

David Rosenberg
2013 Candidate Questions and Answers

- 1. To which of the following two sidewalk projects would you give first priority in terms of being built within our community: A sidewalk from Morehead Lake to Wilkinson Park or a sidewalk from Governors Square to some point short of the front gate?*

If elected to the Board, I intend to make decisions based solely on the relevant facts without consideration of my personal feelings. The Board has appointed a committee to review all aspects of the issue concerning additional community sidewalks. My judgment on this issue must await the completion of the committee's work, my evaluation of its report and the facts and rationale supporting it.

In terms of deciding the next sidewalk project, are you in favor of soliciting community input to help make the decision? If so, how would you propose to obtain that input?

I am always in favor of soliciting community opinion on any major issue under Board consideration. Only an informed membership can provide meaningful input. I think, therefore, the Board should explain either by email or, if necessary, by a community meeting or meetings the relevant information concerning the issue.

The membership can provide input through contact with Board members either directly or by email. As noted above, the Board can arrange for community meetings to discuss an issue and to receive membership input. Finally, the Board can arrange for a non-binding vote on any matter not requiring a membership vote under the Covenants. The alternative chosen should depend on the importance of the issue and its financial consequences.

- 2. Assuming the Board decided at some point in time to move forward with building a sidewalk from Governors Square to the front gate, would you be in favor of extending that sidewalk out to Mt. Carmel Church Road; thus allowing non-resident pedestrians and cyclists to bypass the security gates and enter the community at any time?*

I do not favor any project that compromises the security of Governors Club. Your question is based, however, on a hypothetical situation which provides me with insufficient information to determine whether the described access by non-residents would occur.

- 3. Until this year, all community wide social events (in other words, not related to the country club) were participant funded. Last year, the Board decided to create a Community Activities Committee to run community wide activities and, for the first time, to fund those events with money from our annual assessments (dues).*

Are you in favor of using POA funds to pay for community wide events run by the Community Activities Committee; or, alternatively, would you be in favor of requiring this committee's activities to be participant funded or funded through voluntary donations?

I think one function of the POA is to build a sense of community, and these events seem to be in keeping with that goal. I support the concept of using POA funds for community activities as long as the number and type of activities are limited and the total expenditures are kept reasonable. I understand that in 2013 there have been three such events at a total cost of \$323.

4. Currently, our budget allocates \$25,000 to the Realtor Relations Committee. Its purpose is to improve our relations with all realtors, to improve their awareness of our community, to make them feel welcome in terms of bringing prospects into the community to view homes for sale, and to make it as easy as possible to obtain information on homes for sale as well as information about our community.

We are currently not undertaking any marketing programs to increase awareness of our community in areas outside of the triangle (for example, national marketing programs).

Are you in favor of continuing to fund the Realtor Relations Committee as is currently being done?

I believe the current outreach to local real estate brokers by the Realtor Relations Committee is necessary, and such efforts should continue. Governors Club's relationship with local brokers have been strained over the years as a result of certain ill-advised policies instituted by the Developer and continued for some period after his control ended. I think some continuing actions to alleviate these prejudices and to make access to information and homes as pain free a process as possible is in the interest of all property owners.

I understand that the some of the funds allocated to the Realtor Relations Committee have been spent on marketing or consideration of marketing alternatives. If elected to the Board, I will carefully review the use and amount of funding for this committee. As I indicated previously, all expenditures should be subject to a cost -benefit analysis.

On a long term basis, would you be in favor of pursuing some type of national marketing effort or program? If so, how would you suggest funding such a program?

A great deal of controversy has surrounded the subject of a national marketing program. The membership recently rejected a proposal to allocate funds to implement such a program. There is substantial disagreement about what activities should be part of this program, the benefits, if any, available from it and the amount of resources necessary to implement it. I think those who believe in this type of program must present convincing evidence concerning its benefits and costs. I have not seen any such evidence to date.

5. *Are you in favor of the POA building community wide amenities such playgrounds, picnic grounds and concert arenas? If so, how would you propose to fund those expenditures?*

To the extent such amenities do not conflict with those provided by the Club and would be beneficial to property owners and to property values I would consider them. As a practical matter, however, I'm not sure which amenities would enjoy wide community use or support.

6. Last year, the Board passed Resolution # 3 allowing it to convene privately in Executive Session. It limited those sessions to discussion only and did not allow business to be conducted or resolutions to be passed. It limited reasons for convening an Executive Session to “issues that – if discussed in public – could violate privacy laws or harm or cause embarrassment to the association or another party.” The full text of that resolution can be found here: [Resolution # 3](#)

This year, the Board passed Resolution # 7 which superseded Resolution # 3. While this new resolution left the language regarding Executive Sessions essentially unchanged, it created a new category called “Closed Sessions”; which can be convened at any time without giving any reason. It also allows the Board to take actions, pass motions and conduct general business in Closed Sessions. The full text can be found here: [Resolution # 7](#)

Are you in favor of the new Resolution # 7 which allows the Board the unlimited ability to conduct community business in private sessions without giving any reason? Or are you more in favor of the old Resolution # 3 which limited private sessions to discussion only and required sufficient reason before convening a private session?

I have reviewed Resolutions # 3 and # 7. The question accurately states the differences in the Board's ability to exclude members from its meeting under the two Resolutions.

I think the Board should strive for maximum transparency. The Board certainly should not have the unlimited ability to conduct community business in private sessions. The Board members are elected officials doing the community's business. Generally, property owners should have the right to be present at Board meetings to view the process of Board decision making. Therefore, I think the reasons for passing Resolution #7 should be reconsidered with the intent either of substantially narrowing its scope or reinstating the parameters of Resolution #3.

7. Some directors claim that the future of our community is critically linked to getting more young families with children to move here. Others feel that the future of the community is linked to getting couples over the age of 50 (pre-retirees and retirees) to move here. Arguments exist to support both positions. There are also arguments to support the position that both groups are equally important and that we should not try to socially engineer the community or encourage any particular type of buyer. Rather, let every buyer decide on their own whether they want to live here.

Do you lean in any particular direction on this issue? Do you feel that the community should be spending money and/or taking actions to entice a particular demographic segment of buyers to move here?

It is in the interest of all property owners to maximize the demand for houses and lots. Certainly, we should do nothing to discourage any demographic group from living here. Diversity in any community adds to its appeal. I think our first obligation is to promote Governors Club's many unique attributes and let individual buyers choose.

Whether any action should be taken by the POA to attract any particular demographic group depends on specific information not currently available to me.

8. *Are you in favor of continuing the annual deer culling program without any changes to the way it is being conducted?*

This is the fourth year of the deer cull. It is an accepted activity at Governors Club. I think the conduct of the cull should be checked on a regular basis to make sure that its safety and security procedures are adequate and properly enforced. The recent tragic pool incident is a reminder of this need.

9. *Are you in favor of seeking community input before making major decisions or implementing changes to the community? If so, please comment the types of issues for which you would seek input. Also, please indicate how you would propose acquiring such input; for example, community wide polls, votes, etc.*

I am always in favor of seeking community input concerning major community issues. Only an informed membership can provide meaningful input. I think, therefore, the Board should fully explain issues either by use of email, the community website, or, if necessary, by community meetings.

The membership can provide input through contact with Board members either directly or by email. The Board can arrange for community meetings to discuss an issue and to receive membership input. Finally, the Board can arrange for a non-binding vote on any matter not requiring a membership vote under then Covenants. The alternative chosen should depend on the importance of the issue and its financial consequences.

The kinds of issues on which member input might be sought include those which: 1. have a major impact on the nature of the community, for example Branch Meadow; 2. have a significant financial impact on the community, for example a national marketing campaign; 3. involve adding new infrastructure, for example, a new POA building.

Finally, I should note, that while community input is important, the Board is empowered and obligated to make decisions on behalf of the community and to act in the community's best interests. Thus, the Board retains the obligation to make its own independent determination except in those instances in which the Covenants require a membership vote.

10. *The current road reconstruction project is being funded primarily from reserves accumulated over a five year period plus a \$300 special assessment and loan proceeds. In the case of future, large, capital projects, how would you propose obtaining the necessary funding? For example, accumulating reserves and undertaking projects once funds are available or, alternatively, borrowing money from lending institutions.*

I can't really answer this question in the abstract, except to say it depends. It depends, in part, on the particular project, its cost, its immediacy, the cost of money, and the financial condition of the POA.

Currently, the largest foreseeable expenses concern road repair and replacement. In the intermediate term the recent dues increase should provide the necessary funds. I think it is very important that the cost estimates for these improvements should be updated on a regular basis to determine the adequacy of available funds.

11. Please bear with the long introduction here. To understand this question, it is critically important to understand the definition of a "public access event"; which has the following characteristics:

- It is advertised to the general public outside the gates; and it encourages participation by as many people as possible from outside the community. In other words, there is no upper limit on the number of participants.
- There is no pre-registration required. Therefore, we will not know the number of participants in advance. Nor will we know who is attending.
- On the day or days of the event, any member of the general public who drives up to the gates can request access and gain entry for the event.

At this time, there is only one public access event approved for 2013; the Chatham Artist's Guild Studio Tour. This takes place over four days in December and is advertised throughout four counties. During those four days, anybody can pass through the gates; without any pre-registration; to visit the homes of one or more of the five participating artists who live in the community; the purpose being to visit the studios and to view and buy the work of those artists.

Participation in the Studio Tour was approved by the Board for the first time last year. For that tour, which was last December, the Board chose not to implement any special security or record keeping procedures. Anybody driving up to the gates and requesting access during those four days was simply let into the community. For the event this coming December, the Board

approved security procedures requiring our attendants to record the driver's name, number of passengers and license plate number on the car.

Public access events are totally different from events held at the country club. With the club's events, there is no advertising to the general public, participants are required to pre-register, the number of participants is both limited and known, the gate attendants have a list of names, and anyone requesting entry for the event is checked off against that list.

Several (and possibly more) current directors are in favor of having more public access events and wish to approve a "public event" policy or a "public access" policy. They would argue that such events are good for the community's image and make us more welcoming to the world outside the gates. Having a "public access" policy would imply tacit approval of having such events; thus making it easier to have them approved.

Contrary views hold that "public access events" are not consistent with the nature of a gated community in that they allow general public access with no upper limit on attendance. Regardless of the nature of any "public access event" (artwork related or otherwise), such activities result in additional work for the gate attendants, unrestricted traffic on our roads, parking impacts and the ability of the general public to roam the community at will.

Are you in favor of allowing "public access events" in our community?

Do you want to encourage having more public access events?

Are you in favor of adopting a policy to allow for "public access events"?

I could support a "public access policy" which limited the number of yearly events, imposed reasonable security procedures, and limited the nature of the community activity. My support for any particular policy would depend on the specifics.

Some history concerning "public access events" will be helpful in considering this question. There have been a number of such events in the past, usually not more than one or two events per year. For instance, for a number of years the POA had an annual event associated with the Parade of Homes which allowed unscreened outsiders entrance into Governors Club allowing them to view the community and its homes.

12. Running a community association is, in many respects, a balancing act between spending the money necessary to preserve and enhance overall property values within the community and maintaining a reasonable level of dues (or, put another way, not raising annual assessments or initiating special assessments). On one side would be those who say it is far more important to keep the level of annual assessments down than to worry about the condition of the community. On the other side would be those who say that the condition of the community (and resulting property values) are far more important than worrying about increases in annual assessments. It's

probably fair to say that most people are somewhere in between these two possibly extreme positions.

Can you indicate toward which side of this balance you might lean?

The primary functions of the POA are maintaining the appearance and functioning of existing community infrastructure. It is essential that funds are available to achieve these goals. Our quality of life and the maintenance of our property values are dependent on this. Anyone who has been to or lived in a community where the condition of the community is allowed to deteriorate knows this. Thus, such maintenance and provision of funds for this purpose should be the first priority of the POA and its membership. Of course, as with all expenditures, they should be made in the most efficient and cost effective manner.

It is also true, however, that the cost of living in a community affects property values and the quality of life of property owners. Thus, beyond maintaining existing infrastructure, any financial decision should depend on assessing the impact of the expenditure on its overall worth to the community. Each decision requires a specific evaluation, but in making any decision it is essential that we separate needs from wants and focus first on needs.