



Mountain Oaks Homeowners Association

First Annual Resident Poll Summary and Results

Dear MOE Residents:

The responses we received from the community will allow us to serve more effectively. 60% of residents took the opportunity to respond. Many expressed gratitude for having the input opportunity and three residents contributed several pages of additional insight and opinion in a most positive way. Although this is a small community, it is a diverse community, and a community represented by strong and independent viewpoints. The trends with large areas of consensus will stand out. There are numerous community opportunities that present with close splits of opinion. If and when these particular topics raise to the level of community action, much transparency, and respect will be required to find an agreeable consensus. Percentage values were rounded off to the nearest whole number.

Budget and Fiscal Review

Y 98% - N 2% Is it your expectation that the Board reviews all major contracts, including reviewing competitive bids for same services, about every 3 years, as recommended by the CA Davis Stirling Act? Y/ N

Is it your expectation that the Board invite competitive bidding for any service exceeding \$1000, **20%** \$2000 **33%**, \$3000 **34%**, \$4000 **11%**, or \$5000 **2%**. Please enter your chosen value in the blank space.

Is it your expectation that the Board invite competitive bids for any product, machine, equipment that exceeds \$1000 **29%**, \$2000 **25%**, \$3000 **26%**, \$4000 **1%**, \$5000 **19%**. Please enter amount of chosen value

OK 40% - H 59% - L 1% MOE monthly association dues are: 1] OK as is = 'OK', 2] too high = 'H' , or 3] too low = 'L'

Architectural and Landscape Approvals

Y 57% - N 43% Would you be comfortable with a 'NO verbal approval' policy for projects you would like to accomplish around your home? The current CC&Rs do not provide for verbal approvals. Y/N

Y 71% - N 29% The Board should reply to all architectural and/or landscape requests within 30 days of your submission? Y/ N

Y 91% - N 9% The Board should reply to all architectural and/or landscape requests within 15 days of your submission? Y/ N [choose either the 30 or 15 day as your preferred answer]

Y 55% - N 45% Would you be comfortable with an Association imposed 'fine'... if you or others started a project without a potentially timely approval? Y/N

Weed and Fire Abatement

Y 36% - N 64% Do you feel strongly that 'goat' weed abatement is the best method, as it is environmentally friendly and the Association should only entertain that method? Y/N

H 22% - G- 11% - DC 67% If a bid for human and machine driven weed abatement was very close, or equal to the fee for goats, would you prefer human or goats or don't care? H= human, G = goats, DC = don't care

Y 42% - N 58% A number of years ago, the Association would rent the weed abatement machinery and residents would volunteer to remediate the grass and weeds; the event would take about 2 weekends. It was discontinued because of insurance liability concerns regarding resident use of equipment the Association rented. [in addition, many of the volunteers were/are getting older] If Association insurance covered this type of self implemented weed abatement, would you be supportive? Y/N

Y 40%- N60% If the above method was used, resident driven, and residents who agreed to become a member of the 'Common Area Management Committee' were covered by our standard liability policy, would you join the committee and participate in the weed/fire mitigation process ? Y/N
[your NAME] _____

Y 64%- N 36% If each resident or lot owner was responsible for an 80 to 100ft or so abatement area adjacent to their home, or abatement to your property lines, and if the small common corridors between lots were managed by the adjacent landowners, and the small corner common areas managed by the closet 3 or 4 lot owners... leaving the Association only contracting out only the 3 or 4 large common areas; would you be supportive? Y/N [In this scenario, some lot owners may choose to hire someone to do the abatement for them... in the end, the potential cost to the Association would be less]

Y 52%- N 48% In the above scenario, if a home or lot owner did not or could not remediate weeds/grass in the perimeter adjacent to their home, would you support the idea of having an Association approved contractor, or the Association's approved 'Common Area Management Committee' members provide the abatement service and charge the home or lot owner for the service? Y/N
[An Association approved contractor provides adequate coverage for appropriate liability coverage]

Y 52%- N48% Another way to state all the above options- would you agree to have the Association contract to have our 3 large common areas done by outside contractors, and the smaller common corridors and the common areas adjacent to some lots... mitigated by a board approved list of resident committee members, or an approved landscape contractor in behalf of that member? Y/N

Y 57%- N 43% This question is not related to weed/grass abatement for fire risk reduction. Would you support Committee members, to keep the grass trimmed back some 3 or 4 ft along all roads adjacent to the common areas? This would mean, about every 3 weeks, roadside grass would be cut adjacent to all common areas. Y/N [typically, the roadside grasses have been allowed to grow until 'goats' or other, arrive to cut them]

Risk Tolerance and the MOE Reserve Fund

The State of CA mandates all HOAs maintain a certain amount of money in a reserve fund. Those monies remain available to fund mostly large scale common property maintenance issues as they arise. In our instance; road repaving or surfacing, gate replacement and repair, street lights, and waste water treatment. If and when those maintenance items come due, the Association would not need to levy a special assessment and could utilize their reserve. The reserve fund can be borrowed against and must be repaid. The reserve fund has base low that should be maintained as determined by a State formula. In the end... an Association can retain a minimum amount in their fund, lower than ideal, which could then influence monthly association fees downward but place the community at a potential calculated risk to have an inadequate amount of reserve to deal with an urgent maintenance item. Should that type of event take place, the Association would need to make a special assessment to cover that expense.

In conclusion, to keep a reserve fund maximally funded, keeping up with annual inflation would mean monthly association fees would slowly trend upward. Should the Association's residents be willing to accept a limited or moderate amount of 'risk', [risk of a special assessment if adequate monies not available to deal with a large urgent repair or replacement] then monthly dues could be held or potentially lowered as other budget related factors are taken into consideration and implemented.

Y 36%- N 64% We are not concerned about the monthly Association fee amount; please keep the Reserve Fund **healthy and maximally funded.** Y/ N

Y 63%- N 37% We would like to see the monthly Association fee amount come down, in addition to other expense reduction strategies, we would tolerate **a modest reduction** in the Reserve Fund, understanding a greater potential risk for a special assessment. Y/ N

Y 16%- N 84% We would like to see a significant reduction in Association fees, in addition to other expense reduction strategies, we would tolerate retaining **an absolute minimum** amount in the Reserve Fund, understanding greater risk for a potential special assessment. Y/ N

MOE Property Appreciation Potential

Y 49% - N 51% We are comfortable with simply allowing the market place dictate property appreciation. Y / N

Association property appreciation can be influenced by the amenities the community offers its residents. For instance a pool, a clubhouse, or even on campus storage. These amenities can be funded by a traditional loan, by borrowing from the Reserve Fund, or by the levy of a special assessment. Loan payoffs can be linked to charges placed on the amenities, i.e. renting storage space to residents at below market rates. A pool, clubhouse, or recreational gazebo can generate rental usage income, but they are less predictable in creating a steady cash stream.

Our resident community lives in a foothills recreation area; recreational vehicles, motorcycles, campers, and trailers abound. We have the lake at our door front; offering recreational boating and fishing. As a resident of the MOE, it can be challenging to keep a recreational vehicle or trailer on our property. As a prospective buyer of a MOE property, many have been discouraged by needing to use off site storage. Sierra Del Sol; a neighboring HOA, has an onsite RV, boat, and trailer storage area; residents rent space.

Y 49%- N 51% We are supportive of an on site RV, boat, and trailer storage area. Assuming it can be placed in a non-esthetic area and we are comfortable with how this amenity would be paid for. Y / N

Y 29%- N 71% We would likely use an on campus storage area, and be willing to pay a monthly fee that was just below the area market rate, for parking in this area. Y / N

Y 48%-N 52% If a space were to be constructed for storage purposes, we support using a traditional bank note, perhaps a 7 to 10 year payback, with evidence that our residents' paying monthly space rental fees would cover most of the payment. Y / N

Y 37%- N 63% If a space were to be constructed for storage purposes, we support borrowing from the Reserve Fund, assuming all governing agencies approve; a 7 to 10 year payback, with evidence that our residents' paying monthly space rental fees would cover most of the repayment. Y / N

Y 16%- N 84% If a space were to be constructed for storage purposes, we would support the Association using a special one time levy to accomplish, our residents' paying monthly space rental fees would/could go into the Reserve Fund, or could be dedicated to another Association amenity... like a community gazebo or clubhouse. Y / N

Y 59%- N 41% We would be supportive of constructing a community recreational gazebo; shaded, water and electric, grilling area, picnic area, in the next 10 years. Y / N

Y 17%-N 83% We are supportive of a gazebo recreational area [GRA] only; not a storage area. Y / N

Y 32%- N 68% We would support the Association using a traditional bank note, 7 to 10 year payoff, to construct a GRA. Y/ N

Y 34%- N 66% We would support the Association borrowing Reserve Fund monies with appropriate governing body approval, and work to repay the Reserves in 7 to 10 years. Y/ N

Y 12%- N 88% We would support the Association levying a one time fee to each resident for a one time payment for the construction of a GRA. Y / N

Y 23%- N 77% We would support the construction of a common clubhouse, guesthouse and pool, in a common area, with a financial plan presented to us that made sense. Y/ N

Y 52%- N 48% We would support improving roadway street lighting by both new fixtures and potential additional lights in a few 'dark zones'. Y/ N

The MOE Wastewater System

If you are relatively new to the community, perhaps you are not aware of the rainwater intrusion issue the MOE Board has been challenged to resolve over the past 6 or so years. In short, on a sunny day, the community produces some 5000 gallons of waste water delivered to the wastewater processing pods and pond just off of Messilla Rd. During a rain event, that amount grows by about 10 thousand gallons per day to reach 15,000 [and more] gallons per day. Our system was designed to handle 16,200 gallons per day.

About 3 years ago, the Board authorized the inspection of every resident septic tank to discover if the source of that intrusion was coming from multiple tanks having seals that leak around the risers or pipe leaving [or entering] the tanks. The conclusion was inconclusive; some defects were found, some repairs were made, and some residents did not participate or elect to repair.

We will be engaging a sanitary engineer to develop a clear strategy to resolve the issue. The engineering report will be shared with each resident. The board will move forward on the task of implementing the recommendations, which may, or may not require another round of tank inspections.

Y 50%- N 50% If you are an owner who was found to have a tank leak from 3 years ago, are you willing to have essential repairs made now, if not already completed? Y/N

Y 67%- N 33% If you are an owner who was found to have a tank leak from 3 years ago, and have not had a repair, would you agree to have another inspection to provide conclusive proof, and then proceed to repair a confirmed leak? Y/N

Y 89%-N 11% If additional tank inspections were recommended, and the Association Reserve fund covered the inspection, would you agree to have any 'leak repairs' accomplished at your expense? Our CC&Rs state that the homeowners are responsible the tank maintenance and repair. Y/N

B 91%- H 9% If the Association is advised by an engineer to re-inspect certain tanks, would you encourage the Association to get 'inspection bids' from qualified county contractors in behalf of the residents, or accept the bid of Hydrotech, the long time wastewater service provider for the community? B= bid / H = Hydrotech

MOE Board Meetings

Z 34%- IP 21%- DC 45% If you attend, or would like to attend, MOE Board meetings, would your prefer Zoom or in person? Z= Zoom, IP = In Person, DC = Don't Care

A brief summary of key points of community consensus

- The board is expected to remain vigilant regarding community expenses and use the process of bidding to keep expenses reasonably low.
- The board is expected to make timely responses to architectural and landscape requests; 15 days
- The residents feel more strongly about cost rather than method, goats or human, when it comes to annual weed/grass fire abatement
- Residents feel the Association, rather than residents, should provide the weed/grass annual fire mitigation process. But if residents did become involved, there is a small % of individuals who would participate rather than not.
- A majority of residents are comfortable with a modest reduction in the Reserve Fund if it would lower monthly fees. Very little support for high risk exists.
- A slight majority would agree to enhancing property values outside of natural market factors. A slight majority disapprove of a recreational parking site on campus; a slight majority likes the idea of a Gazebo area; very little support for a clubhouse; and a little support for improved street lighting. There is mediocre and weak support for financing by either a bank note or borrowing from reserves... if a project were to be approved.
- A majority of residents are willing to participate in ultimately resolving the water intrusion issue