

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS ASSOCIATION  
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING  
IN PERSON & VIA ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE  
JUNE 20, 2023

In Attendance: George Sears, President; John Adams, Vice-President; Chris Moore, Secretary; Andrew Pagel, Treasurer; Dwaine Anderson (Area 1); Marty Hansen (Area 2); Katie Winters (Area 4); Shaun Baker (Area 5); John Kleba (Area 6)

Ex Officio – Jody Robinson, Ranch Manager; Nicole Irving, representing the Fire Committee; Robert Rosing, HOA Counsel

Excused: Taissa Folden (Area 7)

George Sears called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

### **Minutes**

John Adams sent Carol his minor corrections to the minutes before the meeting.

Katie Winters had not read the minutes and would abstain from the vote.

MOTION: George Sears moved to approve the minutes of May 16, 2023, as corrected. Marty Hansen seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Katie Winters abstained from the vote.

### **Ranch Manager's Report**

Jody stated that they would start graveling roads and cleaning culverts. Jody had received the email regarding drainage, and they would start working on that as well.

Jody reported that currently they were working on Oil Well Road. He is spending more time off the Ranch because of it. Mr. Adams asked if someone else could focus on it so Jody could focus on the Ranch roads.

Jody asked if the agreement with the trucking company was by the hour or by the load. Mr. Adams replied that it was by the load, and it should be within the \$400 range.

Jody remarked that he needed to purchase gravel.

Jody wanted to know what was happening with Tollgate Canyon Road. Mr. Adams replied that a decision has not been made but they will discuss it. He thought Jody should plan on doing the basic repairs around the edges. However, they need to address the drainage issue before spending too much money. Jody pointed out that there was a bad stretch of road that needs to be addressed. Mr. Sears asked if they would be ready this week to make a decision. Mr. Adams stated that if the Board or at least the Executive Committee could meet again, they should be ready to move forward. Mr. Sears thought the Executive

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association  
Monthly Board Meeting  
June 20, 2023  
Page 2

Committee should meet to make the recommendation. If the rest of the Board members need to be involved after that, it would be fine.

Jody asked about mag water. Mr. Sears noted that the Girls' Camps were starting up and there is a lot of traffic. In some areas, the roads are still wet. Mr. Sears did not want to lay down mag water one day and have it rain the next day and wash it off. He suggested that Jody tentatively schedule the mag water for the same time frame they did last year.

Jody stated that the grader is running well but it needs some minor repairs. The water truck needs an airbag, but it is usable. He had to buy a clutch for the Ranger. Jody needs to purchase asphalt for the potholes.

Mr. Pagel stated that they had enough reasonably priced proposals to move forward. Mr. Sears agreed. The Executive Committee should meet to make the final reviews and pull the trigger on getting it done. They will send it to the rest of the Board so they all understand the recommendation and whether there are any challenges.

Jody stated that someone in Deer Meadows was asking for gravel on their road. Mr. Sears replied that Deer Meadow is now part of the HOA and they are responsible for the road from the Church Camps up to that corner. Mr. Sears recalled that the HOA annexed six of the Deer Meadow lots and it goes up that far.

Jody asked about Fire Safety Cleanup Day. Mr. Sears replied that it is July 15<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Sears noted that several plow groups have not taken down their plow stakes. They should all be taken down by now and he asked the Area Reps to reach out to those who have not removed them.

### **Water Company Update**

Mr. Sears reported that there was very little activity at the Water Board meeting. The Water Company is ramping up for the summer and taking care of repairs and installations.

### **Monthly Budget Review**

Andrew Pagel reviewed the unpaid bills. They budgeted \$40,000 for aggregate and spent \$18,000 on aggregate this month. They have exceeded the budgeted amount in the last few years. He asked Jody to report back next month to see how far they can go with the \$18,000 spent this month.

Mr. Sears pointed out that this is the month when they pay insurance for the year, which contributed to the larger amount of unpaid bills.

MOTION: Andrew Pagel moved to pay the unpaid bills as presented in the amount of \$32,018.94. John Adams seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

### **Ratification**

Mr. Adams reported that the Board voted electronically to accept quotes from the State of Utah approved vendors for work related to the FEMA Grant that was recently received. The Board also wanted to allow the Fire Safety Committee to use State approved vendors and their quotes without having to go through an RFP for other work they plan to do.

Mr. Adams stated that the Board voted electronically on June 1<sup>st</sup> and the motion passed with 8 votes in favor

MOTION: John Adams moved to ratify the previously approved electronic motion to accept State approved vendors for FEMA's Fire Mitigation Board that was approved on June 1, 2023. George Sears seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

### **Rules and Regulations**

Mr. Sears provided an update relative to the rental rules and regulations. It will be sent to all the owners within the next couple of weeks for their input. The owners are given 15 days to respond with input. Once the input is received, they will make a final recommendation. The rules and regulations would go into effect 15 days after the Board approves them.

Mr. Sears commented on one addition that was added. Even though the CC&Rs do not give the HOA the ability to preclude rentals or set limits on rentals, per a new Legislature statute they can charge up to \$200 per rental for administering them as a rental on the Ranch. The language was put into the rental rules stating that the HOA has the right to charge up to \$200. Mr. Sears stated that the Board will need to make a decision in the future regarding exactly how much of the \$200 to charge. Mr. Pagel asked about frequency. Mr. Sears replied that the language states "up to \$200 annually to administer the rentals". He wanted to make sure the language was specific so everyone is aware, and no one is taken by surprise.

### **Burn Pile Discussion.**

Nicole Irving stated that she was speaking on behalf of Peggy Simeone and the Fire Safety Committee. She understood that Adam Harmon met with people last week regarding the burn pile and he had more information.

Adam stated that the Fire Safety Committee met and provided a recommendation for this year and going forward for the next year. Adam remarked that time was a critical issue for this year with the burn pile already growing and not having a straightforward management plan in place.

Adam stated that the Committee's recommendation is to look the Green Waste Program. The purpose of

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association  
Monthly Board Meeting  
June 20, 2023  
Page 4

the Green Waste Program is to provide an easily accessible avenue for Pine Meadow HOA residents to dispose of green waste generated from fire mitigation activities, which hits at the core of fire mitigation. Adam stated that the recommendation for this year is to continue with how they have been managing it but work on reducing the potential overall size by limiting construction waste and clearing the lots from construction activities. It goes back to the core of using it for fire mitigation. Adams remarked that the recommendation is to follow the basic recommendation that Alpine Forestry recommended, and then subcontract a separate contractor for stacking, along with trying to educate the community and limit the use of the pile for clearing from construction. They also recommend that the ARC look at implementing a rule so people understand they cannot use the green waste pile for clearing from construction. Also, in that time, gather community feedback on other ways to utilize the green waste pile such as to generate firewood, wood chips for community use, or potentially bio-char or removal, as well as other options. Part of the process is to monitor through the year to see how it is going and whether they were able to reduce the amount of dumping from construction efforts, and if not, there are other avenues such as fences and cameras.

Mr. Sears asked Adam how they could monitor or preclude individuals from dumping green waste or construction materials considering the size of the burn pile already in place. Adam stated that initially with signage and education. They have also talked about buck and rail fencing and potentially making narrower openings to limit large trucks. They will ask the ARC to implement a rule so that people understand when they start building that they cannot use the burn pile for construction waste. If it is still an issue, they will look at further efforts.

Mr. Adams asked from a precautionary standpoint whether they could decide to close the burn pile during the week and only open it on certain days of the weekend, or one day during the week. If the day and times are specific, someone could be there to monitor what is being brought in and by whom. Mr. Adams stated that every year the burn pile gets bigger and bigger. They have had discussions about bringing in a woodchipper. He reached out to Global Equipment to see about using an 18-20" chipper, but he had not heard back. They could also ask Republic Waste to bring in a couple of 40-yard construction dumpsters for a week or so and people could use those instead. Mr. Adams thought the real risk is if they let people continue to bring in waste like this, it will be out of control. He did not believe the HOA wanted to take on that risk and they do not want to encourage that type of use.

Mr. Adams thought that monitoring the burn pile and opening it periodically would be the best approach. Adam stated that if it is feasible to manage the manpower, monitoring would be a viable option. The Committee discussed what is feasible to implement this season and what takes more effort. If sectioning it off during the week and opening it on the weekends is feasible from a management side, it might be a good option.

Mr. Pagel thought pre-construction clearing could be an issue. Nicole stated that this type of situation is where the defensible space rule that the Fire Safety Committee presented last year comes into play. The rule needs to be revisited as a way to monitor how much fire fuel is being used to burn versus specifying it cannot be done. Currently, there are no rules saying what they can or cannot do. Mr. Pagel thought they

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association  
Monthly Board Meeting  
June 20, 2023  
Page 5

could easily make that rule. Nicole reiterated that the rule needs to be revisited because it has been brought up before. Mr. Pagel stated that it was becoming a problem and proposing prohibiting pre-construction and commercial use will be easier if there is a rule to follow. It will make it easier to manage what it was intended to be, which is a local resource for local owners to be able to remove green waste from their properties. The intention was never for commercial entities to use it and profit, and the owners take the financial burden for the companies to make the financial profit.

Someone recalled that Chief Nielsen was going to look into the chipper program. She asked if that been had explored to possibly drop down the impact. Nicole replied that the response was that there was not adequate staffing for that program this year.

Mr. Pagel asked if Adam wanted to talk about the burn pile proposal. Adam stated that the proposal is now called the Green Waste Program rather than Burn Pile.

Mr. Sears had read the RFQ that was sent out. The RFQ stated that all green waste, except for that which would be chipped, would be taken off the mountain. He asked if that element would be changed or left in because as written it lets everyone know that if they contract with a company, the company needs to haul everything off the mountain. They cannot put it in the burn pile. Mr. Adams explained that for any HOA contracted projects, the intention would be to remove it from the mountain unless it is a small number of chips the community would like to use and has a predetermined usage. Mr. Pagel understood that predetermined means that someone has already volunteered to take it. Mr. Adams explained that if community members are interested in getting some chips, they would request that one or two truckloads be left for people to collect, but it would not be a default to dump those chips or any green waste from the larger scale projects in the pile.

Mr. Adams remarked that it was noted in the Steering Committee meeting that the larger mitigation projects will reduce the green waste generated from community projects. On those weekends they were continuously dumping trailers and that should reduce some of the green waste size this year. Mr. Adams stated that the intent is to limit or eradicate the pre-construction dumping, but they know it will not occur immediately with a line in the sand. If they can work on reducing it, that will be an initial benefit and they can work on reducing it more each year.

Robert Rosing stated that dumping in a Summit County dumpster is against the law. He had not looked at private dumpsters and he thought it might be worth looking into. Mr. Sears understood that construction materials cannot be dumped in a County dumpster, but people dump in the Pine Meadow dumpsters all the time and the HOA has no control over it. He noted that the 40 cubic yard dumpsters would be contracted independently as part of the HOA. Mr. Rosing pointed out that it is also illegal to dump outside of a dumpster. He believed that dumping construction waste outside of the proper receptacle is potentially a crime.

Mr. Rosing suggested putting in cameras to catch the culprits. Mr. Pagel stated that part of the solution is to first decide how to monitor it, what they are monitoring for, and the conditions they are monitoring against. Those are the primary issues they need to decide. Mr. Sears stated that if they take that route, they need to

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association  
Monthly Board Meeting  
June 20, 2023  
Page 6

go back to the issue of new construction since that is where most of the building material comes from. Mr. Sears remarked that another challenge is that the HOA is not a police force. There are issues with any solutions they consider for enforcement.

Mr. Sears stated that the Fire Committee has a recommendation; however, the question is how to control the current pile so it only grows on a limited basis for the rest of the year. He pointed out that they are getting a lot of exposure because of the burn pile and Summit County could prohibit them from having it. Nicole stated that when they spoke with Bryce Boyer, he recommended that they burn the pile more frequently so it does not reach a monstrous size and is easier to manage and control. She thought the concept of only having it open on the weekends was a reasonable solution. Mr. Sears was comfortable with gating and having proper signage. They could open it one or two days during the week and again on weekends. Mr. Pagel suggested that the Fire Committee determine the days it should be open and what signage they would like to see. He thought it was a tiered approach. They put in signage and gates and only allow access during specific days and install cameras. If it is continually abused to the point where it cannot be controlled with those barriers, it will need to find a more aggressive approach.

Nicole stated that if the pile gets too large, they can decide to close it for the season. Those who clear their lots early will have the ability to use it, but they need to have a hard cut-off point. Mr. Sears wanted to know how they identify when the pile is too big. Nicole suggested asking a professional what they think is a reasonable size, and basing it on something significantly smaller than last year. She noted that last year it was divided into two piles and they could limit it to one pile this year.

Mr. Sears remarked that no one cleared the ash from last year's fire. He wanted to know what would happen to all the ash. He noted that before the Fire Committee took over, Jody would mangle the burning and push the ash over to the side and increase the size of the parking lot over time. Last year nothing was done with the ash, and he thought it was an issue to be addressed on the Fire Committee. Marianna stated that the Fire Committee was not aware that the burn pile was part of their responsibility; however, the committee would be happy to take it on. Marianna believed that ash would not be an issue in the future if they monitor the quantity and the quality of waste, including the amount and size of the green waste. It can be managed so the residual after the burn is minimal to non-existent, but it needs to be planned. Marianne assumed they would end up with ash again this year, but if they make changes they can end up with minimal ash in the future. Nicole agreed that minimizing is always the future goal. She recalled a suggestion that it be carted off and they would need to look into scheduling that for this year. Mr. Sears thought the Fire Committee needed to come up with a solution for this year. He understood from last year that the Fire Committee had the responsibility to come up with a proposed solution.

Mr. Sears pointed out that the location is a parking lot that is supposed to be used for staging. They should not be allowing 18-wheelers to go back into that part of the Ranch. They are supposed to pull into the lot, unload, and take their goods back to the construction site. That is currently not happening. Mr. Sears remarked that they have not done a good job of educating the owners that 18-wheelers are not allowed to drive up into the Ranch. He wanted to know what the Fire Committee would propose to keep using that lot as a parking lot or staging area. Adam replied that the committee was concerned about the fire mitigation

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association  
Monthly Board Meeting  
June 20, 2023  
Page 7

aspects. Mr. Sears pointed out that taking up the entire parking area eliminates the ability to handle parking and construction staging. He clarified that he was not blaming the Fire Committee. Mr. Sears did not believe they were collectively coordinating the use of that area, which is supposed to be primarily a parking lot. He thought they were doing the right things in terms of fire mitigation, but they need to think broader when looking at the ground they are using or how they intend to use it. Mr. Sears asked that people begin to think about it because once they start blocking it off and someone needs to park or stage in that area, someone will need to unblock it to allow those vehicles to come in and out. Nicole recalled that staging occurred on the upper winter lot last year. Mr. Sears answered no. There is no staging on the upper lot because there is too much equipment to allow that. He was told that by both the Water Company and Jody.

Someone thought it was important to be clear upfront about who is managing the burn pile. The question last year was whether Jody was managing it or whether Alpine was managing it with a management fee. She emphasized that the triangle needs to be well-defined for this year regarding the ash, aside from the burn pile versus the parking lot. Mr. Pagel agreed.

Mr. Pagel recommended an action plan for when they want to have mitigation signage posted and set the hard rule about no more commercial dumping. Mr. Adams explained that the notice of a proposed rule change must be out for 15 days to give the owners adequate time to provide feedback. Mr. Adams offered to prepare a notice of a proposed rule change with a request for feedback. Mr. Pagel thought the process could be completed for the next Board meeting. Mr. Sears clarified that the owners could provide feedback but the Board makes the final decision. The Board has the authority to make the rule, but they promised transparency and the opportunity for the owners to provide feedback. The Board looks at the feedback to determine whether they might have missed something or whether the rule should be refined.

Mr. Sears remarked that a second action item is how to manage the burn pile. What he heard from the comments this evening is that Jody should still be managing it or possibly Alpine for a fee. He noted that when they spoke with Alpine last week, they indicated that Jody still needs to do the stacking and other things, yet Alpine raised its price significantly and the HOA is now required to take over a greater portion of that management. Mr. Pagel thought it should be managed by the HOA so they could decide the outcome. Mr. Pagel preferred to talk to Jody and have the HOA manage it. If they decide as an HOA to manage it, Jody can set the hard stop as they try to implement long-term strategies. Mr. Sears stated that if Jody is going to manage it, they need to consider his input. If it were up to Jody, he would close it right now.

Mr. Sears thought the Board could make a motion to put some type of rule in place on how to manage contributions to the burn pile. Nicole asked if they could piggyback the defensible space rule that was presented as a recommendation last year. She noted that the defensible space rule states that any new properties are required to create a defensible space, which is 30' surrounding their property and anything that is taken from their lot must be removed from the mountain. Nicole stated that it was put up for a vote last year, however, someone was upset because they thought their lot needed to have a lot of stuff removed, even though it only applied to new builds. Nicole thought the rule was not explained very well. Mr. Adams recalled that the recommendation did not move forward because there was not enough support for the rule as it was written. He thought there was still an effort to take a nother approach, but the way it

was presented did not work out. Nicole remarked that considering how fast the community is growing she thought it was reasonable to ask people to remove waste from their lot.

Marianna suggested that the Fire Committee revisit it and address a solution with the HOA at the next meeting.

**MOTION:** John Adams made a motion for the Architectural Guidelines to implement a construction waste rule that limits the dumping of any green waste or construction waste at the burn pile, with details to follow. Posting and community feedback will take place over 15 days minimum.  
George Sears seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously.

### **Open Public Forum**

Someone wanted to know what will determine the use and the application of the mag water. He recalled a discussion last year regarding whether to hold off or do it, and whether to add more pavement. He asked for an update. Mr. Pagel replied that they were investigating other longer-term solutions along with mag water. At this point, they were not ready to stop doing mag water, but they were thinking about allocating budget funds towards other things that can last longer than mag water with the same result. John Adams has been looking into it and gave examples of potential solutions. Mr. Adams stated that the Substrata Rep will be in town the second week of July and can meet possibly with some of them.

In response to the question, Mr. Sears stated that they will be doing some mag water this year. They were doing it in so many places in the past and last year they pulled back. Mr. Sears remarked that mag water needs to be done in the areas that are most impacted by dust.

There was a question about the roads on Tollgate Canyon itself. Mr. Pagel stated that it was a key item the Board has talked about. Currently, the ground is saturated with water and the water table is high. Any roadwork done at this time will be washed away. When they reach the point of being ready to do the work, they have some good proposals. The Board plans to make a decision later this week. Mr. Adams stated that the Board needs to vote on what they are willing to move forward on based on the funds available. Mr. Sears stated that the Board obtained and reviewed the proposals. They also put out a call to remove and install culverts. He noted that multiple approaches will be going on simultaneously.

Mr. Pagel stated that in the budget they purposely have a \$75,000 surplus left over, plus \$50,000 of excess in variable income from construction impact fees. They have \$125,000 to put towards fixing the roadway before they have to reallocate the budget items. Mr. Sears stated that they also need the owners to step up and clean out their culverts. He stated that 80% of the damage on Alexander Canyon is caused by three 18" culverts that are plugged. Mr. Adams pointed out that not everyone is on the mountain all the time. He agreed that the owners are responsible for their culverts and suggested that some of the contractors working on HOA problems throughout the mountain could provide possibly have a set rate to help owners



with culverts. Mr. Sears agreed that it was a good option. Mr. Adams could reach out to the owners and propose it as a solution.

An owner at 1667 Tollgate stated that he lives right on the turn where the pavement ends and the dirt begins. He was trying to understand his responsibility on the culvert. He does not have a culvert in front of his driveway. The culvert is across the road and it is constantly clogged because the road is so sandy. He pays to have it cleaned all the time. It becomes disconcerting because he pays a contractor to clear it out and the road base flows back down into it. He understood that the owners have the responsibility to keep the culvert cleared on their property and wanted to know his responsibility when the culvert is across the street and not in his driveway. Mr. Sears stated that this is one of the areas where they need to figure out a way to redirect the water appropriately. It is a major challenge and they need to have a dialogue with the engineers about drainage.

Alex Faulkenstien stated that they can get larger concrete culverts from Geneva Pipe. They are state job rejects that were damaged and they are free. He thought it was worthwhile for the Board to look into it. Alex did not know the size, but if they call at the right time and talk to the right person they should be able to get them; otherwise, they are sent back to the crushing yard and they are crushed and recycled.

Kent stated that Geneva stocks culvert rejects are in 24" and 36". Mr. Adams asked where they keep the culverts. Kent replied that they are in Lehi at their pit near the Point of the Mountain. Mr. Adams will follow up with Kent on the culverts.

## **Committee Reports**

### Roads and Parking

Mr. Sears stated that they have the survey results. They also need to discuss purchasing new equipment. He noted that they talked about funding for the repairs earlier in the meeting and he did not believe they needed to go over it again.

### New Equipment Purchase

Mr. Adams reported that a meeting was held and they heard feedback from people who use the heavy equipment. He did not have the information in front of him, but he recalled that they were looking at a CAT 930 or 938. They also looked at a commercial-grade snow blower at a cost of approximately \$60,000 to \$70,000. If they go this route, the question is how much money they would be willing to put in and what they expect to do with the equipment. Mr. Adams thought the expectation would be for the HOA to take over plowing the connector route. They would also explore the possibility of plowing other routes that the owners contribute to. Mr. Adams pointed out that they would need to figure out how that would work. The urgency is that Jody and the Ranch need a solution rather quickly. He noted that last winter Jody was driving backwards on a tractor with a small plow that barely makes a dent. He is using snow plows that are minuscule compared to what some of the contractors use. The HOA does not have equipment capable to plow roads in another winter like the one this year.

Mr. Adams stated that the equipment they were looking at would be anywhere from \$180,000 to \$250,000. They have the money, but they need to finish going through the process of identifying the best solution. Mr. Sears explained that the reserve analysis that was done three years ago is an important element that comes into play relative to long-term planning. If they purchase a piece of equipment from the reserve, they need to refund the reserve because the reserve is based upon the existing equipment and when it was projected to be replaced. Mr. Sears emphasized that it was not a simple task as taking money out of the reserve. They will need to go back to the owners to replenish the reserve account.

Mr. Adams stated that in the discussion with Jody about the equipment and the status of the large grader, which is incredibly old, Jody said that when they purchased the grader they put in a new transmission and new engine. Even though the grader is old, it might still have a usable life for a while longer. Mr. Sears stated that part of the reserve planning is to look at the reality today and the original purchase date. Mr. Pagel remarked that reserves are approximations based on the existing equipment. However, the existing equipment can have a longer or shorter life span with proper maintenance. It is a function of how much you need in the bank to cover an emergency. Mr. Pagel stated that if they purchase the additional equipment, they will need a commitment from Jody and Trent that they would utilize that equipment to support the Forest Meadow side. He thought it was too early to ask Jody and Trent to commit to anything else additional at this point. Mr. Sears pointed out that the new equipment could be used year-round and not just for snow. They coordinated with Jody to see how they could capitalize on using the equipment on a year-round basis. Another issue is to figure out a solution for when Jody or Trent are not available for someone to operate the equipment.

#### Road Survey Results

Mr. Adams provided the road survey results and thanked everyone who had participated in the survey. He explained that the premise behind the survey was driven by a thought process that would increase broader community involvement in the longer term. The survey asked what people thought the HOA should focus on over the next five years. Mr. Adams noted that they have been doing things the same way for decades and they recognize that there may be ways to do some things differently.

Mr. Adams stated that the survey went out on June 11<sup>th</sup> and they received a lot of feedback. He noted that 317 owners responded, which is the largest turnout for surveys over the past two years. Mr. Adams stated that 20% of the lot owners responded and 38% were full-time owners and 37% were part-time owners.

Mr. Adams noted that they were still going through the comments; however, several people wanted the HOA to focus on culverts, drainage, and owner responsibility. Mr. Adams stated that some people wanted better engineering. A comment that was not on the survey was to pave the road to Bobcat and possibly consider going all the way to the winter lot. That sentiment was repeated over and over by many people. Mr. Adams presented a slide showing how many owners commented on the question of what the HOA should focus on in the next five years. Regarding drainage, 77% thought they should focus on drainage over the next five years; 55% said road material was an issue they should focus on. Maintenance practices were another major issue they want the HOA to focus on. Snow plowing, road safety, and road dust were also

important issues, but not as much as the top three items he mentioned.

Mr. Adams stated that of the single-most items the respondents want the HOA to address, 43% said road drainage. The next categories were in the 15% range. Mr. Adams noted that 87% said road drainage, road maintenance, road material, and road safety are important. The second most important items included maintenance practices, drainage, and road materials. He noted that it was a repeat of the top priorities.

Mr. Adams stated that the survey asked the question, "Would you support an annual dues increase". 74% said yes. 26% said no. The 74% was divided between people who were willing to see their dues go up by \$25-\$50, \$50-\$100, \$100-\$250, and \$250-\$500. Mr. Adams stated that taking what the owners responding to the survey said, taking the high and the low, it comes out to a range of between \$85 and \$178 in terms of how much an increase people would tolerate. If that is applied to the entire community, they would see additional funds for the HOA between \$70,000 and \$142,000 that could be dedicated to road-related maintenance or repair and better practices. Mr. Adams noted that the high end of the income range would double the current road budget.

Mr. Adams remarked that the survey also asked whether people would support a one-time road assessment. 76% would support a one-time road assessment. 24% said no. People in the 76% majority were willing to spend anywhere from \$25.00 to \$2500 on an additional assessment. Some wrote that they were willing to spend more than \$2500. Based on the owners who responded, a one-time assessment could be between \$263 and \$600. Applying that to the broader community of 806 lots, the one-time assessment could raise funds between \$211,000 and \$482,000

Mr. Adams stated that his take on the survey is that a lot of people are willing to invest in the community and would like to do things that improve the roads. They are not saying the roads should be paved, but that Tollgate Canyon should be repaired from the standpoint of safety and accessibility, and that the primary arteries should be considered. Mr. Adams believed there was a way to work out the mechanics that would allow them to move forward before they are ready to implement an assessment. He remarked that there is also the option of borrowing against the reserve.

Mr. Pagel remarked that the one-time assessment versus the increase in dues is conveniently all rolled into a three-year ROI, meaning that if you pay the one-time assessment versus dues, after three years the dues would equal the special assessment, which would not cost the residents more in the long-term.

Mr. Sears thought the survey provided good information. If people have questions they should reach out to the Board because it will be a discussion point for some time. Mr. Adams noted that the Fire Safety Committee has done great things for fire mitigation and a lot is being done to move forward. He asked the Board for their thoughts on establishing a broader community-based road committee. More than 100 people are willing to contribute time or expertise to that committee and he believed they could start finding ways to leverage their willingness and expertise. Mr. Sears agreed that if they have the right people who want to be involved and want to see change and growth it would be a good solution. Mr. Adams asked how they would move forward. Mr. Sears stated that they would need to assign resources to identify who should

be on the committee. The committee must be willing to function similarly to the Fire Committee, if money is associated, and procedures and finances must be Board approved with at least one Board member actively engaged. At a minimum, he recommended one Board member and one member of the Executive Committee be on the road committee. Mr. Adams offered to revisit with the group who expressed an interest in getting involved and bring the information back to the board so they can move forward.

Mr. Pagel reminded everyone that the HOA only takes the data from the survey to propose an increase to the dues, and that proposal is presented to the owners for approval at the Annual Meeting. He thought the numbers should incentivize people to be a part of the Annual Meeting. Mr. Pagel noted that the HOA cannot ask for any additional money in terms of an increase in dues or a one-time assessment unless the owners approve it. Mr. Adams clarified that only 60% of the owners who attend the Annual Meeting is voting on approval. He encouraged everyone to attend the Annual Meeting. Those who do not attend do not have a vote. Mr. Sears pointed out that it is easier now to be part of the Annual Meeting because people can participate via Zoom.

#### **Architectural Review Committee**

##### FM-C-74

Mr. Adams reviewed an amendment to a Lot Improvement Plan for a home on Lot FM-C-74, 2647 Valley View Road. The building for the owner, Mel Raymond, was approved by the HOA in 2019 but she ended up having to use multiple builders. It was a bad experience and she has struggled with doing a full construction project. The siding materials she selected did not come in and when she was out of town on business material came that she was not expecting. Ms. Raymond currently has corrugated steel which is approved by the Architectural Guidelines, but it is solid black and she would like to paint it a charcoal gray.

Mr. Adams stated that from his perspective they need to allow an amendment to the Lot Improvement allowing the corrugated metal and the change in color to charcoal gray. The colors listed were mineral gray and rock bottom gray by Sherwin Williams. He showed the color that it will look like.

Mr. Adams asked if anyone could think of a reason why they should not move forward and grant the requested amendment to the Lot Improvement Plan. Mr. Pagel clarified that black is not an approved color for primary siding and that painting the corrugated steel charcoal gray would meet the color standards and the material standards. He was comfortable granting the amendment.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the amendment to the Lot Improvement Plan for FM-C-74, 2647 Valley View Road for Mel Raymond to change the color of the black corrugated metal steel that will be changed to a shade of gray resembling charcoal gray. Andrew Pagel seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed.

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association  
Monthly Board Meeting  
June 20, 2023  
Page 13

PI-I-41-AM

John Adams reviewed plans for Lot PI-I-41-AM. The owner, Dave Smith, was proposing a 3,615-square-foot new home on 3 acres. The colors, material, and design in the Lot Improvement Plan meet the Architectural Design Guidelines.

Mr. Adams noted that the documents are complete and straightforward. There is nothing unusual about the proposed plan. The ARC reviewed the plan and found no issues.

Mr. Sears asked if they had addressed the stream bed on the property. Mr. Adams was unsure. Mr. Sears noted that it would be addressed by Summit County, so it was not an issue for the ARC.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the Lot Improvement Plan for PI-I-41-AM for a 3,615 square-foot new home on 3 acres. Andrew Pagel seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PI-E-91

Mr. Adams reviewed a plan for a privacy screen for the owner, Bryan Thompson, on Lot PI-E-91,1632 Arapaho Drive. He is doing renovation work and for privacy and fire safety he would like to put up a 6' aluminum privacy screen. The screen will be close to his home. Mr. Adams presented a slide to show what it would look like.

Mr. Adams stated that the ARC thought this was different and not what they typically see. They suggested a screen that could be rolled up. It would be temporary, and the owner could take it down each season, roll it up and put it away. Mr. Thompson has said that from where he lives, he stares straight through the French doors of another home. Most owners do not see his house because it is tucked downhill from Arapaho Drive.

Mr. Adams recognized that this was a different request than what the Board typically sees. Mr. Thompson had proposed a black screen and the ARC told him it needed to be gray.

Katie Winters stated that this Lot is in Area 4 and she was familiar with it. The intent is to install privacy because they have had neighbors build quite close. Ms. Winters clarified that the screen would be long term and it was spurred by the need for a deck repair. Mr. Pagel stated that 6'10" is quite tall. It looks like it wraps around a pergola that is in front of an A-frame cabin. Mr. Sears pointed out that the screen would only be on one side and not all the way around. Mr. Pagel could not see an issue as long as the screen is not excessively long. Ms. Winters remarked that it is only enclosed on the deck. It is truly just a privacy screen.

Mr. Adams asked how they could interpret this request versus the Architectural Guidelines for fencing. Mr. Sears pointed out that it is not a fence per se because Mr. Thompson is putting it against his deck.

Mr. Adams asked Mr. Thompson if he could provide a sample of the screen, he was proposing so the ARC and the Board could see the actual material. Mr. Thompson stated that the material is quite expensive, and he is not able to get a sample; however, the Quick Screen fencing link has photos of what it looks like installed. Mr. Thompson stated that the house sits in a drainage and fire would run up to it quickly and would push against it very hard, even given the 30' defensible space out to the property line. He wanted to avoid wood. Even though the pergola is wood, he was trying to balance fire safety with mountain motifs and still provide privacy from the neighbors above. The neighbors are so close he can see them walking around their house. Mr. Thompson was willing to go with the color gray as suggested by the ARC.

Mr. Adams asked how they could define a privacy screen within the impact fee guidelines because technically open decks, patios, and porches are never charged a fee. Mr. Sears pointed out that if the screen does not go to the ceiling of the pergola, it is not enclosed. If it was enclosed all the way around, they could charge a fee.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve a privacy screen for PI-E-91, 1632 Arapaho Drive as presented to the Architectural Review Committee in a nickel or gray color; not black. Katie Winters seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Sears noted that the Board needs to define privacy screens so they have a set definition for future requests.

### **Community Improvements**

Regarding the playground, Mr. Adams noted that two good location options were presented to the Board. He asked if they needed further Board review or whether they were ready to move forward. Mr. Sears agreed that there were two good options. If they want more input from the community, they need to highlight the two options and the pros and cons of each. Mr. Sears recalled that last month they asked as many Board members as possible to review the two areas. He visited both areas today and believed there were pros and cons for both. Mr. Sears outlined the expenses associated with one location in terms of creating parking, improving the road, and installing a culvert. Regarding the other location, Mr. Sears noted that there are more trees and he thought it was a nicer environment; however, there is a lot of traffic going in and out of the lower parking lot.

Mr. Adams thought they should ask the community which location is the best and move forward on the majority response. Chris Moore noted that a playground committee was already in place. Mr. Pagel thought the playground committee could help create a quick survey to send out with a response deadline, and the Board can vote on it next month. Ms. Moore stated that anyone who wants to be part of the playground committee should email the HOA within the next few days. Mr. Pagel stated that the survey should be sent out within two weeks from today, which gives two weeks for responses before the next Board meeting. Mr. Adams offered to work with the playground committee to create the survey.

### **Area Rep Reports**

Area 1 – Dwaine Anderson had nothing to report

Area 2 - Marty Hansen had nothing to report.

Area 4 – Katie Winters had nothing to report.

Area 5 - Shaun Baker had nothing to report.

Area 6 - John Kleba had nothing to report.

### **Fire Safety Committee Update**

Nicole Irving reported that the RFQ was sent to the Board for review. They are planning to send it to the vendors on Friday. Mr. Sears stated that he read the RFQ several times to make sure he understood it. He asked how many Board members had read the RFQ that was sent out. They all need to review and understand it before they vote. Mr. Sears personally thought the RFQ was well thought out. Mr. Sears suggested giving the Board members three or four days to review the RFQ and then there will be a request for approval. Ms. Irving requested a shorter time than three or four days. Mr. Sears gave the Board 24 hours to review it and provide feedback. If they have any concerns, they should contact the Executive Committee in the next 24 hours.

Ms. Irving reported that the community days scheduled for work around the community were July 8<sup>th</sup>, August 12<sup>th</sup>, and September 9<sup>th</sup>. The first date is to go through the emergency evacuation exit that is shared with Stagecoach to make sure it is passable and also to clean up the evacuation safety zone above the winter lot. Volunteers are needed for the community cleanup days. She noted that last year they primarily cleaned up along roadsides, etc. but since the FEMA grant will cover all roadsides this year, they are diverting to smaller projects. Further into the summer they also plan to use those days to help install the emergency exit signs being procured through another grant. Ms. Irving noted that they received quotes today and they will be requesting approval for the signs to the Board within the next two weeks. Mr. Sears asked Ms. Irving to put together a summary of the dates and send it to the Board members so they can have it on their calendars. Ms. Irving stated that within the next two weeks communication will go out to the community for volunteers to sign up.

Ms. Irving stated that as part of signage, they could also purchase a new sign for the burn pile indicating the restrictions that were mentioned earlier in the meeting. She asked if they could put a sign together and send it to the Board before purchasing. Mr. Sears was comfortable with seeing a sign, but the Board would need to approve it before it is posted. Chris Moore thought the sign was a good idea, and suggested adding the language that fines will be imposed.

### **Open Public Forum**

Leslie, an owner at 2234 Running Deer Circle, recalled that a year ago John Adams did a presentation on a new type of road base. She was curious as to whether it was still an option. Mr. Adams stated that it was the

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association  
Monthly Board Meeting  
June 20, 2023  
Page 16

Substrata Perma-zyme Solution. The premise behind it was to find something that lasts longer than what they currently do year after year. Summit County was assessing this process. Mr. Adams stated that the HOA has the product, but they need to find the time and people to apply it. If Jody does not have the time to do it, they will need to find someone else. The company will be in town in July doing work for someone else, and it might be an opportunity to go see what they are doing or have them come up and demonstrate what to do.

Donna thought the HOA dues were raised specifically for that project. Mr. Sears answered no. Mr. Pagel clarified that last year the dues were raised \$100 and \$60 of that was allocated towards the permanent retention of the fire safety committee, and the other \$40 of that went towards the reserve funds. Mr. Pagel explained that the Substrata product is still in the testing phase, and it is too early to put an actual number to it for budget allocation. Once they have a proven concept, they can outline which roads need to be done and the cost. Mr. Adams pointed out that Substrata might be the wrong solution and something else might be better. They need to keep an open mind and look at all options to see what might work.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Owners Association Board adjourned at 9:14 p.m.

---