

John 'Kim' Wiley
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?*

I would favor the Morehead Lake to Wilkinson Park extension. It's been discussed in the past so residents are more familiar with it. It also serves a section of the community that has more children so it would be put to good use and provides added safety.

There is an ad hoc Sidewalk Committee that is studying the question and will presumably present their findings to the board and community.

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?*

No. I'm in favor of sidewalks but the Governors Square to front gate area is unique in that it would allow public access into our community by bypassing the gate. It gives permission to enter. The gate helps to improve privacy and gives a sense of security. Both could be compromised.

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?

The Community Activities Committee was formed last year in response to the 2012 Focus Group findings that residents wanted a central place for community wide events, not just events for Club members (I'm paraphrasing). The aim of these activities is to encourage community spirit and promote a variety of ways neighbors can get to know each other. A strong cohesive community is important to strong home sales and neighborhoods where people want to live. Like the TV show Cheers, "people like to go where everybody knows your name". People feeling like they belong to a community help to make the community desirable. It certainly made a big difference for us last year when deciding whether to stay within the gates or move away. We need to emulate that type of community atmosphere. I favor continuing and funding the committee.

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? 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?

I favor continuing to fund the Realtor Relations Committee. I believe the committee is doing good work in attracting agents and prospective clients but it's been very difficult especially during the road construction and golf course green repair.

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?*

In general, open areas for outdoor community activities would be a plus in the sense that it would probably require minimal set-up and maintenance, provide a nice addition for all residents and their guests, attract families, and compliment the walk ways. Depending on how it was set up, it shouldn't duplicate or compete with the Club. This would be a good question to ask the members (see Q. 9 below) to get their direction.

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 favor board transparency. The more the board does behind closed doors, the more troubled the community and the more the membership will distrust their leadership.

Resolution #3 is no longer in effect. Resolution #7 is the current resolution which adds that the board may go into closed session to discuss any topic. While it is broader in scope than the previous Resolution #3, it is my hope that this part of the current resolution will be used judiciously.

I think there are a limited number of topics that should be discussed in private, for example: hiring, firing, personnel matters; legal issues; issues where confidentiality is required by law, etc.. The rest should be open to the membership.

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?

People generally come here to retire but on average they stay about 10 years before moving on. It would be better to get younger people coming in so that they remain as residents for decades.

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

No. I believe it's good policy to periodically review and evaluate the practice and effects of any undertaking. For this issue, what are the effects and expenses after 2 years of the program? Is this the most effective, safe, and humane approach? Does it reflect current science? What other non-lethal methods could be used to control the population and/or its effect on our community?

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.*

Yes, I favor seeking community input before any major decision, policy changes, or issues that are emotionally charged and polarizing. I know it can take time and slow the decision process down but it gives the board insight into the residents' positions, questions, misgivings, misconceptions or even giving additional expertise. We need community buy-in. Unless it is a truly urgent situation (and those should be pretty rare) I think it's prudent to base major decisions on residents' input so we can move together as a community.

Some examples might be: projects involving large capital expenditures, direction changes in the long-term strategic plan etc.

How to do this ... first, provide information about the issue(s) on which we need resident input so we're all starting from the same point. Next, open it for public comment. If a "course correction" in the proposed plan is needed, then would be the time for the board to do it. Last, a poll or vote to confirm we've heard and understood the members.

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.*

In general, I favor accumulating reserves and then proceeding rather than borrowing. Pay as we go, rather than owe. Some factors which we need to consider would be: the urgency of project, priority within the community, any cost savings if we can proceed sooner rather than later (especially when interest rates are low), other competing large projects, ability to maintain some reserves for emergencies (particularly infrastructure and weather related).

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?

Yes, to such events in general. No, if the event is narrowly defined as above

Do you want to encourage having more public access events?

Yes, if the board & community develop clear guidelines to define/describe the type of events it will host and how the event will be managed

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

Yes, it’s key to have a clear understanding of what type of events will be hosted and how they will be handled at the gate and throughout the community.

Public access events really bring up the broader issue of community safety and gate access. The definition in the question is really narrow. I’d begin with describing what events would/would not be appropriate to host, under what circumstances, and how gate access is handled. Do we have adequate security in place? What measures need to be taken to improve it? What happens when an attendee is not on “the list”?

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?

A community’s first impression can make or break a sale. I’ve heard so many people comment over the years how “wowed” they were when they first drove through GC. We certainly were. With that comes with a responsibility and a commitment to maintain it.

I am in favor of preventive maintenance, taking care of problems when they’re small, and fixing (rather than patching) them so they don’t reoccur. I realize that urgent or unexpected problems come up, especially infra-structure or weather related events.

I don’t think you have to choose between maintenance or reasonable level of dues. I think it’s a balance of setting the priorities of maintenance, getting the best pricing, value and people. I know that periodically dues will need to be reviewed and adjusted. But it’s key that people can see they’re getting value for their dues: the community is beautiful; the roads, sidewalks, lighting, and common areas are well kept; the office staff and management are responsive to the membership, the gate provides a warm welcome to those who are given access, and there is a sense of community and “neighborliness” among the residents.