

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS ASSOCIATION
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING
WRONA LAW OFFICE
1745 SIDEWINDER DR.
PARK CITY, UTAH
MARCH 19, 2019

In Attendance: Pamela Middleton – President; Tom LeCheminant, Vice President; Jan LeVitre, Secretary; Andrew Pagel, Treasurer; Joe Pagel (Area 3) Nicole Irving (Area 4); Bruce Hutchinson (Area 5); Ted Bonnitt (Area 6) via telephone. Jeremy Jespersen (Area 2) via telephone.

Ex Officio: Jody Robinson, Ranch Manager; Randy Larson, Assistant Ranch Manager; Robert Rosing, HOA Counsel

Excused: Jonathan Hoffman (Area1); Byron Harvison (Area 7)

Guests: Matt McWhirter, FM-C-43; Tom Volbrecht, PI-E-58 Katie with Creative Energies regarding the Marcie Adams, PI-D-14-AM project; Jeff, the Architect working with Grant and Meghan Colley on their house for Lot FM-C-79. Bill and Carol Groot, Lot E-70; Grant and Meghan Colley, Lot FM-C-79; Bill Binnelli, Lot E-85; Catarina Blais, Lot D-94; Carolyn Strathearn, Lot F-50; Jamie and Jim Madore, Lot B-2; Ginger Garson, PI-50; Connie Perkins, Lot D-41

Pamela Middleton called the meeting to order at 6:38.

Approval of Minutes

February 19, 2019

Pamela Middleton referred to page 5 of the Minutes. At the top of the page the word “Motion” was repeated twice. She corrected the Minutes to delete one of the words.

MOTION: Pamela Middleton moved to Approve the Minutes of February 19, 2019, as corrected. Tom LeCheminant seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Ted Bonnitt, Bruce Hutchinson, Jan LeVitre and Jeremy Jespersen abstained from the vote because they had not read the Minutes.

Mr. Bonnitt had not received the Minutes from the last meeting and asked that they be sent to him.

CC&Rs Update

Ted Bonnitt reported that he had received comments from the CC&Rs committee on

the last draft dated January 25, 2019, based on the January 2nd Meeting. Mr. Bonnitt had submitted all the comments to Robert Rosing *grouped* by Article. Mr. Bonnitt remarked that there were still unresolved issues, but generally there was consensus. The committee would meet again to discuss the differences and try to reach a consensus. Mr. Bonnitt pointed out that even if the committee agrees to disagree, nothing was definitive, and it was important to distribute the first draft to the membership for their input. Successive drafts would reflect that input. By the end of the third meeting with the membership, the committee should have an understanding of the greater consensus on the majority opinions. The last draft would hopefully be the most viable to achieve the vote needed to approve the new CC&Rs.

A meeting was scheduled for March 28th at 6:30 to meet with the Board members and Mr. Rosing. Mr. Bonnitt and Mr. Rosing would have a preliminary discussion prior to that meeting.

Easement of Necessity for the SS-146-L-5 Lot

Mr. Rosing reported that the property owner was asking for an Easement by Necessity. He disclosed that his firm represents G & L Sanders, LLD on other matters. At this point he did not believe it presented a conflict, but he would re-evaluate as this matter progresses.

Mr. Rosing understood that SS-146-L-5 is a landlocked parcel and the owner previously tried to obtain an easement. The owner has returned claiming that he is entitled to an Easement by Necessity. Mr. Rosing advised the Board that there were advantages to giving the easement. Mr. Rosing was unsure why the owner had refused the terms the HOA had offered in negotiating the previous easement.

Mr. LeCheminant noted that it was 298 yards from the road to his lot and 25 feet wide. The cost was \$.50 per square feet or \$3725, and he had to join the HOA. Mr. LeCheminant stated that the terms were the same as what was proposed to other people who requested an easement. Mr. LeCheminant believed the burden was on the property owner to prove that his lot was part of the Pine Meadow Ranch property before it was split.

Mr. Rosing remarked that Easements of Necessity are very complicated and most people in Utah do not understand how they work. Mr. Rosing offered to review it further and send an email to the Board. However, he did not believe Easement by Necessity applied to this situation because it does not meet the definition. Ms. Middleton had intended to send the owner an email asking him to provide the Statute that he felt entitled him to an Easement by Necessity.

Mr. LeCheminant asked if they could charge for the easement and use of the property. Mr. Rosing stated that if the owner can prove that it really is an Easement by Necessity, he might be entitled to just take the easement. He explained that an Easement by Necessity needs to have minimal impacts on the land being taken. Mr. Rosing stated that another issue is that the piece the owner of SS-146-L-5 Lot wanted took the whole lot.

Mr. Rosing suggested that the Board should continue this discussion at a later time in closed session. Another option would be for a smaller group to discuss it and follow up with the entire Board.

Fire Station Follow-up

Ms. Middleton reported that Summit County was doing a complicated land transfer for the new fire station building. She was not aware of all the details. It would be going before the Summit County Council next month.

Mr. Rosing explained even though everyone wants the fire station, it is difficult for Associations to sell land without amending CC&Rs and plats. In this situation, Summit County will condemn the land so the HOA does not have to transfer the land, and the Association will get a fire station in return.

Ms. Irving asked if someone from the HOA should attend the County Council meeting. Ms. Middleton planned to attend and offered to send Ms. Irving the information if she was interested in attending. The date was April 3rd, but she did not know the time or whether it was daytime or evening. Ms. Middleton noted that Alan Powell also planned to attend.

Fire Documents

Ms. Middleton tabled this item to the next meeting when the Board would have more time for discussion.

Mr. LeCheminant asked if the HOA could have a different fine schedule for fire versus the current fine schedule. Ms. Middleton replied that it was a matter of amending the documents. If they amend the rules again, it would require sending another mailing to the entire membership informing them that the rules were changing. Another mailing would be sent after the change is made. The cost for each mailing is approximately \$600. Ms. Middleton stated that if the Board can make sure the fine schedule is consistent and fair they should take that approach.

Carolyn Strathearn understood that any type of amendment requires a majority vote by the membership. Amendments cannot be done by the Board alone.

Ms. Middleton stated that if any changes are made, it would be to a document the Board has the authority to revise as a Board. Ms. LeVitre clarified that they would not be making substantive changes. It was only a matter of making sure everything is consistent. Ms. Middleton recalled a different fine in the fire rules. Mr. Rosing stated that it was acceptable to have a specific fine that is different from the general fine amount, as long as it meets the requirements of the fine schedule. Ms. LeVitre noted that in a previous meeting Alan Powell had pointed out the specific fire fine and Mr. Rosing had said there was a conflict between the two documents. Mr. Rosing had not reviewed the fire document. Ms. Middleton thought the documents should be circulated to the Board members for review so they could look at all the options.

Ms. Middleton stated that the goal is to set up the fines properly without incurring additional expenses to the HOA.

New Construction

Stop Work Order – Deer Meadows DMS-4

Mr. LeCheminant had nothing new to report.

Stop Work Order – Bull Moose FM-B-36

Mr. LeCheminant reported that all three members of the Architectural Committee agree that the proposed breezeway connection should not be approved because it was a way of getting around the rule of only having one household per lot. The owners keep sending emails asking the Architectural Committee to meet with their architect to see if they could find a way to make it one building without the breezeway.

Joe Pagel was contacted by the property owner earlier in the day. He stated that the Building Code is open to interpretation; but technically, if the structures have a connecting wall or a common wall it is considered one. However, with the distance between the two structures, it could be interpreted different ways; especially since it is a secondary dwelling with a kitchen and garage and all the living amenities. Mr. Pagel stated that per Summit County regulations, there can be a secondary dwelling on one lot as long as the square footage is under 900 square feet. However, the CC&Rs explicitly states only one dwelling on a single lot unless otherwise approved by the Board. Mr. Pagel stated that if they want a secondary dwelling on their property, it

should be consistent with some type of guidelines and the structure should be under 900 square feet. It would also need to be reviewed and approved by the Board. The goal is to be consistent and fair across the board. Mr. Pagel felt that the plan as proposed was an excessive size.

Mr. Rosing asked if the plan for FM-B-36 was before the Board this evening. Mr. Pagel stated that before he speaks with the property owner he wanted to talk with the Board and hear everyone's opinion.

Carolyn Strathearn was not in favor of the Board approving this if it would open up a door for other people to do double dwellings.

Ms. LeVitre asked if there were legal ramifications for denying the breezeway if the property owner was following Summit County rules. Mr. Rosing explained that building on the Ranch requires both Summit County approval and HOA approval. Summit County does not care if a house is pink, but the HOA does care and has color regulations. In this particular case, the County may allow the breezeway but the Architectural Committee sees it as a way around the HOA rules to achieve two structures.

Ms. Middleton asked if the Board would approve it if the second dwelling was placed against the original house; and whether that would be considered a common wall. Mr. Pagel stated that his interpretation of a common wall is an actual wall or room connecting the two structure. Mr. Pagel thought the issue was the size of the building with a garage.

The Board discussed different scenarios that the Board might accept. Mr. Hutchinson noted that the property owners were not present and the Board could not approve the plans as proposed. Mr. Pagel thought the Board had two options; a single dwelling or a double dwelling. If they choose to allow two dwellings, the secondary dwelling should be limited to 900 square feet or less per Summit County guidelines. If the Board chooses to only allow a single dwelling, they need to discuss a maximum square footage.

Mr. Rosing pointed out that it was not really a double dwelling. The issue is that the CC&Rs call out two dwellings and the Board believes the proposed plan is a means around the CC&Rs. If a property owner proposes a 900 square foot addition as a wing off the building, it would not be considered a double dwelling. He cautioned the Board to be consistent.

Ms. Middleton thought the Board should be prepared to have this issue come up again in the future if they make this exception.

Josh Lane – PI-G-14

The Board discussed the plans for PI-G-14 at the last meeting.

Mr. LeCheminant noted that the owner, Josh Lane had reduced the square footage as requested by the Board. The Board voted on the plans at the Executive Meeting last month. A formal vote was required this evening for the Minutes.

MOTION: Tom LeCheminant moved to Approve the plans for PI-G-14 as submitted. Joe Pagel seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Lot PI-49

Mr. LeCheminant recalled that Peggy Savage, Lot PI-49, had submitted building plans to the Board via email. The structure is 3,056 square feet.

MOTION: Tom LeCheminant moved to Approve the building plans and Lot Improvement Plan for Lot PI-49, Peggy Savage, as submitted. Ms. Middleton seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Lot FM-C-79

Mr. LeCheminant noted that the plans were submitted a year ago; and revised plans were recently resubmitted because the house size was reduced. The original plans listed a dog run and fence in the back yard, which Mr. LeCheminant had not noticed a year ago. Mr. LeCheminant stated that a dog run is allowed but a chain link fence is not allowed. The revised plan shows a dog run and a 5' chain link fence. Mr. LeCheminant had no issues with the house. The fence was a problem because the Guidelines prohibit chain link and nothing higher than 4' fencing. Mr. Hutchinson suggested that the owner consider an in electric fence.

Mr. Colley, Lot FM-C-79, stated that he has two golden retrievers and he would like to keep them safe and healthy. they need space to run around and a small area would not be sufficient. Mr. Colley was not comfortable with the idea of an electric fence shocking his dogs if they venture too far. He was willing to keep the fence height at 4' and to build whatever type of fence the Board would like as long as it is functional.

Ms. Middleton thought the issue was a large fenced area. The Architectural Guidelines prohibit fences except for dog runs, which need to be approved by the Board. The question is whether the proposed fence was acceptable; and if not, what would the Board accept. Ms. LeVitre noted that per the Rules and Regulations, if fences are allowed they must be in natural colors and natural materials. The maximum height is 4'.

Ms. Middleton was concerned that the size of the dog run proposed would be more like a fenced yard, which would not be allowed. Yards are not fenced for a number of reasons. Ms. Middleton emphasized that the Board needs to stay within the Rules and the Architectural Guidelines when considering approval.

The Board discussed the size of the dog run proposed. Ms. Irving stated that by definition, a dog run is enough space for a dog to make a lap. Mr. Pagel was not opposed to having the dog run along the side of the house. He thought a 10' wide and 50' long dog run with a 4' high natural wood fence would be ample room for the dogs to play.

Mr. Hutchinson asked about impacts to the neighbors. It was noted that the lot is a large parcel and the neighbors should not be impacted.

Mr. Rosing noted that a 10' x 50' dog run is 500 square feet and that would be larger than most dog runs. He believed 10' x 50' was consistent with what the Board would accept and it should set the maximum going forward. Mr. Pagel clarified that it would not be 10' x 50' for everyone. The size would be the function of how far out from the house and the length of the house. The idea is to keep it close enough to the house that it does not impact the wildlife. He believed the key point was keeping it close and consolidated to a primary structure.

MOTION: Tom LeCheminant moved to Approve the house plans for FM-C-79, Colley, with a 4' high, 10' x 50' dog run area with natural wood posts and wood paneling, with the understanding that the owner will resubmit revised plans for the fenced area at a later date. Nicole Irving seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Lot PI-B-2 - Madore

Mr. Pagel had no issues with the plans; however, he wanted to see the path for the water line to the house. The plans also needed to include the electric and the secondary power path to the house. The property owner, Jamie Madore, stated that she had given the site plan to Mr. LeCheminant. Mr. Pagel thought the propane tank needed to be clearly identified on the plans and explicitly called out as propane.

Mr. Pagel commented on the setbacks from the future garage to the edge of the property were showing at 7'. He thought it should be 15', but he left that issue to be resolved between the property owner and Summit County. Ms. Madore believed it was measured at 12', which is what she was told was the County required setback between adjacent properties.

Ms. Middleton asked if the proposed materials were acceptable. Mr. Pagel noted that the materials were called out on the plans but he had not seen the actual material samples. The roof would be a 9' pitch with asphalt shingles. The siding would be natural wood.

Ms. Middleton summarized that the Board was comfortable with the materials and the structure itself.

MOTION: Tom LeCheminant moved to Approve the plans for PI-B-2, the Madore residence, as submitted. Jan LeVitre seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Mr. Bonnitt abstained since he had not seen the plans.

Adams - Lot PI-D-14-AM - Solar

Mr. Pagel had met with Marcie Adams and her husband to see what they were proposing. Katie, with Creative Energies, stated that the footprint would be 1,848 square feet in the winter and 2,128 in the summer. The difference is because the panels are pivoting. Mr. Pagel noted that the area would be 56' x 38'. They have a location in the gulley, and nothing will be visible ground level. It will be seen from higher elevations, but this property is at the end of the road.

Mr. Pagel stated that there were actually two different locations. One was a prime location but more visible. In an effort to minimize the visibility, they chose a second location that would still work. Mr. Hutchinson asked about the number of individual structures. Katie replied that there would be nine posts with nine panels on each post. The panels are all black. Ms. Middleton asked if the concrete pad was as large as the perimeter. Katie believed the concrete would be underground and the galvanized steel post would come up from the concrete.

Mr. Pagel preferred something besides metallic metal. He suggested using a neutral matt, similar to what they require for roofs. Ms. Middleton asked if the poles could be painted. Katie replied that the poles could be a different color, but they need to be non-corrosive to withstand the weather.

Mr. Hutchinson asked if this would be one structure, or whether they would run multiple

buildings off this grid. Katie replied that it would only be for the Adams' home. It would be connected to the grid and their home. All of the wiring would be buried 2' underground.

It was noted that solar could not go on the house itself because of shade issues. The owners had explored all other options. The owners were trying to be environmentally conscious and still considerate of their neighbors.

Bill Binnelli, Lot E-85, asked about the height. Katie replied that it is a 25-degree grade and she believed the lowest panel would be 8'. Ms. Middleton asked if there would be hanging cords. She was told that all the cords and wires are contained on the back of the panel and everything else would go along the post. Ms. Middleton noted that if wildlife engages with the panels, the panels would not withstand the force. Mr. Bonnett stated that he has seen damage done to the panels from wildlife rubbing the fur off their antlers. Ms. LeVitre assumed the panels should be checked regularly.

Mr. Pagel was not opposed if the height could be kept to a reasonable height off the ground, the posts are painted in a neutral color, and the panels are black.

Catarina Blais, Lot FM-D-94, asked if the Board has the means to inspect the structure as it is being built. She was told that Summit County would monitor the construction and conduct inspections.

MOTION: Joe Pagel moved to Approve the Marcie Adams, Lot PI-D-14-AM, solar project, contingent upon making sure the posts are painted a matt neutral color to match with surrounding colors and that the posts are 8-13 feet off the ground to not interfere with the existing wildlife. Nicole Irving seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Tom LeCheminant voted against the motion.

Ranch Manager's Report

Jody Robinson reported that the equipment was in good condition. The water truck is back on the Ranch and the dump truck was running well. Jody stated that they still have a couple loads of sand left and he thought that should be enough to finish the season. If not, he would need to purchase additional sand.

Jody stated that he and Randy were removing snow and slush. He anticipated a heavy amount of runoff this Spring.

Large Equipment Purchases.

Tom LeCheminant noted that last Fall the Board discussed purchasing a mini-trackhoe for ditches, culverts, and other projects around the Ranch. The one they leased last year had an open trailer. If they get an enclosed cab mini-trackhoe with a heater and air-conditioner, the cost would be approximately \$53,000. They would still need to purchase a trailer for approximately \$4,000-5,000. Ms. Middleton thought they could find a trailer at an auction.

Mr. LeCheminant noted that at the end of the year the HOA had enough money to make both purchases. Mr. LeCheminant stated that the specific equipment he was proposing was a mini-trackhoe with dozer blade, bucket coupler, hydraulic thumb, 12" and 18" blade, two-speed transmission.

The suggestion was made to purchase a 50+ horsepower Kubota with a full-size boom instead of a mini-trackhoe. Jody remarked that it is difficult to get into the ditches with a Kubota.

MOTION: Tom LeCheminant made a motion to purchase a mini-trackhoe at a cost of \$52,283.34; plus an additional \$5,000 to purchase a trailer.

Mr. LeCheminant offered to ask Carol for the amount left in the accounts after all the expenses for 2018 were paid. Ms. Middleton was not opposed to purchasing the equipment necessary to maintain the roads; however, she was interested in seeing the final amounts to make sure the money is available. She preferred to run the numbers before making a final decision.

The motion was withdrawn.

Mr. LeCheminant commented on a Kubota tractor. He noted that the HOA paid \$30,000 this year to a private contractor to plow the roads. He proposed that the HOA consider purchasing a tractor in the amount of \$56,000. The tractor would have a rear drag blade versus a bucket. It is hydraulic all the way around. They could purchase the tractor and pay three years of labor with the \$90,000 they would save from hiring a private plower for three years. Ms. Middleton clarified that in lieu of hiring a private contractor, they would purchase the new tractor and hire a part-time person to plow for the winter.

Ms. Middleton asked Andrew Pagel to look at the numbers to determine how much the HOA could reasonably afford. She thought the Board should determine which equipment was the most beneficial, because she doubted they could make both purchases. Mr. LeCheminant pointed out that if they were not paying a private contractor for plowing, they could make that purchase with the money saved over the

next three years. Ms. Middleton understood the need to move quickly on a decision, but it needed to be done in the most cost-effective way. Ms. Middleton asked Mr. Pagel to send the Board members an email in the next week or two with the amounts they can work with. Once they have that information, the Board can decide which equipment is most important and what they can afford.

Andrew Pagel clarified that the Board was considering a mini-trackhoe for \$53,000 plus \$5,000 for a trailer. They were also looking at purchasing a Kubota tractor with a blower for \$56,000. A portion of the tractor purchase would be offset by the money saved from not having to hire a private contractor to plow during the winter.

Monthly Budget Review

Andrew Pagel reviewed the unpaid bills detail.

MOTION: Andrew Pagel moved to Approve payment of the Unpaid Bills as presented, in the amount of \$7,022.61. Bruce Hutchinson seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. LeVitre asked if the Board needed to discuss the percent of budget for legal costs. Mr. Pagel agreed that it was important to have that discussion. He would do a current budget evaluation. Currently the total collections were at 57.6%, and there were expenses to be paid for the year.

On-going Business

Mr. LeVitre requested that the Board make the emergency evacuation routes a priority agenda item for the next meeting.

Open Forum

It was noted that several people were interested in fundraising for the Park, in addition to the \$5,000 that came from Deer Meadows.

Connie Perkins, Lot PI-D-41, asked the Board to carefully evaluate what “abandoned trailers” really means. Her neighbor has a trailer that Ms. Perkins would consider abandoned, but her neighbor has been on the Mountain for 25 years.

Ms. Middleton thought that item could be removed from the agenda. She pointed out that the HOA will not tear down or remove something without first contacting the

owners.

Ms. Perkins commented on the mailboxes. She stated that \$75 was not a significant amount, but that was not the point. Ms. Perkins asked for the total number of mailboxes. She thought the Board should look at the cost of installation, insurance, maintenance, ongoing fees and cushion that amount.

Mr. Rosing stated that the point he was making in one of the emails was if mailboxes are free, there would not be enough mailboxes for everyone. The price is also set to allocate the resource so they can eventually add more mailboxes when necessary. Without charging, it would be impossible to determine who does or does not get a mailbox. Currently it is first come/first served if people are willing to pay.

Mr. LeCheminant estimated that Pine Meadow bought 96 new mailboxes. The old mailboxes belong to the Post Office and some people still use those boxes. Andrew Pagel stated that 96 boxes did not come close to being able to sustain just the number of full-time residents. Of the 400 developed lots, 150 lots are full-time residents. It was noted that one-third of the 96 mailboxes were currently be used.

Mr. Pagel noted that if more people wanted mailboxes and they exceed the 96, they would have to expand the square footage to add additional boxes. The reason for the \$75 is to cover the cost of expanding in the future. Ms. Perkins noted that those who have mailboxes are paying for the new boxes now. If more boxes are needed, she thought those people should pay for the add-ons. Mr. LeCheminant understood that it was also a way to generate additional revenue for the Ranch. Mr. Pagel noted that it would take a while to replace the money that was spent on the mailboxes.

Mr. LeCheminant noted that the \$50 fee is paid and refundable if the owner turns in a key for the PO Box.

Ms. Perkins agreed that people who want mailboxes should pay for them, but she thought the \$75 annual charge was a problem. Ms. LeVitre pointed out that the HOA was treating it as a yearly rental cost. She thought the Board could look at a possible cost reduction or a different approach. Ms. Middleton noted that the Board had lengthy discussions over several meetings to determine the best approach and a fair cost. Mr. Rosing did not think it was a fair accusation to the Board to say this does not make sense when they had many things to consider.

Ms. Perkins put out the request to see if people wanted to participate, but ultimately the HOA took of over. When the HOA purchased the boxes from the Post Office, she understood that everyone got a mailbox key. A year later there was an additional \$75

annual fee without any discussion. Mr. LeCheminant stated that he informed everyone who signed up and obtained a mailbox key from him that it was \$50 for the key and an additional \$75 per year rental fee.

Mr. Rosing understood that Ms. Perkins believed \$75 was too high. Ms. Perkins replied that it was definitely too high. Mr. Rosing did not dispute that it generates revenue for the HOA. He thought the Board could be open to reducing that amount. Ms. Middleton agreed that the Board could revisit the issue. Mr. Rosing wanted Ms. Perkins to understand that the Board gave the matter careful thought before setting the \$75 annual fee.

Ms. Perkins commented on video conferencing. If the Board talks about applying fees or have discussions that affects the majority of property owners, she thought it would be helpful if the members could have some input during a meeting via chat box or Zoom.

Mr. LeCheminant stated that they do not have an internet connection at the Ranch Office, which is where they hold the meetings during the summer. Mr. Bonnitt noted that he was participating via conferencing at the end of last summer and he recalled that the internet from the Water Company was used.

Ms. Middleton stated that he had already been thinking about what Ms. Perkins had suggested. The Board meetings are private meetings open to only Pine Meadow Ranch Owners. To moderate those meetings, monitor only those owners who are supposed to be on the call, and the process to get them on the call requires a paid service. When someone calls into a conference call they have a code and they can join the meeting.

Ms. LeVitre thought they could set it up to require a password or another type of access. Ms. Middleton pointed out that they would still need a moderator to make sure the system is secure and to only the members are allowed access. They could use Zoom for video-conferencing, but that would still require a moderator. Ms. Middleton remarked that it would have to be a muted meeting so people could not speak until the Open Forum.

Ms. Middleton believed it could be done, but they needed to research the options and work through the issues. It was not as simple as just setting up a conference line.

Mr. Rosing commented on the legal issues that could arise from televising the meetings. In the past most attorneys advised Boards not to do it. That has changed over time, but the liability concerns remain. If the Board decides to go that direction, Mr. Rosing thought it was important for the Board members to consider the issues and receive some training.

Ms. Perkins reiterated her belief that it would be nice for the members who cannot attend a meeting to be able to listen in, especially for financial discussions.

Andrew Pagel agreed that it was worth looking into. Mr. Bonnitt thought it would be helpful to have it for one of the membership input meetings for the CC&Rs so members who are not on the Ranch can be part of the process before they vote.

A property owner intends to put in a 10' x 12 or a 12' x 16' shed on his property after the snow melts and Carol said he needed to talk with the Board. Mr. Pagel pointed out that if the shed was 120 square feet or less, which is a 10' x 12' pad, it did not require Board approval. If it is greater than 120 square feet, the owner needs to fill out a Lot Improvement Agreement listing the colors, the size, and what the structure will look like and bring it to the Board for approval. The impact fee is \$2.40 per square foot for the total square footage. If the structure is over 190 square feet, it needs to be approved by the Board and Summit County. He was told to fill out the Lot Improvement Plan and bring it back to the next Board meeting. He could also email the Lot Improvement Plan for the Board to review prior to the next meeting.

Ms. Middleton noted that Caterina Blais was interested as a candidate to be considered for an appointed Area 1 Representative. She asked Ms. Blais to briefly introduce herself.

Ms. Blais stated that she has been on the Mountain for 15 years. She ran the FEEMF Group for 10 of those years. She served on the Claimjumper Board in Park City for 17 years. She is a full-time resident at 2547 Forest Meadow Road. Ms. Blais stated that she cares about the Ranch and would like to be part of the decision-making process.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Owners Association Board adjourned at 8:31 p.m.
