

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS ASSOCIATION
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING
RANCH MANAGER'S OFFICE
OCTOBER 16, 2018

In Attendance: Pamela Middleton – President; Tom LeCheminant, Vice President; Jan LeVitre, Secretary; Andrew Pagel, Treasurer; Jonathan Hoffman (Area 1); Bruce Hutchinson (Area 5). Joe Pagel (Area 3) and Ted Bonnitt (Area 6) participated via telephone.

Ex Officio: Jody Robinson, Ranch Manager; Robert Rosing, HOA Attorney

Excused: Jeremy Hoffman (Area 2); Robert Walthall (Area 4); Byron Harvison (Area 7)

Guests: Jan LeVitre, Lot FM-17; Maria Lamb, Lot P-91; Roy Parker, Lot G-85; PI-C-01, William Folden, 2112 Pine Meadow; Carolyn Strathearn, Lot F-50

Pamela Middleton called the meeting to order at 6:41 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

October 23, 2018

Approval of the Budget Minutes of October 23, 2018 was tabled until the next meeting.

Board Secretary Position

Pamela Middleton stated that when the Board voted her in as President, it left a vacancy for the Board Secretary. She noted that Jan LeVitre was interested in filling the position until the elections. Ms. Middleton had spoken with Ms. LeVitre and she felt confident that Ms. LeVitre could adequately do the job.

Mr. LeVitre stated that she lives on 1475 West Alexander Canyon Road and they were going into their fourth winter on the Mountain. She is a programmer by day and her experience fits with taking over the secretarial duties of the website and various other communication details. Ms. LeVitre thought it was important to improve communication on the Ranch by using email and other methods to make sure as many people as possible are aware of what happens on the Ranch.

MOTION: Pamela Middleton nominated Jan LeVitre as the temporary Board Secretary. Board Member Hutchinson seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Elections

Tom LeCheminant noted that several potential candidates have not turned in their bios for the elections. Joe Pagel expressed an interest in running for the Board again. He would submit his bio to Carol by the end of the week. Ms. Middleton stated that the bio should be no more than 100 words and in the third person so the candidates were speaking about themselves. Ms. LeVitre and Bruce Hutchinson had already submitted bios.

Update on CC&R Review Committee

Ted Bonnitt reported that the committee has been working with Mr. Rosing on what he needs to prepare the initial draft of the revised CC&Rs. The plan is for Mr. Rosing to provide a draft for the committee to review and send to the full Board. The goal is to give a very preliminary update to the general membership at the Annual Meeting. Mr. Bonnitt noted that revising the CC&Rs requires a vote of approval by 67% of the members; and engaging the members is critical to the success of the rewrite.

Mr. Hutchinson understood that per the original CC&Rs, a rewrite requires 75% approval; not 67%. Mr. Rosing replied that State Statute has a 67% cap, regardless of what the previous document states. Mr. Bonnitt stated that the committee had talked about November 2nd as the target date for the committee to review the draft. Mr. Bonnitt had sent an update on the progress being made and the comments were 100% positive from those who responded, even though there are differences in opinions. He and Mr. Rosing have talked about how to lay out the process that can lead to a random vote next summer. To achieve that goal there will be an initial review by the committee and the Board. Mr. Rosing will then review their comments and make adjustments. The next step would be a series of three meetings open to the membership for information and feedback in hopes of getting consensus for approving the revised CC&Rs.

Mr. Hutchinson asked if Mr. Bonnitt intended to call a committee meeting prior to the Annual Meeting. Mr. Bonnitt stated that he would like to have a committee meeting because that was a better process than trying to count on a full Board to be present at a meeting. Mr. Bonnitt suggested that the Board might want to call a special meeting to review the draft prior to the Annual Meeting.

Ms. Middleton thought it was best to meet on the weekend. Mr. Hutchinson was not available that weekend. Mr. Bonnitt asked about Monday evening. Mr. Rosing stated that his best hope was to deliver the draft by October 26th, rather than November 2nd. Ms. Middleton asked if the committee could meet on Saturday, November 3rd. Mr. Rosing was not available to meet on that day, but the committee could call him if they

have questions. Ms. Middleton suggested that the Board could list their questions and email it to Mr. Rosing. Mr. Rosing stated that if he completes the draft on October 26th he could meet on October 27th or the 28th. Mr. Bonnitt tentatively scheduled a committee meeting at 9:00 a.m. local time on Saturday, October 27th. Ms. Middleton suggested that he send a confirmation text prior to October 27th.

New Construction/Additions

FM-B-36

Ms. Middleton noted that the property owner started building without Board approval or Summit County permits. Summit County had issued a Stop Work Order. Ms. Middleton has seen no construction activity since the Stop Work Order was issued.

Mr. LeCheminant stated that he spoke with Summit County and he was told that it was going before a Judge for a hearing and he would keep Mr. LeCheminant informed. He noted that Summit County requires a second living structure to be under 999 square feet; however, the Water Department says there can only be one meter per structure per lot. At the last Water Board meeting, the Board was trying to decide how the property owner could have two structures on the lot.

PI-D-14

Ms. Middleton noted that this item was the sign and gate on Alexander that the Board discussed at the last meeting. Mr. LeCheminant reported that the sign was moved off the road. The gate on Alexander Canyon was removed. He assumed the gate was taken down and re-installed on the owner's property on Alexander Canyon Road.

Mr. LeCheminant was having difficulty in researching whether the property owner had a physical approval from the Board to build the house. Mr. Tyler recalled signing a Lot Improvement Agreement and he would look through his records to see if he had the actual paperwork or the signed Lot Improvement Agreement. In reviewing the Minutes, there was discussion but nothing was approved by the Board. However, the Board granted a conditional approval based on other items that needed to be submitted and approved.

Mr. LeCheminant reported that the Water Company issued a water letter in 2014 so the property owner could continue with their plans. He pointed out that the Water Company typically does not issue a water letter unless the plans have been approved by the HOA Board. Summit County needed the water letter to allow the property owner to continue building. The owners have a water letter and a building permit. The question was still

whether the Board had approved the plans.

PI-E-30

Ms. Middleton stated that this item was the house on Arapaho with the safety chain link fence around the building site. The Board discussed this item at the last meeting.

Mr. Rosing had spoken with the owners and they were happy to comply with whatever the Board wanted. They fenced off the site because items were being stolen and kids were walking around the construction site. They thought the fence would be taken down in approximately two weeks. Mr. Rosing stated that if the fence is not removed in two or three weeks, he would follow-up to get a firm date, or take action as the Board discussed at the last meeting.

Mr. Rosing recalled that at the last meeting the Board had discussed adding language for temporary construction fencing with firm completion dates when the Architectural Guidelines are amended. They could add other conditions whereby the Board could proactively allow construction fencing for safety.

Ms. Middleton recalled a time frame of 6 months or a specified time from completion closed. Mr. LeCheminant emphasized that the construction fencing must be approved for each lot. Mr. Rosing thought it should be part of the initial plan approval.

Mr. Hutchinson understood that construction fencing is temporary, but he thought there were problems on both sides. Theft is a real issue and he was concerned about creating a long-term problem where people will want to start having fences. Mr. Hoffman was not opposed to construction fencing as long as there are actual build dates and deadlines. Carolyn Strathearn stated that she has never seen a construction site in Park City that was not fenced. Mr. Hoffman thought it was standard practice everywhere else. Ms. Middleton remarked that it was important to be proactive and include construction fencing in the Guidelines.

Mr. Hutchinson was comfortable with the fence on Lot PI-E-30 as long as it was only another two or three weeks.

PI-G-36 on Aspen View

Ms. Middleton believed this item was the property on Aspen View with improper marketing signs. Ms. Strathearn stated that there was a large painting sign and a large construction sign. Ms. Middleton noted that Carol was writing a letter to send to the

property owner.

Ms. Middleton stated that if the Board would vote on these types of action it would help Carol track what needs to be done, and it also makes their action more legitimate.

MOTION: Pamela Middleton made a motion to authorize Carol to send a letter to the lot owner of PI-G-36 at 2234 Aspen Ridge Road requesting that the builder and the painter remove the signs on the lot. Jonathan Hoffman seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Deer Meadows marketing sign at the bottom

Ms. Middleton understood that the person who put up the sign was told that they could put up a small sign at the bottom, along with everyone else who was selling land. There was a concern that no one knew there were new lots for sale on the Mountain and they wanted a map. Mr. Hutchinson stated that the request never came before the Board. Ms. Middleton agreed. It did not come before the Board and they were never given approval to put up the sign. Ms. Middleton believed people would like to know that lots are available for sale, but it was not done appropriately.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that there are lots all over the Ranch for sale, and he could not understand why they were advertising for Deer Meadows. Ms. Middleton replied that she was trying to make that point. There are already signs advertising HOA lots for sale. She thought the Deer Meadows sign was unfair to everyone else selling their lots either by owner or by realtor.

Ms. Middleton suggested that the Board look into getting a new sign for the Ranch because the Deer Meadows lots are part of the Ranch and part of the HOA. She was not opposed to listing the lots on a sign, but they should not be on a separate sign. Mr. Hutchinson remarked that Deer Meadows could use the \$5,000 they gave to Pine Meadow Ranch and pay for a new sign.

Mr. LeCheminant recalled that when they originally put the sign at the bottom they talked about adding the Deer Meadows area, but no one knew which lots were going to be sold. Mr. LeCheminant offered to see if he could get an overlay to fit on that area of the sign. The Board thought that was a good idea. Mr. Hutchinson agreed, but he thought the Deer Meadows sign needed to come down in the interim because it has been up for too long a time.

MOTION: Bruce Hutchinson made a motion to write Deer Meadow a letter requesting

that they remove the sign. If the sign is not removed in a short time period, Jody should be allowed to remove it.

Mr. Hoffman thought the motion should include a solid time frame for removal, but he believed Deer Meadows should be the ones to remove it. If the sign is not removed, the Board would implement a fine. Mr. Rosing stated that if the sign is on Pine Meadow Ranch property the Board could remove it. Mr. Rosing suggested 10-15 days. If the sign is not removed in that time period, Jody should take it out.

Mr. Bonnitt thought Deer Meadow had previously promised to take down the sign. Mr. Hutchinson noted that the Board discussed it but nothing was ever decided.

AMENDED MOTION: Ms. Middleton authorized Carol to send a letter to ask Pam Slaughter, owner of the Deer Meadows sign to remove the sign within 7 days. If it is not taken down within 10 days of the date of the letter, Pine Meadow Ranch will remove the sign. Jan LeVitre seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. LeCheminant wanted to make a motion to fine people who park on the road \$50 per incident per day. Mr. Rosing stated that he could not make a motion until the fine was in the fine schedule. Mr. Rosing pointed out that all violations were subject to the fine schedule, but in addition to fines, he wanted to add the ability to "boot and tow without warning".

Mr. Rosing suggested that they could send out the draft rules with the Annual Meeting Notice. The parking issue would clearly be addressed in that document. Mr. Rosing stated that towing has become more difficult in the State of Utah because of a recent change to the Statute. The tow companies are less willing to tow because it is more difficult to get paid. Booting has become more popular than towing.

Mr. Rosing explained the fee schedule and the difference between a fine for a violation and the cost of reimbursing what the HOA had to pay for something such as towing. Mr. Hutchinson asked if the owner needed to be warned before booting or towing their car. Mr. Rosing replied that for towing, they could post a sign with language that if anyone parks illegally in Pine Meadow Ranch, they will be towed immediately. In order to boot, it is good to give a warning, but it is not necessary.

Lot PI-D-91

Maria Lamb presented her construction plan based on revisions recommended by the

Architectural Committee. Mr. Hutchings still had issues with the plan because it did not address siding or roofing materials. The roof pitch was incorrect. The Guidelines require a 4:12 pitch and the pitch shown was 3:8. Mr. Hutchinson also had concerns with the proposed colors. It was pointed out that later that per the math it was a 4:12 pitch. It was just drawn incorrectly.

Ms. Lamb stated that the siding would be cedar siding with natural stain. The roof would be metal in a dark gray color. Mr. Hoffman asked if Ms. Lamb had completed the Lot Improvement Agreement. She answered yes. Mr. Hutchinson noted that the structure was on piers rather than a foundation.

Mr. Hutchinson had an issue with the parking area. He believed they were taking the parking on the HOAs right-of-way. The owner would need to have a driveway into the lot. He recalled mentioning that at a previous meeting. The rules and regulations specify no parking on the roads. The right-of-way goes 33' from each edge of the property line. Mr. Hutchinson explained that the property line is normally at the center of the road. The property owner gives the right-of-way to the Association and the owner cannot build within that area. Ms. Lamb pointed out that they were not building in that area. Mr. Hutchinson understood they were not building in the right-of-way, but they would be parking in the right-of-way if they do not have a driveway.

Ms. Lamb clarified that their understanding of the easements was that nothing could be built, but they could use the easement. Mr. Rosing pointed out that the Lamb's were proposing to make the road their parking spot. Ms. Lamb stated that it would actually be 45' off the road. Mr. Hoffman understood that Ms. Lamb was proposing to have the driveway 45' long, which would give them 12' to park their car. An area that is 12' long by 46' wide will park at least four cars.

Mr. Rosing explained that the easement is wider than the road for a reason. It is designed to allow people to pull off the road; or if someone careens off the road they do not hit something. People should not be parked in the easement even if it is wider than the road.

Mr. Hoffman was comfortable with a 12' long 46' wide driveway. Mr. Hutchinson questioned whether Summit County would find it acceptable. Mr. Hoffman remarked that what Summit County does is a separate issue from the HOA. After further discussion, Mr. Rosing had a better understanding of what the Lamb's were trying to do; however, he pointed out that the parking area needed to be at the back end. Ms. Lamb believed they could make that work.

Ms. Lamb had already paid the impact fee and the water fee, and she had received her

water letter. Ms. Middleton asked Carol to send Maria Lamb's approved Lot Improvement Plan and Proof of Payment to the Architectural Committee so they have it in their records.

MOTION: Jan LeVitre made a motion to Approve the plans for Lot PI-D-91 pending verification that all the required documents have been submitted, including the Lot Improvement Plan and a check for the \$6,000 impact fee. Bruce Hutchinson seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Tom LeCheminant abstained from the vote. unanimously.

Lot PI-C-20

Mr. LeCheminant presented plans for a 192 square feet shed at 2203 Running Deer Circle. The owners are Gary and Leann Jensen. The roof will be metal in a green color. The siding will be natural wood and painted a brown color. The owners had submitted a check for the impact fee.

Mr. LeCheminant found no issues with the plan as proposed. It is a standard 12' x 16' shed. A main structure already exists on the lot.

MOTION: Tom LeCheminant moved to Approve the 192 square feet shed brown and green shed on Lot C-20, 2203 Running Deer Circle, as proposed. Pamela Middleton seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Joe Pagel and Ted Bonnitt abstained from the vote.

Ranch Manager's Report

Jody reported that the sand shed was ready for the winter. The snow removal equipment was ready, except for a problem with the Chevy that he was working on.

Everything else was going well. Randy was doing bar ditching around the Ranch with the trackhoe.

Mr. LeCheminant reported on the water truck. The motors should be put together Monday if all the parts come in. It was possible to have the water truck back the first part of next week if the truck is running. Mr. LeCheminant reported that per their previous discussion, the HOA would agree to pay \$5,000 to keep the water truck with a new motor, or the seller could take the truck and refund the initial payment of \$27,500. The seller was comfortable with those terms.

Lower Forest Meadow - SS-145-A-3-A

Mr. Rosing has spoken with Ms. Follette; however, he preferred to give a more in-depth report on their discussion during a closed session. He believed that Ms. Follette, 3335 S. Forest Meadow Road, had already addressed the initial issue with that section of the road. Mr. LeCheminant agreed that it had been addressed, with the exception of a few minor items. Mr. Hoffman thought potholes were better but they still needed more fill.

Mr. Rosing reiterated his preference to have a more in-depth discussion at the next meeting.

Plowing RFP

Mr. Hoffman commented on the request for removal of snow on part of Forest Meadow from the base to Junction Court, and the second segment from Junction Court along Forest Meadow to the Ranch Manager's Office. Mr. Hoffman had prepared a proposal and sent it to the Board for comment. Four people had responded, including Mr. Rosing, and there were no recommendations for further clarification other than to get Jody's input. Jody stated that he had read the RFP and thought it was fine.

Mr. Hoffman stated that he would send it to the Board members who had not received it. He also passed around a copy he had available. Mr. Hoffman intended to solicit bids from other companies, as well as residents on the mountain, to remove snow from one of the two sections mentioned. Upper Forest Meadow route is slightly longer at 2.5 miles for the upper segment, and 2.1 miles for the lower segment. For the lower segment, they would like whoever is awarded the contract to sand the lower segment of Glass Hill. The logic is that the lower segment is easier for a third party contractor to access.

Mr. Hoffman noted that last year Randy and Jody plowed the entire loop, but they only had four or five days of significant snow accumulation. Jody remarked that if they have a normal snow year neither he nor Randy would have time to plow the entire route.

Mr. Hoffman remarked that money for plowing was approved last year, which also covered the first part of this year, but none of that money was spent. He was hoping to get a bid within the \$20,000-line item that was approved. Mr. Hoffman explained that the contract would be awarded to plow one of the two sections. The remaining section would be plowed by Jody and Randy.

Mr. Hoffman asked if everyone was comfortable with the language, the time frame, and

the insurance requirement. Once the bids come in, he anticipated having another discussion based on what people are willing to do and the cost. Mr. LeCheminant noted that Carol Strathearn had names of contractors to contact. Last year the HOA spent \$2500 posting the RFP in the newspaper, but no one responded. Mr. Hoffman stated that Carolyn Strathearn had sent him four names and Jody had given him names to contact. He thought they should solicit from those names and from people on the Mountain who have expressed an interest. Mr. Hoffman suggested posting an announcement on the webpage and possibly on Facebook. It was important to let the Ranch residents know they could bid on the RFP. He did not think it was necessary to spend money on a published announcement.

As the bids come in, Mr. Hoffman would email them to the Board members in hopes of being able to vote at the next meeting.

Water Company Report

Mr. LeCheminant reported that at the last Water Company Board Meeting the Board continued their discussion on increasing in the water assessment. The rates have not been increased for four years. The Board was still considering an increase in the base water and standby assessment.

Mr. Hutchinson asked if there was a reason for increasing the rate other than the fact that there has not been an increase for several years. Mr. LeCheminant understood that the Water Company was taking money out of the other funds to pay operating expenses.

Mr. LeCheminant noted that the Water Company would hold their Annual Meeting on November 8, 2018 at the Kimball Junction Library. Everyone was encouraged to attend. Mr. LeCheminant asked Carol to email the Board members with the information on the Water Company Annual Meeting.

Ongoing Business

Fire Evacuation

Joe Pagel stated that he had contacted Sue and Kent regarding a small evacuation plan. Nothing was set in stone, but the idea is that one person would have contact information for every four or five houses to notify the owners in case Facebook or another type of virtual messaging failed. Mr. Pagel understood that nothing had been done in terms of the evacuation routes.

Mr. Pagel apologized for not yet having the time to reach out to Ms. LeVitre, but he intended to sit down with her to devise a plan so this would not go unnoticed. Ms. LeVitre stated that a lot of people provided their phone numbers via text in the event of an emergency. She felt a responsibility to have a plan in place to use that information if it becomes necessary. Mr. Pagel stated that currently they are already signed up for a text messaging emergency service. Ms. LeVitre understood that it was through Summit County, and those who signed up would only get a text if there was an immediate evacuation notice. She thought the HOA could do more for their own residents. With the Tollgate fire those who had to evacuate were minimal; however, she believed everyone would have appreciated a text with information.

Mr. Rosing thought the plan should be fairly substantial. They need to identify all the routes to make sure they are all usable. In addition to text, people could be emailed from the email list. Mr. Rosing noted that Alan Powell is the on-mountain fire person for the Ranch. Mr. Rosing suggested that they look at any resources they can get through Summit County to address these issues. The emergency plan needed to be updated and other things still needed to be done.

Mr. Pagel understood that they were running into significant issues with some of the routes because they are on private property and the HOA cannot maintain the roads or keep them clear from brush and grass. Mr. Rosing suggested that they identify the routes and then decide which routes are usable. Mr. Pagel replied that all the routes have been identified, and but they still need to work with the owner of the property that a route cuts through. Ms. Middleton asked Mr. Pagel if he had a list of all the routes. Mr. Pagel did not have a list; however, Mr. LeCheminant was familiar with every route on the map and he believed they could compile a list in a few minutes.

Mr. Rosing recommended that the committee compile a list and begin approaching the property owners to see if they are amenable to using their property as an evacuation route in case of an emergency. If the owner refuses, that would require a different plan discussion. Mr. LeCheminant noted that one route is through Blue Sky. He understood from Alan Powell that Summit County is trying to force Blue Sky to re-open Alexander Canyon Road for their secondary evacuation area. Mr. Rosing thought the Board needed to be more systematic about listing the route locations. Once they have a list of the routes, they would be able to create a map and possibly mark some of the emergency exits.

Mr. Pagel stated that if he and Mr. LeCheminant could sit down together this weekend it would be easy to identify each route and pull up the owners of the private lots. Mr. Rosing assumed that the routes go over multiple parcels and they would need to speak with each property owner. Mr. Rosing stated that only having one ingress/egress was a problem. He suggested that they talk with Summit County about that issue because if

there is a mudslide or a fire at the egress point, it could be catastrophic. Egress might be a mechanism to get Summit County's attention.

Communication by text

Mr. LeVitre stated that for \$300 per year the HOA could set up the emergency list. People would opt into it and they would receive a text letting them know they were on the list. In that same text they could tell people if they wanted to know what goes on in the Tollgate neighborhood, they could text a specific code and be added to that list as well. Mr. LeCheminant asked if there were restrictions on the number of texts that could be sent. Ms. LeVitre believed that in an emergency situation 10 to 20 messages could be sent in a single month. If they used it generally month to month, she assumed they would only be sending one or two messages.

Mr. Bonnitt asked if the phrase "one message" would apply if it went to 500 people, or whether it would count as 500 messages. Ms. LeVitre replied that it would count as 500 messages. Andrew Pagel asked Ms. LeVitre to bring a proposal to the next meeting with details and numbers. Ms. LeVitre noted that she had sent an email to all the Board members with the detail. Ms. Middleton asked Mr. LeVitre to resend the email to the Board members.

Ms. LeVitre pulled up the email. The cost is \$25 per month for 2,000 messages. With the current list of subscribers and in the event of an emergency, it would allow close to 30 texts to be sent in a single month. Ms. LeVitre recalled that approximately 100 people were currently on the list; and, obviously, that number would grow. On average, in a non-emergency time, they could send a text to people on the list two or three times a month. For those on the emergency list, they could start with something and if it was not good enough in the event of an emergency, they could increase their subscription at the time to send more texts.

Mr. Hutchinson remarked that once again this was a service that only benefitted people who use the Ranch more often. Ms. LeVitre disagreed. Mr. Hutchinson clarified that he was referring to the emergency portion. He believed the Board was not in favor of this type of service when it was brought up before, because less than 25% of the property owners would need that type of information quickly. Ms. LeVitre stated that if she owned property but did not live on the Ranch, she would want to know immediately if there was an emergency. Mr. Hutchinson suggested that they allow voluntary participation in the service for a fee.

Ms. Middleton thought communication should be part of the CC&Rs revision. It would be extremely helpful to get out notices for updates, meetings, and other things that

affect everyone on the Ranch. Mr. Hutchinson pointed out that the Pine Meadow website is primarily used by people who are actively involved on the Ranch. He believed most owners have never been on the website. Ms. LeVitre pointed out that having this service was a better way of getting information directly to people who do not use the website.

Ms. Middleton asked Mr. Bonnitt for his opinion as someone who does not live on the Ranch full-time. She asked if Mr. Bonnitt felt that it was disproportionate or whether it would be helpful for part-timers. Mr. Bonnitt asked if Ms. Middleton was asking about an alert system. Ms. LeVitre stated that it would be an alert system, but it would also be used to communicate general information and updates. Mr. Bonnitt noted that he has been a proponent of updating the communication system for years. He believed websites are becoming less and less relevant. People do not use the website because it requires being proactive. Mr. Bonnitt believed that people are interested in knowing what happens on the Ranch, and recently people have been very encouraging about being kept informed. He thought it would be a good service as long as it is not abused by sending too many messages. Mr. Bonnitt stated that he has always been a part-timer, but he has as much interest in his investment as everyone else. He absolutely wants to be informed on any level and for any alert.

Mr. Rosing noted that they have been using an email list because they can use the email list for free. However, there has been concern regarding overuse of email. Mr. Rosing favored the text proposal in terms of emergency alerts. He believed there were two separate issues. One is to increase emergency access and to keep people safe on the Mountain. In that case he thought an email blast and a text blast would be effective to tell people not to come to the Mountain or to inform those already on the Mountain whether they need to evacuate or what areas to avoid. Mr. Rosing disagreed with Mr. Hutchinson in that everyone has an investment in their property, and the safer the Mountain the more their investment is protected. Mr. Hutchinson agreed. From that perspective, Mr. Rosing believed the text alert service was a good idea to pursue for emergencies.

Mr. Rosing stated that the Board needed to decide if the HOA should become more active generally in keeping people informed on what occurs on the Mountain. Regardless of whether the owners opt into a text or an email, it could be a separate list. Mr. Rosing emphasized that emergency alerts and general Ranch updates were separate issues and different conversations.

Ms. LeVitre explained how she expected the process to occur and how the lists would be maintained. She volunteered to be in charge and would train another volunteer if she leaves the Mountain. It would be simple to do once it is set up. Andrew Pagel

thought it should be clear that if people opt into the emergency list they would only be notified of an emergency and not any type of general information. He clarified that initially the list would only be used for emergency services. The next issue to make sure that the service has specific protocols and privacy act. Ms. LeVitre agreed, which was her reason for using a paid service rather than a free service. Mr. Pagel stated that his concern for himself and everyone else was not to have their numbers sold to telemarketers. He also wanted to know who declares the messages and sends them out, the privacy act and encryption, and how they intend to let the community know about this service the HOA will now provide. Ms. LeVitre replied that they could post it on the website and Facebook, and send emails from the email list.

Mr. Pagel emphasized that a proposal needed to be presented at the next meeting with answers to these key questions. Ms. Middleton noted that the Board could review a proposal at the Budget Meeting if they have a quorum. Mr. Hutchinson agreed that this item could not be resolved this evening.

Andrew Pagel summarized the issues the Board expected Ms. LeVitre to include in her proposal, such as the privacy act, who will manage the service, how they can inform the community about this new communication service, and what should be included in the emergency message. Ms. Middleton thought the message should include immediate important and critical information. Mr. Rosing reiterated his earlier comment on the importance of having better communication with Summit County.

Architectural Guidelines

Mr. Hutchinson referred to the Impact Fee and Contract, which showed a breakdown of \$6,000 fee standard for new construction; \$2.40 per gross square foot additions to existing structures and outbuildings; and \$1.20 per gross square foot for outbuildings and accessories, and structures that do not have utility connections. Mr. Hutchinson questioned why those were broken out separately. As a Board, their concern is to look at the impact to the roads.

Mr. LeCheminant did not believe Mr. Hutchinson had the most recent Guideline document. Mr. Hutchinson stated that he took it off the website. Ms. LeVitre pointed out that the new guidelines have not been adopted; therefore, the document on the website was not updated. Mr. Hutchinson thought the Board should only be concerned with road maintenance in terms of how the roads are impacted by construction.

Mr. LeCheminant stated that the intent is to keep it simple. If an owner submits plans and calls the structure a garage or addition, the impact fee would be \$2.40 per square foot. Mr. Hutchinson wanted to know why there were two fee structures. Ms. Middleton

recalled and Mr. LeCheminant concurred that they had talked about making it all the same. Originally, the fee was \$2.40 per square foot for a living structure or anything with power or water. A shed or structure without power or water was \$1.20.

Ms. LeVitre asked why there was a difference between a shed or garage. Mr. LeCheminant replied that a shed usually comes in on a truck or trailer and only requires one trip. A garage typically requires more trips for materials and construction. Mr. Hoffman recalled that it was also based on size. Ms. LeVitre was unclear why there was a difference between power or no power. She was told that power had more impacts on the actual property and surrounding neighbors. Mr. Hoffman stated that having a separate fee structure gives someone the ability to build a shed for less money, and eventually sneak in power. He agreed with Mr. Hutchinson. Mr. Hutchinson proposed to eliminate the fees. Ms. Middleton thought that had already been done during a phone conversation between herself, Mr. LeCheminant, and Carol.

Mr. Rosing summarized that fencing, parking, and fire safety needed to be added to the current iteration of the revised Architectural Guidelines.

Ms. Middleton asked Carol to send the Board members the current working version of the Architectural Guidelines for their review and changes.

Update on Cabins Built on HOA Property - SS-BDY-15-1-1, PI-23-A

Mr. Rosing reported that the Kendall lot is the same plan as before, but nothing has been resolved. He explained that Mr. Kendall, Lot PI-18, has a home built on HOA property SS-BDY-15-1, and the HOA will sell him that piece and merge it into Mr. Kendall's existing lot. The HOA would take title from the lot Mr. Kendall did not use, and transfer it to the remaining piece of PI-18, which the HOA could then sell. Mr. Tyler was going to talk to Summit County about signing off on that agreement, but Mr. Rosing did not believe that had occurred. Mr. Rosing would follow up with Summit County.

Mr. Rosing had no idea what to do with the Formanek lot, PI-23A. No one knows for certain whether the house Mr. Formanek built is on Morgan County HOA property. The description of the lot is to the Morgan County/Summit County line, but no one knows where the County line is, including the County. Mr. Rosing thought the house was actually built on the Morgan County side on a piece of land. It is more an issue for Morgan County.

Mr. Rosing remarked that in discussions with Carol, he appears that the HOA may own additional land in Morgan County, including a ten-acre parcel. Mr. Rosing suggested that they find out what land the Association actually owns and what the HOA wants to

do with the land.

Family Recreation and Common Area Park

Mr. LeCheminant reported that he asked the group who was requesting the park to give him a plan, but he had not heard back from them. He noted that the original plan was to put the park in the upper parking lot. Mr. LeCheminant thought the best location would be back behind the pine trees.

Mr. LeCheminant stated that Robert Walthall had sent him a plan recommending a bicycle path. The problem is that motorcycles and four-wheelers would also be using the path. Mr. Rosing believed there was a difference between creating a trail versus signs that specify hiking or biking trails. If they choose to create a trail, he recommended posting signs saying "use at your own risk". If a motorcycle uses the trail, he did not believe that was the responsibility of the HOA, but he would add it to the list of questions for the insurance company.

Mr. Hutchinson thought an HOA would have more liability than a municipality. Mr. Rosing named other HOAs who post "at your own risk" signs. He believed it was doable if they make it clear that the trails are for non-motorized vehicles only.

Mr. Hutchinson clarified that the park group would present proposals for the Board to consider, at which time they could address the legal issues. Mr. LeCheminant noted that this item is on every agenda but gets passed on to address at another meeting. Carol keeps adding it to the agenda so they do not forget about it.

Mr. LeCheminant suggested that they could put half of the \$5,000 towards a park area and the other half towards a gazebo. Mr. Hutchinson pointed out that \$5,000 was the initial cost, but who would maintain the park area. If they intend to do this, it should be funded in perpetuity.

Andrew Pagel thought many people would be interested in having a common space, particularly those with children. Mr. Hoffman understood there was some discussion about further improving Bobcat. Mr. LeCheminant replied that the Board had discussed putting a gazebo at Bobcat. Mr. Bonnitt cautioned against recreational equipment such as swing sets because it could be an animal hazard.

Draft Enforcement of Rules

Mr. Rosing stated that he still needed to make the revisions that were previously discussed. Once that is done it would be ready for the Board to review. Ms. Middleton asked Mr. Rosing to email the document to the Board members.

Elections Bios

Ms. Middleton noted that Carol needed bios for Areas 2, 4 and 5. She had submitted her bio for President. Ms. LeVitre had submitted her bio for Secretary, but she was also interested in running for the Area 5 Rep. Ms. Middleton stated that she could run for both positions.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that he has been involved with the Board since 2000, and in that time there have been only three reps for Area 5. He had one replacement for two years, and another replacement for three years. He has been the Area rep. the rest of the time.

Monthly Budget Review

Andrew Pagel reviewed the unpaid bills detail. He asked Jody about the invoice from Howe Rental and Sales in the amount of \$4,000. Jody replied that it was rental on the roller. Mr. Pagel asked about the invoice for the Sons of Utah Pioneers in the amount of \$220. Mr. LeCheminant replied that it was the fee for the Annual Meeting location. MOTION: Andrew Pagel moved to Approve the unpaid bills detail as outlined in the amount of \$5,614.35. Bruce Hutchinson seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. LeCheminant noted that the line item for Chad Krupa, Lot PI-E-87, 1763 W Heather Ln, in the amount of \$6,000 was a refund of the impact fee that was paid to build a house. The Board agreed to refund the impact fee when the owner decided not to build.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Owners Association Board adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association
Monthly Board Meeting
October 16, 2018
Page 18