he started to read it he expressed concern about some wording in it. Mrs. Walker pointed out that she had sent it to him five days earlier. Further discussion ensued. Mr. Taufer made a motion.

Motion: A motion was made and seconded to have Mr. Johnson review the collections resolution by Monday, May 4, 2009; and for Mr. Walker to review any concerns raised by Mr. Johnson with the Law Firm prior to accepting the agreement and resolution. Mr. Walker, Mr. Taufer, and Mr. Johnson voted in the affirmative. The motion carried.

3. Note: Throughout the meeting there was extensive dialogue between members of the Association, the Trustees included, expressing a variety of opinions and positions regarding the wording of the Amended Budget, the wording of the Mail-in Ballots, the need to have

funds available for the timely payment of bills, partially informed or miss-informed points of view, email correspondence and responses, incorrect information in anonymous mailings to members of the Association, the nature of the Law Firm and its services, and the performance of various individuals regarding the affairs of the community.

Mr. Taufer expressed a concern with accusations made by various persons, sometimes anonymously, and about the incorrect information sent out in a mailing by what is presumed to be the CPO. Mrs. Walker stated that she was upset about the unfair accusation written in an anonymous note that she found in her mailbox that stated, "Be more honest not just with yourself, but with every HV owner".

Ms. Marshall objected to the original budget sent out claiming that there were errors in the budget. Mr. Walker pointed out that Mr. Johnson and Ms. Hatch had drafted the original budget. Mr. Walker and Mr. Holzworth discussed the Amended Budget. Mr. Taufer pointed out that funds were not received until late 2008, and were not available earlier to be assigned to road work. Mr. Holzworth was concerned about the structure of the budget. He objected that the budget described the \$23,000 as a "savings account" as opposed to a "reserve fund". Mr. Holzworth agreed that it was a "wording thing", and made the point that there were potential tax consequences to consider.

Ms. Marshall and Mr. Holzworth objected to the requirement on the Mail-in Ballot that 51% of all members approve the proposed By-laws, as opposed to just the majority of those responding. Mr. Holzworth said that the Association has never had a 51% vote. He added that because they "couldn't get anything done", the Board on which he was a Trustee amended the old By-laws to allow approval by a majority of those present at a duly noticed meeting. He confirmed that said amendment was approved by the majority of those present at that meeting, not by 51% of all members. Ms. Marshall reminded everyone that the proposed By-laws don't require 51% of the members to amend them. Mr. Walker explained that the voting requirement in the Mail-in Ballot was included on the advice of the Law Firm.

Multiple simultaneous discussions took place. No further motions were made.

The 01 May 2009 Meeting of the Board of Trustees adjourned at 7:41 p.m.