



## **Annual Meeting Newsletter**

**Meeting Agenda, Board Member Candidate Information, Proposed  
2016 Budget**

**December 1, 2015 8:00pm - Hunters Woods Rec Center Rooms 1-2-3  
(Doors open at 7:30pm)**

To be eligible to vote in the Annual Election, you must be a Resident Member in good standing (i.e. all dues are current). If you have any concerns about your voting eligibility, please contact the Board as soon as possible at [board@huntersgreen.org](mailto:board@huntersgreen.org) to resolve any issues prior to the Annual Meeting.

### **2015 Annual Meeting Agenda**

1. Call to Order and Review of Agenda
2. Reading and Approval of Minutes of 2014 Annual Meeting
3. President's Report
4. Treasurer's Report and Review of Proposed 2016 Budget
5. Vote on 2016 Budget
6. Vote on Road Widening Proposal
7. Vote on Playground
8. Election of Board Members
9. Member Comment Period
10. Executive Session
11. Adjournment

## **Summary of This Newsletter**

So you might be wondering why your newsletter is so thick this year. Well, the community has two major projects up for community vote and the Board wants to ensure you have as much information as possible when you cast your vote. Here's a quick summary of what's going on and what's in this packet.

### **Board Positions**

We have 3 vacancies on the Board this year. We will elect three new members to the Hunters Green Cluster Association Board of Directors. The terms currently held by Yanni Chryssomitis and John Lankau are up for election, and President Jeff Byrd announced that he will be stepping down and his seat will be filled during this annual meeting as well. Two of the vacancies are for 3-year terms, and one of the vacancies is for a 2-year term. Each household will be able to vote for three candidates. The two candidates with the most votes will receive the three year terms. The candidate with the third most votes will receive the two-year term.

### **Annual Operating Budget**

The proposed standard operating budget for 2016 is included for your review. This is for the normal, expenses in the community like trash disposal, landscaping, snow removal, legal, accounting, insurance, etc. The proposed operating budget for 2016 includes a dues increase of just over 8% from \$370 to \$400 per quarter. For historical context, the Cluster has been able to keep dues consistent since 2013. However, with ever increasing costs to maintain our 45 year old neighborhood plus the critical need to fund our capital reserve properly, it is the recommendation of our Treasurer that the Cluster align our dues properly to build upon the financial stability of the Cluster.

### **Capital Reserve Projections**

Included in this packet is a projection of our capital reserves. It is important to note that the projections for year end of 2016 show there to be a slight negative balance. This is the case for two reasons: 1) An omission in the 2013 projection removed the capital disbursement for sidewalks, curbs and gutters due for the same year, but never allocated it to a future year. The second contributing factor is that the low interest environment in which we find ourselves simply do not allow for 2% returns in a risk-free environment. It should be noted that a negative capital reserve projection is not the same as a negative balance on a bank account. As you will see from the cash flow models which have been created to support community decisions on road widening and the playground, you will see that we have plenty of cash to operate. Once we know the actual disbursements for the asphalt work, we will be able to resolve this matter. As noted above, we are calling the membership to vote on two items - replacing the old playground on Indian Ridge Road and also road widening as a means to achieve more parking within our cluster. The former is greatly underfunded as can be seen in our capital reserve study and the latter is not funded at all. The budgeting and cash flow models created to support these community decisions lean conservatively - that is, costs are exaggerated and our assumptions on negotiating to the financial advantage of the community are mitigated. Of course, you are welcome to contact the Board to answer questions that you have.

### **Asphalt Repaving**

2016 is the year scheduled for us to have our roads repaved. This was planned for several years and is already fully funded in our Capital Reserves. However, this also gives the community an opportunity for widening the roads and allowing for some additional parking.

### **Road Widening Proposal**

You may have noticed the pink taped off areas on Indian Ridge Road and Hunters Green Court the past month or so. These are the areas that are proposed for street widening to allow the community to provide room for 6 parallel parking spaces on Indian Ridge Road and 5 on Hunters Green Court. The Board has been advised by the vendors that widening the road in conjunction with repaving is the best way to ensure the life of the road. This will be voted by the community at the Annual Meeting. There is a full section detailing this proposal and a Q&A as well.

### **Playground Project**

The 2015 Playground Committee has selected a playground design to replace the current playground on the big hill coming up Indian Ridge Road. Unfortunately, due to safety concerns the current playground will need to be removed in 2016 no matter the outcome of this vote. This new playground project will be voted on by the community at the Annual Meeting. There is a full section detailing the proposal including graphics and background information from the Playground Committee.

### **Putting It All Together**

The Road Widening is currently not funded at all and the Playground Project is very much underfunded. Both initiatives will require a special assessment to fund them if the Community votes to approve one or both of these projects. The Board anticipates that the asphalt repaving project could very well come in under the amounts budgeted in our capital reserve study and the excess funds can be put towards whichever projects were approved by the community (if any) and lower the overall special assessments required. For more information, please see the Cash Flow Analysis attachment.

If you have questions about any of the information contained in this Newsletter, please send them to [board@huntersgreen.org](mailto:board@huntersgreen.org). Thanks, and we'll see you at the Annual Meeting!

## Candidate Statements

### Yanni Chryssomitis

Yanni Chryssomitis has lived in Hunters Green Cluster since 2008 and has served on the Board for the last three years, two in the role as your Treasurer. He wants to note his accomplishments in helping build on the fiscal strength and security of our cluster, specifically in maintaining the crucial path in properly funding our capital reserve. Moreover, he strongly believes in inclusion for our silent majority who want to participate in community matters but who can't always make the time. He believes that the next year will be a truly transformative year for Hunters Green and has decided to re-run so that he can help the cluster transition through his perception of what will be a very critical time for our community.

When he is not studying up on the POA act and replying to the many NextDoor posts directed at him, Yanni enjoys spending time walking his amazing canine friend Dante (shameless plug for Friends of Homeless Animals - learn more at [www.foha.org](http://www.foha.org)) around our equally amazing neighborhood.

## **Hadi Damavandy**

Hello, my name is Hadi Damavandy. My wife, Jerri, and I just closed on our townhome on Hunters Green Court a few weeks ago and plan on moving in after some remodeling – just after the New Year. Currently, our family consists of two spoiled animals: Julio the rescue dog and Panky the stray cat. We hope to expand our family in the very near future and make use of the community playgrounds.

I have lived in Reston for about 20 years. I graduated from South Lakes High School and worked for about 7 years – 4 of which in the IT field as a Systems Engineer at the US House of Representatives. I ultimately returned to school and earned a BS in Biological Sciences from the George Washington University and my JD from the University of San Diego School of Law. I stayed in California for about two years after law school working with a small immigration firm and the San Diego Public Defenders Office before returning to Virginia to pursue a federal position. While studying for the Virginia Bar, I was presented with the opportunity to manage some rental property as a side job. As it turns out, by the time I was admitted to the Virginia Bar, I had my Realtor's license and was working full time as a property manager. I currently manage about 30 properties, most of which are in Reston.

Why Hunters Green? My wife and I love Reston and wanted to remain here and really like that it is within walking distance to the metro. Also, I really started to appreciate the style and differences between each home in the cluster after looking at all the vinyl siding units in Herndon. But the main thing that I liked about Hunters Green was the sense of community I felt from looking over the cluster webpage and emailing the board. Before submitting our offer for the home, I checked the cluster page and looked over the bylaws. I remember reading the parking policy and the FAQ about how the board reaches out to the car/home owner before towing the offending car or how you should try to be courteous to your neighbors and move your car to less used areas when you are traveling for extended periods of time – how reasonable! I remember thinking how nice it was that this board embraces and uses technology (webpage, Nextdoor, google docs, etc) to facilitate its functions. My emails to the board were answered quickly and thoroughly with a very friendly tone. It was such a pleasant change from our former condo association board. Heck, on our way to closing, we stopped by the condo to do a final walk through and met our next door neighbor who invited us to their Halloween party (which we enjoyed immensely). I thought that we had found the perfect place. Since then, I have joined Nextdoor and am starting to get a different impression. I can only hope that the negativity or “spirited discourse” is related to the election/parking expansion and not an ongoing issue.

If the community needs able-bodied, friendly volunteers to stay self-managed and keep assessments down, then I would like to be considered.

## Road Widening/Parking Expansion Proposal

**The specific question that will be voted on for Road Widening is as follows:**

*Should the community proceed with asphalt repaving to include widening the street on Indian Ridge Road for and Hunters Green Court in the specified areas to allow room for parallel parking spaces on each street? Based on the estimated cost of \$50,000, funding this initiative will require a special assessment of up to \$450 per household and/or other funding approaches such as fundraising or changing the timing of other projects.*

*Yes – Proceed with the necessary approvals from RA, Fairfax County, and the Fire Marshal to include road widening into the asphalt repaving project.*

*No – Proceed with asphalt repaving and do not pursue widening the road.*

## Road Widening/Parking Expansion Proposal Details

The areas considered for road widening are marked on both streets in the community. Both areas are under consideration for widening from 24 feet to 28 feet (or more) to comply with Fairfax County Fire Marshal requirements to allow for one-way parallel parking. For Indian Ridge Road the area is approximately 120 feet long and would accommodate space for 6 parallel parking spaces. For Hunters Green Court the area is approximately 100 feet long and would remove an existing sidewalk.

The full proposal can be found in the Latest Documents section of the Hunters Green Cluster website Resource Center (<https://sites.google.com/a/huntersgreen.org/home/resource-center>).

The Capital Reserve Study scheduled a combined \$281,522 for asphalt repaving, sidewalks, curbs and gutters to be completed between 2013 and 2016. As a result, these items are already funded.

## Road Widening/Parking Expansion Q&A

At the community's request, we invited questions about the plan.

Since the restriping of the neighborhood required by the Fire Marshal in 2012, there have been many discussions as to the adequacy of our cluster parking. Opinions are driven by each person's individual perspective of need, convenience, aesthetics, and cost. It is the Board's responsibility to respond to the requests of the community – even if only a part of the community – and provide an approach that can be voted on for approval/disapproval at the Annual or a special meeting.

After two years of discussions, the Board has chosen to develop a proposal as a compromise recommendation. The approach reflects a plan that has minimal impact on our green space while providing some additional parking to accommodate those times where there is more than the usual number of visitors.

The following provides the process of approvals that are required if we move forward, and a response to the questions that we have received over Next Door or directly in email. Answers were divided into two categories: those that related to the recommended change, and those that related to the DRB submission. Answers are provided immediately after the question.

### PROCESS

If the community votes to move forward on implementing parking changes, we wanted to outline the steps that will be taken to accomplish the project. There are essentially 3 major approvals required:

- **HGCA** - Most importantly, the community has to vote in the December Annual Meeting to accept the proposed changes since they have an impact on our common ground. The cost of the change and the method by which we recommend paying for these changes will be presented in the December Annual Meeting.
- **RA/DRB** – Approval from the Reston Association requires no funding and requires no commitment on our part to actually make the changes. If approved, we have two years to implement the changes. The Design Review Board will typically look at changes from the perspective of Reston covenants and any impacts to common space. They could recommend changes to the overall plan to meet their guidelines. Getting the plan in front of the DRB is a fairly straightforward process that should not take a lot of time.
- **Fairfax County** – Approval from the County is a much more onerous undertaking. Recognizing this, the Board has requested a proposal from the same engineering firm (JGB Engineering) that did our initial parking study (the original study may be found in the resource center of the HGCA Web site). What JGB will do is:
  - Finalize the exact plan and create drawings sufficient for Fairfax County to review and approve. The Board will work with them to determine the exact changes to be made taking into account such things as safety and esthetics.
  - Work with Fairfax County to ensure they have everything they need to review and approve (e.g., issues related to water run off).
  - Coordinate with Williams pipeline for approval.
  - Coordinate with the Fire Marshal for agreement regarding re-striping.
  - At our option, they will manage the selected asphalt firm during repaving.

Discussions with JGB indicate that we can go through the above process in time to perform repaving next summer.

The following provides the answers to the questions we received. When similar questions were received, they have been grouped and answered together to reduce redundancy.

#### QUESTIONS REGARDING THE PROPOSED CHANGES

- **Q. In the August 2013 parking study done by JGB Engineering there were many potential places to add parking spaces. Now it seems the board is proposing only two - one for Hunters Green Ct and one for Indian Ridge Rd. I'm sure there have been many discussions and decisions since then. Can you summarize why the board is proposing only two areas for adding parking spaces?**
  - **Why aren't more alternatives plans being brought up for vote?**
- A. Through the course of a year's worth of parking committee meetings, a walk-through of the community to discuss options, and numerous discussions at Board meetings we were unable to reach consensus as to how many or where to place additional parking spaces. The community is fairly evenly split as to the need or desire for additional parking. As such, proposing an expensive initiative did not seem prudent, and the Board decided to propose a low cost alternative that provided a moderate amount of additional parking. The Board would have preferred a proposal that distributed the parking more evenly across the community, but any such approach would have added to the cost.

- **Q. In the same parking study, the two areas the board is proposing are evaluated. For the one on IRR (item J), it is presented as an area that would have bay parking, which would add 14 spaces on IRR. It appears that the board is proposing widening only enough for parallel parking, adding 5 or 6 spaces. Wouldn't it be more cost effective in the long run to add 14 spaces?**
- **Why can't we distribute spaces more evenly around the community?**

A. Providing bay parking would add significantly more spaces but at added cost and greater loss of common green space. The Board's proposal takes into consideration those who have indicated a desire to keep as much common property green; bay parking would take approximately 15 feet, as opposed to 4-5 feet in the areas being proposed, which we believe would be a showstopper for many owners on Indian Ridge Road (IRR). Similarly, distributing the spaces across the community has proportionately greater cost at the loss of more common space.

- **Q. Did GJB Engineering include road widening as an option on IRR?**

A. They included these spaces in their analysis and discussed doing just a road widening at one of the committee meetings as a possibility.

- **Q. Regarding IRR, according to plan and ground markings, cars will protrude significantly into the existing roadway. Please explain the safety implications, and the Board's response, as to people exiting vehicles amongst traffic in the middle of the road. Where do you expect them to walk without a sidewalk? What is your opinion on the adequacy of lighting? Does the Board plan to add new sidewalks and/or lighting, and if so why is this not reflected in the plan?**
- **Won't cars parked in the proposed spaces stick out into the street?**

A. Prior to the striping, people parked in this area without sidewalks or additional lighting. The proposed change will partially recreate the situation that existed previously, but will be in compliance with the Fire Marshal's standards. Many of the clusters in Reston have designated parking similar to the road widening proposal, so this would not be an unusual situation. Per our capital reserve study, lighting will be considered as a major initiative in 2016-17 and lighting needs could be addressed at that time.

- **Q. As part of planning for the road widening, I think you said you are contacting Reston Association, Fairfax County, the Fire Marshall, and the Williams Pipeline to discuss the road widening and understand implications to the cluster if we do. It's my understanding that the vote in the December Annual Meeting is simply a vote to move forward on doing the research needed to make an informed final decision on the road widening. There are unknowns and costs involved in doing that (Fairfax County fees, etc.) that you are trying to be 'transparent' about - and will allow residents in December to decide on whether we want to spend the dollars to move forward on the research.**

A. The Board's intent from the very beginning (approximately 2 years ago) was to bring a proposed parking change to the December meeting that had not to exceed (NTE) costs included for the project. Costs described would include both the cost to create new spaces as well as the costs associated with getting permission from Fairfax County. With approval from the community we would continue to move forward with the detailed design, permitting process and other considerations required to begin the repaving.

- **Q. During the last Board meeting, someone stated that delaying the paving for up to a year while we get permits, etc. will cause more damage to our roads, costing us double the amount for the paving? What did the engineers say?**

A. Both paving companies said this was absolutely NOT the case for the majority of the asphalt; they said that the roads were not so bad that a delay would cause additional cost and even localized need for deeper milling which is required for damaged roadbeds would cause only a nominal increase in cost of less than \$15,000. Further, they stated that doing the widening (or other parking expansion) at a different time than the re-paving would impact the useful life of the addition, and they advised that both projects should be undertaken at the same time to maximize the life of the pavement.

- **Q. Is it true that Fairfax County has one of the toughest fire codes in the country -- which includes the 28ft road width requirement?**

A. The Board does not have insight regarding other fire standards in different jurisdictions. We do know that the Fairfax County Fire Marshal tightened the standard a few years ago. When the community was first built we were in compliance with the then 24' standard.

- **Q. Why are these spots so far away from units?**
- **How will these spaces benefit those who don't live near them?**

A. To meet the Board's objective of minimizing cost and impact to green space, road widening became an attractive solution. The two areas selected were obvious choices since for IRR, there was no impact to trees, bushes or other landscape; and HGC would replace the "sidewalk to nowhere" which has no effect on green space. Keeping in mind that the road widening is a compromise solution that is intended to offer overflow relief at times of heavy congestion, they provide a better alternative than parking outside the cluster.

- **Q. How does the upcoming repaving plan affect this?**
- **Can we delay the vote on the proposal and discuss in a committee?**

A. Response from the two asphalt companies we have talked to is that the road widening and re-paving should be done at the same time. Their opinion was that doing an addition to the street after re-paving was completed would compromise the street in those areas where the old asphalt stopped and the new asphalt began (the seam), and result in a serious degradation to the life of the asphalt. In other words, if we don't do them simultaneously, the Board has been advised from many contractors that parking expansion performed at a time other than asphalt repaving would have a negative impact on the community's asphalt investment. Effectively, we would be advised to wait approximately 18 years until the next re-paving is scheduled to re-evaluate parking expansion.

- **Q. Can the community parking issues be resolved with increased enforcement?**

A. No, the Board believes increased enforcement is not a viable solution for more parking. Enforcement and adequate parking are two separate topics. Independent of how much parking we have, enforcement is always an issue where, for example, cars are out of registration, or non-residents are parking their cars within the cluster for extended periods of time. Our experience with enforcement is that you will occasionally have an issue that needs to be addressed, but we have not experienced the situation where it is a daily occurrence that is keeping residents from parking their cars or their guest's cars.

Professional enforcement would also be an additional cost, and the Board has not heard any residents advocating for a professional solution.

- **Q. If the community does not approve the current proposal, what happens next?**

A. If the current proposal is not approved, the Board will continue to monitor the needs of the community, but does not expect it will pursue any additional parking alternatives in the near future.

#### QUESTIONS REGARDING THE RA/DRB SUBMISSION

- **Q. How do you justify stating that we lost over 50 parking spaces? Can you mark these out on a plan please? Were these designated parking spaces that we lost? Wasn't there adequate accommodation for all cars the day after the striping occurred, with leftover spaces, as per the 2012 survey results?**

A. The exact number of spaces that people were using could be debated. The Board performed a walk-through that counted 60+ spaces. We used 50 as a conservative estimate. As has been stated many times, on a day-to-day basis there is adequate parking within the community. The question of adequacy, however, is a perspective issue. Surveys from last year have reflected that over half of the community would be interested in additional parking if the price is right. The proposed change is a direct response to the community's expressed interest for an approach for this additional parking.

- **Q. You are effectively stating that the fire lanes created a hardship due to parking spaces lost. Are you willing to include within the proposal the results of the open spaces parking surveys from 2012, 2014 and 2015 to justify this statement?**

A. We have used the parking database as an overall metric of utilization. The database analysis reflects a parking utilization of approximately 2 cars per household. The current standard according to the engineering firm for new communities in Fairfax County is 2.7. This approach does not take into account visitors and other traffic that consume spaces on an ad hoc basis. Additionally, the Board believes that residents changed their behavior in response to capacity limits, which would not be reflected in parking surveys. The fact that street parking occurred in the community prior to lane striping indicates that demand was present when capacity was greater.

- **Q. You are stating that due to the fire lanes, residents have a regular need to use overflow parking outside of our cluster that does not exist. Can you please explain, justify and quantify this need?**

A. Everyone's needs are different and have been voiced at various times within meetings. Hunters Green residents have reported the need to park in neighboring communities, and Indian Ridge Road has no alternative parking locations readily accessible.

- **Q. You state we have a problem during "holidays and special occasions". Please explain, justify and quantify this statement. Whose opinion is this?**

A. Many members of the community have voiced this opinion over the past 2 years.

- **Q. When you state "we have decided" are you referring to the Board or the community? Isn't it the community that needs to decide on changes to common ground according to the By-laws?**

A. Of course it's the community. The Board selected the areas for widening and the community gets to vote on whether to execute the proposal.

- **Q. You state "HGCA believes that the attached plan meets our goal". HGCA is the community, not the Board. Can you assure the community a proposal representing the community won't be submitted to any authority without prior community vote/approval?**

A. The approval to move forward will occur at the December meeting where the community decides if we will make modifications to common ground. The Board has already voted to submit the proposal to the DRB for approval if it is passed by community vote. If approved, a final plan will be developed by the Engineering firm and will be similarly shared with the community as it is prepared.

- **Q. You state that we lost 50 parking spaces and it created hardship, yet you then say that 10-12 additional spaces is adequate. This seems inconsistent. Please explain.**

A. There is no inconsistency in the two statements. With the loss of parking due to striping we now have approximately 20 spaces open according to the parking database (there are 250 total parking spaces). It has been accepted that on a day-to-day basis parking is adequate, but does not allow for exception events. This is also the result of the Board's goal of providing a cost-effective proposal that maintains green space.

- **Q. Whose opinion is it that this road-widening proposal "minimizes impact to our common ground"? Please explain, justify and quantify.**
- **How do you justify stating that this proposal "minimizes financial impact" to residents without any quotes or financial information having been produced? Why have you not shared with the community? What is the cost over and above repaving existing roads?**

A. Compared to a much broader construction effort (for example, as outlined in the JGB study), a 4-foot widening of the road provides minimal impact. Over the course of a year of parking committee meetings, there was no recommendation brought forward and certainly not one that would please everyone, leaving the Board in the position of recommending a minimal approach to balance concerns voiced by the community. Compared to constructing dozens of parking spaces, road widening will be cheaper as was verified by the initial estimates obtained.

## Playground Proposal

**The specific question that will be voted on for Playground Proposal is as follows:**

*Should the community proceed with the replacement of the current playground with the recommended Playground equipment at the major playground structure on Indian Ridge Road? Based on the proposed cost of \$81,000, funding this initiative will require a special assessment of up to \$690 per household and/or other funding approaches such as fundraising or changing the timing of other projects.*

*Yes – Proceed with the replacement of the existing playground structure with the proposed playground equipment.*

*No – Do not move forward with the current playground proposal. The current playground will be removed.*

## Playground Proposal Details

Due to the current condition of the existing playground on Indian Ridge Road, under the guidance of legal counsel the safety concerns of the existing playground structure will require it to be removed in 2016 whether or not the current proposal is passed.

## The Playground Committee's Conclusions

Formed last January to research, gather information, and propose a plan for installing new equipment on the "main" IRR playground, the Playground Committee submitted its findings to the Board and the community (as scheduled) at the November 7 HGCA Board meeting. The committee also displayed a poster with images of the proposed new equipment at Hunters Green's first annual community Halloween party on October 31<sup>st</sup>; which garnered an overwhelmingly positive response from attendees. Here is what the committee discovered & proposes for the playground:

- The committee met with a representative of the Williams Company, the overseer of the pipeline, who dispelled the common assumption that we cannot remove or install new equipment because it sits over the pipeline. Instead, they are willing to allow us to construct around their site as long as we stay within the parameters they have outlined for us. The committee strongly believes that we need to seize this moment to begin construction in light of this cooperation from the Williams Company
- After establishing efficacy, the committee gathered quotes from four playground equipment vendors and narrowed this group to one vendor, All Recreation (All Rec). All Rec has done a lot of work in Reston including the playground for Newbridge Ct. as well as installing the equipment in the upper IRR playground and HG Cluster. They have also worked for RA and have experience installing playgrounds on the pipeline. Please see pictures of the proposed playground equipment and new site layout below
- As we worked with playground vendors, various safety issues related to our metal playground and the dangers posed by the deteriorating concrete equipment came to our attention. These issues are also listed on the US Consumer Product Safety Commission Playground Safety Checklist (a copy can be accessed online at: <http://www.cpsc.gov/en/Safety-Education/Safety-Guides/Sports-Fitness-and-Recreation/Playground-Safety/Public-Playground-Safety-Checklist/>)

- It is clear from this assessment that our current metal and concrete equipment is obsolete. Playground equipment has a typical lifespan of 15-20 years and thus we have missed one replacement cycle given the playground is around 40 years old
- In choosing the new equipment the committee selected colors to complement the natural setting and also chose group play elements that echo original elements such as the tunnels and monkey bars
- With the increased use of the playground and more young families moving in it is the right time to address this issue. This is our community playground and the responsibility of the HGCA to upgrade and maintain
- New equipment will also benefit all of our property values. The main IRR playground is one of the first impressions of our neighborhood and one that we should all want to improve
- Ultimately, the committee is concerned with the liability our obsolete equipment poses to the community and would like to see a safe play space for everyone
- The Playground Committee encourages you to support a new playground at this time for all the above reasons





Birds eye view of all new playground elements including swings, a new system with monkey bars and slides, a Spinami and Rockblocks Climbing Tunnel.



Spinami will be key feature for group play

Hunters Green Cluster Association - Proposed 2016 Budget					
Year 2015 Budget					
December 1, 2015					
		2015		2015	2016
		Budget		Actual or Projected*	Budget
<b>Income:</b>					
<b>Interest Income</b>					
	Bank Interest	\$ 115		\$ 111	\$ 60
	Interest from Members	\$ 400		\$ 537	\$ 450
	Interest in Investments	\$ 60		\$ -	\$ 30
	<b>Total Interest Income</b>	\$ 575		\$ 648	\$ 540
<b>Membership Dues</b>					
	Annual Dues Assessed	\$ 174,640		\$ 174,640	\$ 188,800
	Early Payment Discounts	\$ (5,920)		\$ (4,998)	\$ (4,720)
	<b>Total Membership Dues</b>	\$ 168,720		\$ 169,642	\$ 184,080
<b>Other Fees and Assessments</b>					
	Late Fees	\$ 750		\$ 866	\$ 750
	Other Assessments	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -
	<b>Total Other Fees and Assessments</b>	\$ 750		\$ 866	\$ 750
	<b>Total Income</b>	\$ 170,045		\$ 171,156	\$ 188,800
<b>Expenses:</b>					
<b>Administration</b>					
	Parking Feasibility	\$ 500		\$ -	\$ -
	CPA, Bookkeeper	\$ 7,500		\$ 7,000	\$ 7,500
	Bank Service Charges, Meeting Expenses, PO Box Rental, State Filing Fees, Website Costs	\$ 1,000		\$ 1,167	\$ 1,250
	Office Supplies	\$ 300		\$ 282	\$ 300
	Postage	\$ 380		\$ 357	\$ 380
	Printing	\$ 300		\$ 422	\$ 350
	<b>Total Administration Expenses</b>	\$ 9,980		\$ 9,228	\$ 9,780
<b>Grounds</b>					
	Annual Lawncare Contract	\$ 45,000		\$ 35,000	\$ 37,800
	General Maintenance	\$ 6,000		\$ 6,006	\$ 8,000
	Non-turf Area	\$ 2,500		\$ 1,168	\$ 2,500
	Tree Care	\$ 17,000		\$ 18,752	\$ 19,000
	Upper IRR Tree Replacements	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 10,000
	Pavement Maintenance (Potholes)	\$ 3,000		\$ -	\$ -
	Playgrounds	\$ 3,000		\$ -	\$ -

	Barrier along Sunrise Valley	\$ 15,000	\$ 11,617	\$ -
	<b>Total Grounds Expenses</b>	\$ 91,500	\$ 72,543	\$ 77,300
	Insurance	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,002	\$ 2,400
	Legal	\$ 6,000	\$ 2,616	\$ 7,500
	Miscellaneous Expenses	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ 500
	Snow Removal	\$ 15,000	\$ 12,630	\$ 15,000
	Street Lights (electric)	\$ 4,700	\$ 4,525	\$ 4,700
	Trash Removal	\$ 27,000	\$ 26,904	\$ 27,000
	<b>Total</b>	\$ 55,200	\$ 48,677	\$ 57,100
	<b>Total Expenses</b>	\$ 156,680	\$ 130,448	\$ 144,180
	<b>Net Income before Contribution to Reserves</b>	\$ 39,346	\$ 40,708	\$ 44,620
	Contribution (to) from Reserves	\$ (39,000)	\$ 39,273	\$ 39,500
		Proposal 2016 Budget		
	<b>PROPOSED QUARTERLY DUES</b>	\$ 400		\$ 400
	<b>PROPOSED ANNUAL DUES IF PAID BY FEB 1, 2016</b>	\$ 1,520		\$ 1,520
	*Actuals based on P&L through October 30th, 2015 and projections November 1 through December 31, 2015.			

## ATTACHMENT B

HUNTERS GREEN CLUSTER ASSOCIATION				
Projection for Capital Reserve Fund				
As of December 1, 2015				
YEAR	PRINCIPAL ADDED	INTEREST*	DISBURSE- MENTS**	YEAR-END BALANCE***
2000	\$0.00	\$3,710.12	\$4,713.50	\$50,990.83
2001	\$0.00	\$3,430.16	\$2,339.09	\$52,081.90
2002	\$7,000.00	\$3,247.33	\$0.00	\$62,329.23
<b>2003</b>	\$13,000.00	\$2,287.74	\$0.00	\$77,616.97
2004	\$43,254.00	\$2,926.41	\$61,112.00	\$62,685.38
2005	\$8,668.00	\$2,645.32	\$0.00	\$73,998.70
2006	\$20,000.00	\$3,122.75	\$0.00	\$97,121.45
2007	\$20,000.00	\$4,098.53	\$32,520.00	\$88,699.97
<b>2008</b>	\$20,000.00	\$1,774.00	\$0.00	\$110,473.97
2009	\$20,000.00	\$2,209.48	\$0.00	\$132,683.45
2010	\$20,000.00	\$3,100.00	\$1,200.00	\$154,583.45
2011	\$20,000.00	\$2,587.00	\$0.00	\$177,170.45
<b>2012</b>	\$0.00	\$2,397.00	66,066.38	\$113,501.07
2013	\$37,000.00	\$2,270.02	\$0.00	\$152,771.09
2014	\$38,000.00	\$393.66	\$0.00	\$191,164.75
2015	\$39,000.00	\$740.41	\$0.00	\$230,905.16
2016	\$39,500.00	\$2,309.05	\$281,522.00	(\$8,807.78)
<b>2017</b>	\$40,685.00	\$0.00	\$29,214.00	\$2,663.22
2018	\$41,905.55	\$26.63	\$30,412.00	\$14,183.40
2019	\$43,162.72	\$141.83	\$34,436.00	\$23,051.95
2020	\$44,457.60	\$230.52	\$0.00	\$67,740.07
2021	\$45,791.33	\$677.40	\$47,113.00	\$67,095.79
<b>2022</b>	\$47,165.07	\$670.96	\$26,795.00	\$88,136.82
2023	\$48,580.02	\$881.37	\$42,724.00	\$94,874.20
2024	\$50,037.42	\$948.74	\$0.00	\$145,860.36
2025	\$51,538.54	\$1,458.60	\$0.00	\$198,857.51
2026	\$53,084.70	\$1,988.58	\$0.00	\$253,930.78
<b>2027</b>	\$54,677.24	\$2,539.31	\$0.00	\$311,147.33
2028	\$56,317.56	\$3,111.47	\$92,547.00	\$278,029.35
2029	\$58,007.08	\$2,780.29	\$0.00	\$338,816.73
2030	\$59,747.29	\$3,388.17	\$20,429.00	\$381,523.19
2031	\$61,539.71	\$3,815.23	\$0.00	\$446,878.13

**Notes:**

- Bold lines indicate when reserves study was done. Reserve studies are mandated by VA law to be done every 5 years. HOA Boards review the studies annually.
- 1% interest used for reserve projections starting in 2016.

**HGCA 2016 Cash Flow Analysis**

HGCA 2016 Cash Flow Analysis																			
Standard Operations				Scenario A - Asphalt Only - No Special Assessment Required			Scenario B - Asphalt and Road Widening Only			Scenario C - Asphalt and Approval of Playground Only			Scenario D - Asphalt, Playground, and Road Widening						
Date	Operating Income	Operating Outflows	No Action Taken - Cash Reserves (For reference)	Asphalt Only Outflows	Asphalt Only Inflows	Asphalt Only Cash Reserves	Asphalt and Road Widening Only Outflows	Asphalt and Road Widening Only Inflows	Asphalt and Road Widening Only Cash Reserves	Asphalt and Approval of Playground Only Outflows	Asphalt and Approval of Playground Only Inflows	Asphalt and Approval of Playground Only Cash Reserves	Asphalt, Playground and Road Widening Outflows	Asphalt, Playground and Road Widening Inflows	Asphalt, Playground and Road Widening Cash Reserves				
12/31/2015			\$ 270,000.00		\$ -	\$ 270,000.00			\$ 270,000.00	\$ 27,000.00		\$ 243,000.00	\$ 27,000.00		\$ 243,000.00				
1/31/2016	\$ 113,280.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 371,280.00		\$ -	\$ 371,280.00			\$ 371,280.00			\$ 344,280.00			\$ 344,280.00				
2/29/2016		\$ 12,000.00	\$ 359,280.00		\$ -	\$ 359,280.00			\$ 359,280.00	\$ 27,000.00		\$ 305,280.00	\$ 27,000.00		\$ 305,280.00				
3/31/2016		\$ 12,000.00	\$ 347,280.00	\$ 144,158.50	\$ -	\$ 203,121.50	\$ 169,158.50		\$ 178,121.50	\$ 144,158.50	\$ 40,710.00	\$ 189,831.50	\$ 169,158.50	\$ 67,260.00	\$ 191,381.50				
4/30/2016	\$ 23,600.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 358,880.00		\$ -	\$ 214,721.50			\$ 189,721.50	\$ 27,000.00		\$ 174,431.50	\$ 27,000.00		\$ 175,981.50				
5/31/2016		\$ 12,000.00	\$ 346,880.00		\$ -	\$ 202,721.50		\$ 26,550.00	\$ 204,271.50			\$ 162,431.50			\$ 163,981.50				
6/30/2016		\$ 12,000.00	\$ 334,880.00		\$ -	\$ 190,721.50			\$ 192,271.50		\$ 40,710.00	\$ 191,141.50		\$ 67,260.00	\$ 219,241.50				
7/31/2016	\$ 23,600.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 346,480.00	\$ 144,158.50	\$ -	\$ 58,163.00	\$ 169,158.50		\$ 34,713.00	\$ 144,158.50		\$ 58,583.00	\$ 169,158.50		\$ 61,683.00				
8/31/2016		\$ 12,000.00	\$ 334,480.00		\$ -	\$ 46,163.00		\$ 26,550.00	\$ 49,263.00			\$ 46,583.00			\$ 49,683.00				
9/30/2016		\$ 12,000.00	\$ 322,480.00		\$ -	\$ 34,163.00			\$ 37,263.00			\$ 34,583.00			\$ 37,683.00				
10/31/2016	\$ 23,600.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 334,080.00		\$ -	\$ 45,763.00			\$ 48,863.00			\$ 46,183.00			\$ 49,283.00				
11/30/2016		\$ 12,000.00	\$ 322,080.00		\$ -	\$ 33,763.00			\$ 36,863.00			\$ 34,183.00			\$ 37,283.00				
12/31/2016		\$ 12,000.00	\$ 310,080.00		\$ -	\$ 21,763.00			\$ 24,863.00			\$ 22,183.00			\$ 25,283.00				
Scenario Total Outflows				\$ 288,317.00				\$ 338,317.00				\$ 369,317.00							
Scenario Unbudgeted Costs				\$ -	Asphalt repaving is scheduled and fully funded for 2016 per the capital reserves. No Assessment Required. This scenario will proceed if both initiatives are not approved.			\$ 50,000.00	Asphalt and Road Widening Only will have a maximum assessment of \$450 per home. \$225 would be due on 5/31 and \$225 would be due on 8/31.			\$ 81,000.00	Asphalt and Playground Only will have a maximum assessment of \$690 per home. \$345 would be due on 3/31 and \$345 would be due on 6/30.			\$ 131,000.00	Asphalt, Playground and Road Widening will have a maximum assessment of \$1140 per home. \$570 would be due on 3/31 and \$570 would be due on 6/30.		
Unbudgeted Costs per Household				\$ -				\$ 423.73				\$ 686.44				\$ 1,110.17			
Maximum Assessment per Household				\$ -				\$ 450.00				\$ 690.00				\$ 1,140.00			
Disbursement Amount								\$ 225.00				\$ 345.00				\$ 570.00			
Variables (all figures are approximate)																			
Budgeted Income for 2016		\$ 188,800.00	Budgeted Amount for Asphalt, Sidewalks, Curbs and Gutters (from Capital Reserve Study)		\$ 281,500.00		The scenarios outlined above show the impact of asphalt, the playground, and road widening and each possible scenario given the outcome of the community votes at the annual meeting. The special assessment described in each scenario is a Maximum (Not To Exceed) amount based on the information currently available. The Board anticipates these assessments will be lower than the maximum amount. This is because initial estimates for asphalt work are anticipated to be \$30,000 - \$40,000 under the budgeted amount, and this surplus can be applied directly to projects that are approved at the annual meeting which will lower the special assessment amount. The Board anticipates knowing the final costs of the asphalt project by March 2016 and at that time the actual assessment amount will be determined. Additionally, the community can discuss additional funding sources such as community fundraisers to help lower the special assessment amount.												
Budgeted Expenses for 2016		\$ 144,000.00	Asphalt Estimate		\$ 288,000.00														
Budgeted Capital Reserve Contribution		\$ 39,500	Road Widening Proposal Estimate		\$ 50,000.00														
Total Budgeted		\$ 183,500.00	Playground Estimate		\$ 81,000.00														