

**IN THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY
AT NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE**

IN RE:)	
PETITION OF LAUREL HILLS)	
CONDOMINIUMS PROPERTY OWNERS)	DOCKET NO. 12-00030
ASSOCIATION FOR A CERTIFICATE)	
OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND)	
NECESSITY)	

**RESPONSE OF LAUREL HILLS CONDOMINIUMS PROPERTY OWNERS
ASSOCIATION TO REVISED SECOND DISCOVERY REQUEST OF THE
CUSTOMER INTERVENORS**

The following are the Responses of Laurel Hills Condominiums Property Owners Association (“Laurel Hills”) to the Revised Second Request of the Customer Interveners, Gary Hauser, *et al.*, (the “Customer Interveners” or “Customers”) served on Monday, November 12, 2012.

DISCOVERY RESPONSES

1. Gary Haiser, et al. (“Customers”) specifically incorporates each and every Data Request filed by the TRA on August 28, 2012 in this Docket as if fully stated herein. The Customers expressly reserve the right to seek supplemental responses and/or file a motion to compel if the Customers determine that any responses to the Data Request are inadequate or incomplete.

Response: Laurel Hills incorporates its responses to the Data Request filed by the TRA on August 28, 2012 in this Docket as if fully stated herein.

2. The Customers specifically incorporate each and every Discovery Request filed by the Consumer Advocate on September 14, 2012 in this Docket as if fully stated herein. The Customers expressly reserve the right to seek supplemental responses and/or file a motion to compel if the Customers determine that any responses to the Discovery Request are inadequate or incomplete.

Response: Laurel Hills incorporates its responses to the Discovery Requests filed by the Consumer Advocate on September 14, 2012 in this Docket as if fully stated herein.

3. The Customers specifically incorporate each and every Discovery Request filed by the TRA Staff on September 18, 2012 in this Docket as if fully stated herein. The Customers expressly reserve the right to seek supplemental responses and/or file a motion to compel if the Customers determine that any responses to the Discovery Request are inadequate or incomplete.

Response: Laurel Hills incorporates its responses to the Discovery Request filed by the TRA Staff on September 18, 2012 in this Docket as if fully stated herein.

4. Reference Laurel Hills response to the TRA Staff Data Request dated September 26, 2012, Response #1; explain the statement that every customer of Laurel Hills is a member of the RMCC, specifically with respect to "Pre-1972" property owners who may also be Laurel Hills customers.

Response: Laurel Hills believes that all customers should and could be members of the Renegade Mountain Community Club so long as those customers remain in good standing with the Renegade Mountain Community Club.

5. Reference Laurel Hills response to the TRA Staff Data Request dated September 26, 2012, Response #2; identify what three properties for which John Peters is currently responsible for water service and why he is currently being billed for only two properties.

Response: Laurel Hills does not have sufficient information in its possession, custody, or control to respond to this Request. Specifically, customers have refused to provide information as to service address, and Laurel Hills often uses billing addresses to contact its customers.

6. Reference Laurel Hills response to the TRA Staff Data Request dated September 26, 2012, Response #2; define the term "abandonment". Define the 15 customers who have "abandoned" water service and the effective date the "abandonment" was noted. For each identify if and when (date) that a disconnection request was received. Explain why the 15 customers continue to be billed for water service.

Response: Laurel Hills states that the customers identified in Exhibit 1 have stopped paying for water service, and Laurel Hills believes that customers have abandoned water service based on this failure to pay.

7. Reference Laurel Hills response to the TRA Staff Data Request dated September 26,

2012, Response #2. Provide copies of all rebuffed requests sent to customers requesting updated addresses and/or other customer information and provide copies of all letters received from customers requesting that their account information be updated or changed.

Response: Laurel Hills has sent customers a request to sign a contract that had information requesting the identified information but no customer returned these forms. A representative copy of the requests is attached as Exhibit 2.

8. Reference Laurel Hills response to the TRA Staff Data Request dated September 26, 2012, Response #5; identify any approval by any authority (state, federal or other) approving Laurel Hills rate increase from \$25.00 to the \$86.40 for all customers prior to the rate increase being implemented in June 2011 and, if no approval was received, explain why this rate increase should be legally recognized.

Response: Laurel Hills states that it did not seek approval from any authority to increase the rate. The rate increase was necessitated by increasing costs associated with running and operating the system. At the time the \$86.40 monthly rate was adopted, Laurel Hills believed that it was not subject to regulation by the TRA because it was a nonprofit corporation.

9. Reference Laurel Hills response to the TRA Staff Data Request dated September 26, 2012, Response #5; explain why Laurel Hills continued to invoice customers at the \$86.40 monthly rate from June 2011 to July 2012 for those customers who are Plaintiffs in Cumberland County Chancery

Court Case 2012-CH-513 and thus are not required to pay that rate for monthly water service.

Response: Laurel Hills intends to preserve its right to collect the \$86.14 and therefore continues to bill at this rate.

10. Reference Laurel Hills response to the TRA Staff Data Request dated September 26, 2012, Response #6; noting that Robert Adkins is a full time resident in close proximity to the referenced office, identify who occupied this location on what dates and hours from the time period September 15-30, 2012.

Response: Laurel Hills objects to this request because it is vague, ambiguous, argumentative, and contains facts not in the record. Subject to and without waiving this or any other objection, Laurel Hills states that given its current financial situation, Laurel Hills has stopped staffing the referenced office with a representative given that there are insufficient funds to pay such representative's time.

11. Reference the Laurel Hills Response to the Consumer Advocate Division's Data Request dated September 18, 2012, Response #12; provide a description of the major discussions and negotiations surrounding the purchase of the water system (including, but not limited to determination of price, negotiation of the terms of sale, negotiation of the revocable lease and terms of the promissory note); for each provide the date if known, a synopsis of the discussion or negotiation and the person (not entity) representing Laurel Hills and Moy Toy, LLC.

Response: Laurel Hills objects to this request because it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Laurel Hills further objects to the extent that this request seeks information not in Laurel Hills' possession, custody, or control and seeks information covered by

the attorney-client privilege or any other applicable privilege. Subject to and without waiving these or any other objections, Laurel Hills incorporates by reference its Response # 15 to the Consumer Advocate Division's Data Requests as to the determination of price for the water system. Laurel Hills and Moy Toy determined that the method described in that response would be used to determine the price of the water system, in lieu of obtaining a far more expensive formal appraisal. Thereafter, the parties executed the bill of sale and the related promissory note and license agreement and these documents are incorporated by reference herein as to the terms negotiated. Mr. McClung, Phillip Guettler, and Rob Schwerer were involved in these negotiations, which occurred in or around the spring of 2011, the exact dates unknown.

12. Reference the Laurel Hills Petition for a CCN, dated April 10, 2012, paragraph #3; if Laurel Hills did not operate the water system until its purchase on May 1, 2011 and Moy Toy, LLC decided not to operate the water system after their purchase on September 28, 2010, who was responsible for the water system and its continuous operation between September 28, 2010 and May 1, 2011?

Response: Laurel Hills does not know who was responsible for the operation of the water system during the identified period.

13. Reference the Laurel Hills Petition for a CCN, dated April 10, 2012, paragraph #3; who authorized and executed payments for water, electric and repairs of the system between September 28, 2010 and May 1, 2011?

Response: Laurel Hills does not know who was responsible for the operation of the water system during the identified period or who authorized and executed any payments made.

14. Reference the Laurel Hills Response to the Consumer Advocate Division's Data Request dated September 18, 2012, Response #15; define the member's names, addresses and contact information for the individuals at the Tennessee Association of Utility Districts (TAUD) which Laurel Hills consulted with to determine the valuation method described in Response #15.

Response: Mr. McClung does not remember the names of the individuals at TAUD which Laurel Hills consulted.

15. Reference the Laurel Hills Response to the Consumer Advocate Division's Data Request dated September 18, 2012, Response #15; what individual(s) contacted TAUD and at the time were they representing Laurel Hills, Moy Toy, LLC or both entities?

Response: Mr. McClung, representing Laurel Hills, approached members of the TAUD.

16. Reference the Laurel Hills Response to the Consumer Advocate Division's Data Request dated September 18, 2012, Response #16; provide all records discussed in Response #16 whether whole or partial, regardless of condition.

Response: Laurel Hills does not have any records in its possession, custody, or control.

17. Reference Article V and Article VI of the 1972 Renegade Resort Covenants and Restrictions (and later versions), explain where said document gives the "developer" the authority or ability to sell (transfer legal control) of the water system to any other person or entity other than the RMCC?

Response: Laurel Hills objects to this request because it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, and unduly burdensome. Laurel Hills further objects to the extent that this request seeks information not in Laurel Hills' possession, custody, or control and seeks information irrelevant

to this proceeding. Subject to and without waiving these or any other objection, Laurel Hills states that the term “1972 Renegade Resort Covenants and Restrictions (and later revisions)” is vague and such documents are not currently a part of the record in this case. To the best of Laurel Hills’ understanding of this term, and assuming that it refers to a document dated July 26, 1972 and termed “Renegade Resort Cumberland County, Tennessee, Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions,” Laurel Hills does not believe that this document is the operative covenants and restrictions currently in force. Further, Laurel Hills cannot identify any relevant provision of this document that would restrict the conveyance of the water system on the mountain to Laurel Hills and to Laurel Hills’ knowledge, no person has challenged Laurel Hills’ ownership of the water system.

18. Reference the Laurel Hills Response to the Consumer Advocate Division's Data Request dated September 18, 2012, Response #24; identify when (date) the verbal contract between Laurel Hills and Darrell McQueen was made, when (date) the invoice of Darrell McQueen was initially submitted to Laurel Hills for payment and when and who approved this invoice.

Response: Mike McClung, in his capacity of President of Laurel Hills, entered into the agreement with Mr. McQueen in or around May 2011. Laurel Hills further produces the most current invoice of Mr. McQueen, which was sent in or around October 2012. The original invoice previously produced was originally sent in or around June 2012.

19. Reference the Laurel Hills Response to the Consumer Advocate Division's Data Request dated September 18, 2012, Response #24; provide a listing of the specific professional

consulting and supervision tasks performed by Darrell McQueen during the performance period including a detailed description of the work, hours and dates.

Response: Darryl McQueen has provided significant engineering, consulting, and maintenance services to Laurel Hills. Mr. McQueen had historically provided some support to the water system prior to Laurel Hills assuming operational responsibility of the water system, and Laurel Hills decided to maintain this relationship because of Mr. McQueen's familiarity with the rather unique water system operated by Laurel Hills. Given historical problems with the water system, and its aging pump station, Laurel Hills and Mr. McQueen determined that the water system needed to be redesigned. Beginning in or around May of 2011, Mr. McQueen designed the current two-variable speed pump configuration which is the backbone of the water system, and replaced the prior pumps which were in place since 1972. Mr. McQueen then met with officials of TDEC and provided consulting services to ensure that TDEC approved the two-variable speed pump configuration. After TDEC signed off on Mr. McQueen's design, Mr. McQueen performed the physical installation of the pumps and brought the new pumps online. Mr. McQueen also responds to TDEC data requests that from time to time are required. Mr. McQueen has also inspected and located the water lines of the system and placed this information into a GPS/CAD system on his computer to allow Laurel Hills to have a better understanding of the location and placement of the system.

Mr. McQueen also works approximately 20 hours per week on helping to maintain the water system. Specifically, Mr. McQueen is responsible for monitoring the chlorine levels of the water system as required by TDEC regulations. This work requires Mr. McQueen to travel to

various points along the water system and take water samples, which he analyzes and provides results to Laurel Hills' certified operator. He does sampling work approximately five times per week. Mr. McQueen also travels to the pump house approximately three times per week to inspect the pumps and ensure they remain operational. Mr. McQueen has also installed a gauge at his residence to help him monitor the pumps. This gauge allows Mr. McQueen to know whether the pumps are online, as from time to time power outages occur which shut down the pumps. Once power is restored, someone is required to physically restart the pumps, and Mr. McQueen is responsible for this. Mr. McQueen also inspects the ten miles of water line for leaks, and Mr. McQueen helps coordinate and often helps in performing the construction work to repair leaking or broken lines. Mr. McQueen also bleeds fire hydrants to ensure water quality and pressure. Mr. McQueen uses his own personal vehicle for his travel.

Laurel Hills is contracted to provide Mr. McQueen \$500 per month for his engineering and consulting services along with the maintenance services detailed above.

20. Reference the Laurel Hills Response to the Consumer Advocate Division's Data Request dated September 18, 2012, Response #25; to add specificity to the original question, explain why Laurel Hills is entitled to inject any legal expenses not directly attributable to the organization of the water system, or TRA application process, more specifically those legal expenses exhausted on promoting and/or defending its efforts to admittedly operate an unauthorized and unregulated water system.

Response: Laurel Hills objects to this request because it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, argumentative, assumes facts not in evidence. Subject to and without waiving this or any

other objection, Laurel Hills states that the legal expenses incurred in seeking a certificate with the TRA, and in defending itself against lawsuits in Cumberland County court are directly attributable to the operation of the water system as they clearly and unambiguously relate to Laurel Hills' water operations, and are therefore properly allowable operation and maintenance expenses of the Laurel Hills' water system, the cost of which it is entitled to recover in its rate structure.

21. Reference the Laurel Hills Response to the Consumer Advocate Division's Data Request dated September 18, 2012, Data Response #7 (2012 Meeting Minutes), dated January 17, 2012 state that Michael McClung will approach VEC (electric company) to discuss cutting off electricity for water operations and the Customers in Cumberland County Chancery Court Case 2012-CH-513 aver that Michael McClung did abandon the water system on January 19, 2012 by placing a work order for VEC to cut electric power to the Mullinix Pump Station; explain Michael McClung's actions during the period 17-20 January, 2012 with respect to abandoning the water system by eliminating electric power to its only pumps. Specifically did Michael McClung authorize a VEC work order on January 19, 2012 to stop electric service to the Mullinix Pump Station?

Response: Laurel Hills objects to this request because it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, argumentative, assumes facts not in evidence, and seeks information irrelevant to this proceeding. Subject to and without waiving these or any other objection, Laurel Hills did not abandon the water system in January 2012 as evidenced by the fact that the water system continued to operate at this time and as directly found by Chancellor Thurman in an ordered

issued in Cumberland County Chancery Court Case No. 2012-CH-513. Laurel Hills further states that Mike McClung did approach Volunteer Electric Company in or around January 2012 about his concern about the ability of Laurel Hills to continue to pay for electric service, and given this financial situation, Mr. McClung began negotiating with VEC on the timing of the termination of service to certain water system properties in the event it was unable to pay its electric bills in full. However, VEC never terminated electric service to Laurel Hills' water operations property.

22. Reference the Laurel Hills Response to the Consumer Advocate Division's Data Request dated September 18, 2012, Data Response 20 (Renegade Resources, LLC); Noting that this Data Response fails to list the duties performed by each employee and those specific hours attributable to water operations (example, why would any charges from January 1, 2011 to April 30, 2011 be valid), a straight 50% allocation to water operations is false; provide a detailed listing of dates, hours and tasks performed by employees directly attributable to water operations.

Response: Laurel Hills objects to this request because it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, argumentative, and assumes facts not in evidence. Subject to and without waiving these or any other objections, Laurel Hills states that Renegade Resources, LLC does not provide Laurel Hills a breakdown of individual tasks as such a breakdown would be economically inefficient. Given the amount of the invoices and the ongoing work required on the water system since May of 2011, including the construction and maintenance of the system and system lines, this allocation is considerably conservative as it is likely the majority of the costs incurred during

this time from Renegade Resources, LLC were from water-specific tasks.

23. Reference Laurel Hills response to the TRA Staff Data Request dated September 7, 2012, Response #9; explain why Laurel Hills submitted a detailed estimate from Pittsburgh Tank and Tower on July 18, 2012 to the TRA (TRA Response #1) when Laurel Hills already contracted and paid 10% of the total cost to begin repairs on June 9, 2011 to Preferred Tank and Tower (Laurel Hills Response to Customer Interveners First Request dated September 27, 2012).

Response: Preferred Tank and Tower breached its original agreement with Laurel Hills to provide tank maintenance services and after further investigation Mike McClung learned that Preferred Tank had a reputation for failing to fulfill its contractual obligations, and given these facts, it is imprudent to continue to do business with Preferred Tank. Laurel Hills elected not to sue Preferred Tank for its breach because it is economically inefficient to do so.

24. Reference Laurel Hills response to the TRA Staff Data Request dated September 7, 2012, Response #10; since this response (and many previous responses) states that beginning in November 2011, many customers simply stopping paying their water bills altogether, define what "many" means and explain why the Laurel Hills 2011 General Ledger (Response #4 attachment) indicates approximately \$7623.60 of water revenue was received in November 2011 by Laurel Hills.

Response: Laurel Hills incorporates the attached document showing the accounts receivable for the period October 2011-December 2011.

25. Reference Laurel Hills response to the TRA Staff Data Request dated September 7, 2012, Response #17: in this response (and many others) Laurel Hills states that it is unfair for

the timeshare members to subsidize the water system. Given the information supplied by Laurel Hills of a zero percent occupancy rate of the timeshares (Response 22), an increase in the timeshare maintenance fees from \$300 to \$1650 in a two year period (Response 19), its inability to collect but \$14,300 of \$130,000 in total maintenance fees for 2011 (Response 4, 2011 General Ledger), the receipt of \$47,023 in 2011 water revenue (Response 4, 2011 General Ledger) and allocating approximately 50% of all "common" expenses to water customers (Michael McClung's Pre-filed Testimony), explain how and why the water system is not actually subsidizing the failing Laurel Hills timeshare operations.

Response: Laurel Hills objects to this request because it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, argumentative, and assumes facts not in evidence. Subject to and without waiving these or any other objection, Laurel Hills states that it does not agree with the premise of the request. Simply because Laurel Hills has been unable to collect all maintenance fees does not mean that water operations are subsidizing timeshare operations. Laurel Hills further incorporates its profit and loss detail and its general ledger detailing the cash flow problems and expenses incurred related to the water operations which clearly show that water operations are operating at negative cash flow and are unprofitable belying the request's assertion that timeshare operations are subsidizing water operations.

26. Reference Laurel Hills response to the TRA Staff Data Request dated September 7, 2012, Response #4: in reference to the bank statement electronic banking (EB) debit and credit transactions, identify who are the owners of accounts 0110550054, 0082593213, 0110550038, and any other accounts, and there relationship to Laurel Hills.

Response: 0110550054 is a Moy Toy account.

0082593213 is a Renegade Resources LLC account.

0110550038 is Renegade Community Club account.

27. Reference Laurel Hills response to the TRA Staff Data Request dated September 7, 2012, Response #4: in reference to the 2011 General Ledger (Response 4) showing a credit entry of \$33.07 to close out a former checking account, identify this account and the owner and provide all bank statements and copies of checks from September 2010 through its closure.

Response: Laurel Hills states that it opened this account to process credit card payments from its customers, but no customers elected to pay their bills via credit card and therefore Laurel Hills closed this account.

28. In reference to Laurel Hills Response to the Customers First Data Request, Response #23; since the response states that minutes of the December 22, 2011 meeting were not kept, please provide a statement from Michael McClung, Phillip Guettler and Darren Guettler as to where the meeting was held, who attended the meeting, what subjects were covered and discussed, the actual resolutions derived and approved and the final vote for each.

Response: Laurel Hills objects to this request as it is overly broad and unduly burdensome and seeks duplicative discovery. Subject to and without waiving these or any other objection, Laurel Hills states that the meeting was held in Phillip Guettler's office in Ft. Pierce Florida and was attended by Mike McClung, Phillip Guettler, and Darren Guettler. Laurel Hills further states that Laurel Hills' deteriorating financial condition was discussed and as detailed in the referenced letter, Laurel Hills opted to suspended water service to all customers. The Laurel

Hills Board acted unanimously in this decision.

29. In reference to Laurel Hills Response to the Customers First Data Request, Response #6 (Revocable License): paragraphs 3 and 6 of the referenced document state that Laurel Hills must receive written permission from Moy Toy, LLC prior to performing many repairs and improvements, including the installation of shutoff valves. Submit all approval requests sent and approved by Moy Toy, LLC for, but not limited to, the installation of all valves, valve boxes and repairs to customer Nugent's and Perry's water connections. If not dated, identify the date each document was submitted and approved (signed); provide a copy of the Conveyance Agreement and any attachments referenced in paragraph 4, and what person (not entity) negotiated the Conveyance Agreement for Moy Toy, LLC and for Laurel Hills.

Response: Laurel Hills objects to this request because it is vague, ambiguous, overly broad, argumentative, assumes facts not in evidence, and seeks information irrelevant to this proceeding. Laurel Hills further objects to this request as it violates the parties' agreement that the Customer Intervenors be permitted to ask 20 additional discovery requests, as this request combines two requests from the Customer Intervenors' previously served discovery (specifically, this request combines Requests 32 and 33 from the Customer Intervenors' Third Requests). Subject to and without waiving these or any other objection, Laurel Hills states that it does not agree with the premise of this request. The License Agreement speaks for itself and paragraphs 3 and 6 are meant to cover expansion of the water system and those provisions do not apply to current water system assets. Accordingly, Laurel Hills has not obtained written permission for the identified work because the License Agreement does not require it.

DATED: November 19, 2012

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,



Donald L. Scholes
Benjamin A. Gastel
Branstetter, Stranch & Jennings, PLLC
227 Second Avenue North
Fourth Floor
Nashville, TN 37201-1631

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served via U.S. Mail or electronic mail upon:

John J. Baroni,
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General and Reporter
Consumer Advocate and Protection Division
P.O. Box 20207
Nashville, TN 37202-0207

Melanie Davis, Esq.
Kizer & Black
329 Cates Street
Maryville, TN 37801-4903

Jean Stone, General Counsel
Monica Smith-Ashford, Senior Policy Advisor and Hearing Officer
Shiva Bozarth, Esq.
Tennessee Regulatory Authority
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243

on this the 19th day of November, 2012.



Benjamin A. Gastel
Attorney For Petitioner

**RESPONSE
TO SECOND
DISCOVERY
REQUEST
NO. 18**

Darrell E McQueen

Consulting Engineer
P.O. Box 288
Crab Orchard, TN 37723
Ph (931) 707-7799

Oct, 2012

Re: Engineering and consulting services
Including:
Maintenance and operation of pump station and water lines.
Monitoring chlorine levels in water supply.

% Mike McClung
P. O. Box. 288
Crab Orchard, TN 37723

For services provided from June 1, 1011 thru May 31, 2012
52 Weeks at \$500 per week ----- \$26,000.00

Past due----- \$26,000.00

For services provided from June 1, 1012 thru Oct 31, 2012
21 Weeks at \$500 per week ----- \$10,500.00

Total Due on account----- \$36,500.00

Darrell E McQueen *June, 2012*

Darrell E McQueen P.E. Date

**RESPONSE
TO SECOND
DISCOVERY
REQUEST
NO. 24**

2:43 PM

11/18/12

Laurel Hills Condominiums POA
A/R Aging Summary
As of October 1, 2011

	Current	1 - 30	31 - 60	61 - 90	> 90	TOTAL
ADKINS, ROBERT	86.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	86.40
BAUER, TOMMY	86.40	43.20	43.20	86.40	0.00	259.20
BLAIR, WENDALL	43.20	43.20	0.00	86.40	0.00	172.80
BRASSELL, CRYSTAL	86.40	43.20	43.20	86.40	0.00	259.20
BREG, DAVID & AUDREY	86.40	43.20	43.20	86.40	0.00	259.20
CHAMBERS, BARRY	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	0.00	345.60
COPE, TERRY	43.20	0.00	43.20	86.40	0.00	172.80
CPCA (84)	7,257.60	3,628.80	3,628.80	7,257.60	0.00	21,772.80
DOUGLAS, JIMMY & JACKIE	86.40	0.00	86.40	-0.20	0.00	172.60
ELLIS, ALVIN	86.40	86.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	172.80
GAMBLE, ISAAC & WENDY	86.40	43.20	43.20	86.40	0.00	259.20
GARNER, JANET	86.40	86.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	172.80
HAISER, GARY & JEANNIE	86.40	86.40	43.20	86.60	0.00	302.60
HENMAN, MIKE & DEBORAH	86.40	86.40	86.40	172.80	125.00	557.00
KNAPP, RICHARD	43.20	-43.20	0.00	86.40	0.00	86.40
KRABOUSANOS, MIKE	86.40	43.20	43.20	86.40	0.00	259.20
LATHAM, KENT	43.20	-86.40	0.00	43.20	0.00	0.00
LAUREL HILLS CONDOMINIUMS POA	691.20	345.60	345.60	691.20	0.00	2,073.60
LINDSAY, MARK & LAURI	86.40	86.40	43.20	86.40	0.00	302.40
MANERS, EMMETT	86.40	0.00	86.40	0.00	0.00	172.80
MATCHAK, JOEL	86.40	86.40	43.20	86.40	0.00	302.40
MATERDOMINI, DINA	86.40	86.40	86.40	172.80	125.00	557.00
MCMEANS, LARRY	86.40	86.40	43.20	85.40	0.00	301.40
MOORE, JOHN	86.40	43.20	43.20	86.40	0.00	259.20
MURPHY, JEFF	86.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	86.40
NUGENT, GERALD	86.40	43.40	43.40	86.80	0.00	260.00
OW**BOWLES, MELVIN & MARY ANNE	86.40	61.40	61.40	86.40	0.00	295.60
OW**BURMAN, STEVEN	86.40	470.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	557.00
OW**BUTZ, JOHN	86.40	86.40	86.40	172.80	125.00	557.00
OW**CRAWFORD, KENNETH & MARY	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	0.00	345.60
OW**DUNN, LUKE	86.40	86.40	86.40	0.00	0.00	259.20
OW**FORRESTER, ELAINE	86.40	470.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	557.00
OW**HOGARTH, ARDIS	86.40	86.40	86.40	172.80	125.00	557.00
OW**MCMEANS, DON	86.40	86.40	0.00	86.40	0.00	259.20
OW**NUNEZ, GUILLERMO & PATRICIA (2)	172.80	172.80	172.80	172.80	0.00	691.20
OW**PERRY, ROY (2)	172.80	0.00	0.00	250.00	0.00	422.80
OW**WARDEN, JIM	86.40	86.40	86.40	129.60	125.00	513.80
PATTERSON, DAVID	86.40	470.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	557.00
PATTERSON, DAVID & MARY LOUISE	86.40	470.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	557.00
PATTERSON, ELIZABETH	86.40	470.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	557.00
PETERS, JOHN (1)	86.40	43.20	43.20	86.40	0.00	259.20
PETERS, JOHN (2)	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	43.20	259.20
RENAUD, NORMAN	86.40	43.00	43.20	86.40	0.00	259.00
SANDLIN, DONALD & BRENDA	86.40	43.20	43.20	86.40	0.00	259.20
SCHWARTZ, ROBERT	86.40	86.40	86.40	172.80	125.00	557.00
SINGLETON, CONNIE	43.20	-375.00	43.20	86.40	0.00	-202.20
WILLIAMS, TINA	86.40	0.00	0.00	86.40	0.00	172.80
ZABELNY, LOUIS & RENEE TODD	86.40	43.20	43.20	86.40	0.00	259.20
TOTAL	11,880.00	8,001.00	5,936.80	11,524.60	793.20	38,135.60

2:44 PM

11/18/12

Laurel Hills Condominiums POA
A/R Aging Summary
As of November 1, 2011

	Current	1 - 30	31 - 60	61 - 90	> 90	TOTAL
ADKINS, ROBERT	86.40	43.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	129.60
BAUER, TOMMY	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	86.40	302.40
BLAIR, WENDALL	43.20	-43.20	43.20	43.20	86.40	172.80
BRASSELL, CRYSTAL	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	86.40	302.40
BREG, DAVID & AUDREY	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	86.40	302.40
CHAMBERS, BARRY	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	432.00
COPE, TERRY	43.20	0.00	43.20	43.20	86.40	216.00
CPCA (84)	7,257.60	3,628.80	3,628.80	3,628.80	7,257.60	25,401.60
DOUGLAS, JIMMY & JACKIE	43.20	86.40	0.00	43.20	-0.20	172.60
ELLIS, ALVIN	86.40	86.40	86.40	0.00	0.00	259.20
GAMBLE, ISAAC & WENDY	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	86.40	302.40
GARNER, JANET	86.40	43.20	43.20	0.00	0.00	172.80
HAISER, GARY & JEANNIE	86.40	86.40	40.20	43.20	86.60	342.80
HENMAN, MIKE & DEBORAH	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	297.80	643.40
KNAPP, RICHARD	43.20	-43.20	-43.20	43.20	86.40	86.40
KRABOUSANOS, MIKE	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	86.40	302.40
LATHAM, KENT	43.20	43.20	-43.20	0.00	43.20	86.40
LAUREL HILLS CONDOMINIUMS POA	691.20	345.60	345.60	345.60	691.20	2,419.20
LINDSAY, MARK & LAURI	86.40	86.40	86.40	43.20	86.40	388.80
MANERS, EMMETT	86.40	0.00	0.00	86.40	0.00	172.80
MATCHAK, JOEL	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	86.40	302.40
MATERDOMINI, DINA	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	297.80	643.40
MCMEANS, LARRY	86.40	86.40	43.20	43.20	85.40	344.60
MOORE, JOHN	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	86.40	302.40
MURPHY, JEFF	86.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	86.40
NUGENT, GERALD	886.40	43.40	43.40	43.40	86.80	1,103.40
OW**BOWLES, MELVIN & MARY ANNE	86.40	61.40	61.40	61.40	86.40	357.00
OW**BURMAN, STEVEN	86.40	86.40	470.60	0.00	0.00	643.40
OW**BUTZ, JOHN	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	297.80	643.40
OW**CRAWFORD, KENNETH & MARY	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	432.00
OW**DUNN, LUKE	86.40	43.20	86.40	86.40	0.00	302.40
OW**FORRESTER, ELAINE	86.40	86.40	470.60	0.00	0.00	643.40
OW**HOGARTH, ARDIS	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	297.80	643.40
OW**MCMEANS, DON	86.40	86.40	86.40	0.00	86.40	345.60
OW**NUNEZ, GUILLERMO & PATRICIA (2)	172.80	172.80	172.80	172.80	172.80	864.00
OW**PERRY, ROY (2)	172.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	250.00	422.80
OW**WARDEN, JIM	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	254.60	600.20
PATTERSON, DAVID	86.40	86.40	470.60	0.00	0.00	643.40
PATTERSON, DAVID & MARY LOUISE	86.40	43.20	172.80	0.00	0.00	302.40
PATTERSON, ELIZABETH	86.40	86.40	470.60	0.00	0.00	643.40
PETERS, JOHN (1)	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	86.40	302.40
PETERS, JOHN (2)	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	86.40	302.40
RENAUD, NORMAN	86.40	86.40	43.00	43.20	86.40	345.40
SANDLIN, DONALD & BRENDA	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	86.40	302.40
SCHWARTZ, ROBERT	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	297.80	643.40
SINGLETON, CONNIE	43.20	43.20	-331.80	43.20	86.40	-115.80
WILLIAMS, TINA	86.40	86.40	0.00	0.00	86.40	259.20
ZABELNY, LOUIS & RENEE TODD	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	86.40	302.40
TOTAL	12,636.80	6,628.00	7,657.00	5,980.00	12,317.80	45,219.60

2:44 PM

11/18/12

Laurel Hills Condominiums POA
A/R Aging Summary
As of December 1, 2011

	Current	1 - 30	31 - 60	61 - 90	> 90	TOTAL
ADKINS, ROBERT	86.40	43.20	43.20	0.00	0.00	172.80
BAUER, TOMMY	86.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	86.40
BLAIR, WENDALL	43.20	43.20	0.00	43.20	129.60	259.20
BRASSELL, CRYSTAL	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	129.60	345.60
BREG, DAVID & AUDREY	86.40	86.40	43.20	43.20	129.60	388.80
CHAMBERS, BARRY	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	172.80	518.40
COPE, TERRY	43.20	-172.80	43.20	43.20	129.60	86.40
CPCA (84)	7,257.60	7,257.60	3,628.80	3,628.80	10,886.40	32,659.20
DOUGLAS, JIMMY & JACKIE	86.40	43.20	86.40	0.00	43.00	259.00
ELLIS, ALVIN	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	0.00	345.60
GAMBLE, ISAAC & WENDY	86.40	86.40	43.20	43.20	129.60	388.80
GARNER, JANET	86.40	43.20	0.00	43.20	0.00	172.80
HAISER, GARY & JEANNIE	86.40	86.40	40.20	40.20	129.80	383.00
HENMAN, MIKE & DEBORAH	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	384.20	729.80
KNAPP, RICHARD	43.20	43.20	-43.20	0.00	129.60	172.80
KRABOUSANOS, MIKE	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	129.60	345.60
LATHAM, KENT	43.20	-43.20	43.20	0.00	43.20	86.40
LAUREL HILLS CONDOMINIUMS POA	691.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	691.20
LINDSAY, MARK & LAURI	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	129.60	475.20
MANERS, EMMETT	0.00	0.00	0.00	-43.20	43.20	0.00
MATCHAK, JOEL	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	129.60	345.60
MATERDOMINI, DINA	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	384.20	729.80
MCMEANS, LARRY	86.40	86.40	43.20	43.20	128.60	387.80
MOORE, JOHN	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	129.60	345.60
MURPHY, JEFF	86.40	86.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	172.80
NUGENT, GERALD	86.40	886.40	43.40	43.40	130.20	1,189.80
OW**BOWLES, MELVIN & MARY ANNE	86.40	61.40	61.40	61.40	147.80	418.40
OW**BURMAN, STEVEN	86.40	86.40	86.40	470.60	0.00	729.80
OW**BUTZ, JOHN	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	384.20	729.80
OW**CRAWFORD, KENNETH & MARY	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	172.80	518.40
OW**DUNN, LUKE	86.40	43.40	43.20	86.40	86.40	345.80
OW**FORRESTER, ELAINE	86.40	86.40	86.40	470.60	0.00	729.80
OW**HOGARTH, ARDIS	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	384.20	729.80
OW**MCMEANS, DON	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	432.00
OW**MOY TOY, LLC	86.40	518.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	604.80
OW**NUNEZ, GUILLERMO & PATRICIA (2)	172.80	172.80	172.80	172.80	345.60	1,036.80
OW**PERRY, ROY (2)	172.80	172.80	0.00	0.00	250.00	595.60
OW**STANDING ROCK, LLC	86.40	518.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	604.80
OW**WARDEN, JIM	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	341.00	686.60
PATTERSON, DAVID	86.40	86.40	43.20	172.80	0.00	388.80
PATTERSON, DAVID & MARY LOUISE	86.40	86.40	43.20	172.80	0.00	388.80
PATTERSON, ELIZABETH	86.40	86.40	86.40	470.60	0.00	729.80
PETERS, JOHN (1)	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	129.60	345.60
PETERS, JOHN (2)	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	129.60	345.60
RENAUD, NORMAN	86.40	86.40	86.40	43.00	129.60	431.80
SANDLIN, DONALD & BRENDA	86.40	43.20	43.20	43.20	129.60	345.60
SCHWARTZ, ROBERT	86.40	86.40	86.40	86.40	384.20	729.80
SINGLETON, CONNIE	0.00	43.20	43.20	-245.40	129.60	-29.40
WILLIAMS, TINA	86.40	86.40	86.40	0.00	86.40	345.60
ZABELNY, LOUIS & RENEE TODD	86.40	86.40	43.20	43.20	129.60	388.80
TOTAL	11,923.20	12,050.40	6,149.80	7,100.00	17,088.20	54,311.60