

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS ASSOCIATION
ANNUAL MEETING
SONS OF UTAH PIONEER HALL
3301 EAST 2920 SOUTH
SALT LAKE CITY, UT
NOVEMBER 16, 2011

In Attendance: Hutch Foster, President; Dan Heath, Vice President; Bob Burdette, Treasurer; Suzanne Larson, Secretary; Alan Powell (Area 3); Bruce Hutchinson (Area 5); Tom Deaver (Area 4); Mike Gonzales (Area 6); Matt Brown (Area 1), Amy Jackson (Area 7)

Ex-Officio: Jody Robinson, Ranch Manager; Carol Steedman, KGC Associates

Excused: Jeff Hubbard (Area 2)

Hutch Foster called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and thanked everyone for attending. He introduced the Board members and reviewed the agenda of topics that would be presented or discussed this evening.

Responsibilities of the Owners Association

President Hutch Foster stated that the Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association maintains the infrastructure inside Pine Meadow Ranch, which includes grading, resurfacing, and repairs. The Owners Association has historically maintained the roads that go from I-80 to the Ranch, even though those roads are not owned by the Association. Infrastructure also includes drainages, bar ditches, culverts, etc.

Mr. Foster remarked that the Association is also responsible for enforcing the Protective Covenants, construction approvals through the Architectural Committee, and collecting dues and impact fees. He believed that the main guideline is to preserve quality of life and to protect the health, safety and welfare of the Ranch owners.

Staff Introductions

Mr. Foster introduced Jody Robinson, the Ranch Manager, and recognized the amount of work he does on the Ranch. He also introduced Carol Steedman with KGC Associates who handles all the administrative work including billings, collecting dues, parking stickers, financials, and general questions from property owners and other interested parties.

Seats up for Election

Mr. Foster noted that three Board positions were open. Scot Erickson had resigned his Board position from Area 1 and Matt Brown had stepped in to complete Mr. Erickson's term. Amy Jackson, Area 7, was not running for another term. Dan Heath, a Board

officer, was seeking another term.

Matt Brown was a candidate who represented Area 1 on the Board. Mr. Brown purchased property in Forest Meadows on Bull Moose five years ago and has lived on the Ranch full-time for three years. He is from Chicago and his wife was born and raised in Park City. He has two small children.

Tony Tyler and Nick Boyle were candidates running to represent Area 7 on the Board.

Nick Boyle owns Lot PI-20 and has spent considerable time on the Ranch the last few years getting to know other property owners. He currently lives and works in Salt Lake City.

Tony Tyler stated that he and his wife moved from Colorado five years ago. He lives in the first house on Beaver Circle. He has had experience running HOAs and currently runs an HOA at the Canyon's Resort.

Debra Rakes, Lot D-37, asked the candidates to give a brief description of what they would like to accomplish at Board members.

Mr. Tyler stated that he would like to make the Ranch look nicer. He understood that the roads were a concern, but this will be his first winter on the Ranch and he would like experience the roads himself before proposing anything drastic to address those concerns.

Mr. Brown seconded Mr. Tyler's opinion. His goal would be to make the roads safer.

Mr. Boyle agreed. The Ranch is a great place and he was interested in finding out what the property owners want and to make their voices heard.

Bob Burdette stated that he has been the Association's Treasurer for the last four years and he was running for Vice-President. He lives on the Ranch part-time. As Treasurer he watches over the finances of the organization. When he first took over they ran out of money before all the work was completed, and the Association went in debt to get through the year. They have never been in debt since then and currently there is a surplus in the account. A \$70,000 reserve fund was set up to cover emergencies on the Ranch. Mr. Burdette pointed out that the Board has been careful and cautious in spending money.

Dan Heath stated that he has been Vice-President of the Board for several years. He originally started on the Board as an area rep in 2001. His philosophy has always been

to abide by the CC&Rs whether or not he agrees with them. He also believes the roads could be made much safer. Mr. Heath stated that a good portion of the Association budget goes to the Tollgate Canyon road, which Pine Meadow Ranch does not own, and it cannot be made safe enough with the budget they have. He believes everyone who uses the Canyon should pay for it and not just the Ranch owners. Mr. Heath stated that he would like to remain on the Board to follow through on that issue and convince Summit County that Pine Meadow Ranch is worth it.

Someone asked Bob Burdette why he wanted to be Vice-President when he has done such a good job as Treasurer. Mr. Burdette replied that he was running for Vice-President because several people on the Ranch had asked him to do so.

Mike Bowen, Lot FM-C-48, wanted to know how the candidates plan to improve on a piece of heaven. The candidates agreed that it is a piece of heaven, which is why they do not want to see it destroyed.

Minutes of 2010 Annual Meeting

MOTION: Gary Clark, Lot D-83A, moved to APPROVE the Annual Minutes of November 15th, 2010. Mr. Mortenson, Lot PI-13 seconded the motion.

Debra Rakes, Lot PI-D-83, stated that it would have been helpful if the annual minutes had been posted as a draft on the website prior to the meeting. Due to the length of the minutes, she asked if approval could be tabled to the last item so the members would have time to read them.

As a point of procedure, there was a motion on the table to approve. The motion would stand and the vote would be taken at the end of the meeting.

Ranch Projects and Updates

Mr. Foster reviewed the projects that occurred throughout the Ranch over the past year. Some projects were routine maintenance and others were significant improvements. Mr. Foster commented on a culvert under the bottom of Tollgate Canyon Road that collapsed and caused a blockage in the creek and was within a few inches of over-topping the road. They were within hours of permanently losing access to all the lots up Tollgate Canyon. Mr. Foster reported that Jody Robinson, the County, and the Board members worked to find alternate access if the main road was lost. The County came in and installed a temporary culvert, which was not a permanent solution, but it provided a way to keep water from over-topping the road. Mr. Foster stated that when the ground dried up the County worked with the Ranch to install a new culvert. Summit

County provided equipment and labor for nearly a week at no cost to the Ranch to help accomplish the project. Mr. Foster noted that the new culvert is an 8 foot corrugated culvert, which matches the culvert that UDOT had installed under the highway.

Mr. Foster stated that a significant amount of asphalt was lost on Tollgate Canyon Road where the creek actually did top the road in some spots. For that reason, repairing Tollgate Canyon was a primary project for 2011. Mr. Foster clarified that the road was patched rather than repaired. Repairing the road would require more extensive work and cost, which the Association would need to consider moving forward.

Mr. Foster remarked that a standard mag chloride treatment was done this year for dust control. Jody Robinson had done the usual round of weed control on the Ranch. In addition, Jody had bladed nearly everything on the Ranch.

Mr. Foster emphasized the need for property owners to control weeds on their own property. As in the past, he educated the members on the noxious weeds and how they could be identified and removed.

Ongoing Projects

Covenants and Rules and Regulations

Mr. Foster stated that enforcement of Covenants is routine work on the Ranch and includes issues such as architectural and noise violations.

Mr. Foster commented on revised Rules and Regulations addressing rentals, which the Board spends a significant time discussing. After reviewing the CC&Rs for the different areas within the Ranch and speaking with legal counsel, the Board decided that the 2006 rule prohibiting short-term rentals was not within the authority granted to the Board by the CC&Rs. That rule was overturned this year and was removed from the Rules and Regulations.

Mr. Foster acknowledged that dog issues are frustrating, however, those issues are outside of the scope of the Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association and all complaints or problems should be reported to the Summit County Animal Control. He noted that Animal Control is good about responding when called.

Mr. Foster stated that there were private snow plowing requirements for the Ranch. Anyone who pushes snow or blows snow on Ranch roads must be appropriately insured and have a signed agreement indicating that they understand the guidelines for moving snow on the Ranch. Mr. Foster stated that the roads on the Ranch belong to

all the members. They are managed by the Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association and the Owners Association has the right to set very clear guidelines for snow removal. Copies of the agreement were available this evening and they could also be obtained on the website.

Wildfire Mitigation

Mr. Foster reported on wildfire mitigation and noted that the chipper crews were back this year. He explained that if the property owners track the time they spend clearing fuels such as downed brush, dead trees, etc., the Owners Association will earn a value in Federal in-kind grant money. The in-kind dollars can be applied to bring in chipper crews, saw crews, and assisting people who are unable to take care of their own fire hazard issues. Mr. Foster encouraged the members to find the link on the website and use the form to track their hours. He noted that Alan Powell is the Association's fire safety representative and he would be available to answer questions.

Lower Roads

Mr. Foster reported on discussions with Summit County regarding plans for the lower roads. Those who listen to the local news in Summit County were aware of a tragic accident that occurred on Silver Creek Drive between a teenage driver and a woman riding a horse. Mr. Foster stated that when the accident happened there was an uproar in the community regarding the safety of the road and most of the blame was placed on Summit County. However, it was a private road and the County had no part in managing that road.

Mr. Foster noted that for several years the Owners Association has talked about an SSD and whether or not there was merit for having one. He reported that Summit County was moving away from SSDs as a way to manage roads and was considering bringing in roads like Pine Meadow roads as County roads. He was unsure whether that would ever occur. Mr. Foster stated that Ted Barnes, the attorney representing the Owners Association, has been in negotiations with the Summit County Manager and the County Attorney trying to find a better solution for the roads in the lower part of Tollgate Canyon.

Mr. Foster remarked that Summit County has an interest in creating a way to manage roads that are currently unmanaged, but how to do that was unclear. He was unsure if the roads would become County roads, whether the County would condemn roads and take them over, or create boards to manage roads.

Mr. Foster stated that the Association had budgeted a small additional amount of money

to continue that discussion with Summit County to see where it leads. He would keep the ownership informed when solid information becomes available.

An owner asked about the status of negotiations with the LDS Church for Lower Tollgate Canyon. Mr. Foster stated that the LDS Church was not forthcoming on capital improvement funds. The LDS Stake uses Pine Meadow Roads to access land behind Pine Meadow Ranch. In 2008 the Ranch presented a proposition based on car counts. A traffic study was done in Tollgate and at the back exit of Pine Meadow Drive, where cars leave the Ranch to enter the Stake properties. Traffic count comparisons were done between the Church traffic and Ranch ownership traffic. The annual budget contributions from owners were factored in to determine an appropriate dollar amount that the Church would contribute that reflected the actual traffic impacts of their use. Mr. Foster stated that the LDS Church continues to make that contribution, but they were not interested in continuing discussions on capital improvements.

Mr. Foster acknowledged that several years ago when Tollgate was being resurfaced, the intent was for the Ranch to start focusing efforts on repairing other parts of access roads. He noted that Tollgate was not yet completed. The quote to finish the lower part of Tollgate was \$160,000 to surface the road if it were completely prepped and ready for asphalt. Mr. Foster noted that the road was not even close to being ready for asphalt. He assumed the cost to finish that part of the project would be approximately \$200,000, which was not possible under the current budget.

Dan Kemper, Lot D-19, asked about a one-time assessment to complete the Tollgate project, Mr. Burdette calculated that it would be approximately \$500 per lot. Mr. Kemper stated that he recently moved to the Ranch and his only complaint was that section of road. Everyone is quick to say that it is not their road, but everyone funnels down that road.

Mr. Foster pointed out that \$200,000 would be a true, full, 20-foot width resurfacing project. Lesser repairs could be done to improve the road, similar to the repairs done last year on the Forest Meadows side using the grader and asphalt.

Collections

Mr. Foster reported that the percentage of members who do not pay their assessment was decreasing.

Noise and Trespass Issues

Mr. Foster stated that noise and trespass issues were routine events each year. He did

not believe those issues would ever be resolved.

Deer Meadows Subdivision Application

Mr. Foster stated that in 2008 an application was submitted to the Eastern Summit County Planning Commission to create a subdivision behind Pine Meadow Ranch, between the Ranch and the LDS Stake properties. The original proposal started with 20 lots and was reduced to six lots by the end of the process. At the time it was called a Transfer of Density Rights (TDR) proposal. The proposal was to take lots within Pine Meadow Ranch and buy the building permits from those owners to make them non-buildable lots. The building permit would then be moved to lots behind the Ranch to create a small subdivision. Mr. Foster stated that the Board at that time reviewed the proposal and provided input to the Planning Commission on behalf of the Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association. The opinion was that if those lots joined the Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association and paid dues and impact fees to help support the roads, and as long as the density transfer would keep the same net density in the area, the Board would neither support nor oppose the proposal.

Someone asked about water. Mr. Foster clarified that water was not within the purview of the Owners Association. He noted that water rights were already attached to the land and drilling has occurred on those water rights. Mr. Foster pointed out that the owners could apply to the Pine Meadow Mutual Water Company for service and that decision would be the purview of the Water Company Board.

Mr. Foster remarked that within the past six months a new application was submitted to the Eastern Summit County Planning Commission for the Deer Meadows project. The current application is for a 25 lot subdivision in the same area, but under a different provision of the Planning Code, which is an SPA application, Specially Planned Area. Mr. Foster stated that the language of the Planning Code states that an SPA application is an opportunity to propose a project that does not meet the specified zoning of the underlying area; but if it adds a valuable community benefit that makes it a worthwhile project, the Planning Commissioner should consider that as a trade-off for density.

Mr. Foster reported that the original community benefit proposed in the current SPA application would be a \$3,500 per lot contribution to the Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association for roadwork. Mr. Foster noted that the Board discussed the proposal at length and decided that the Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association would provide a negative recommendation to the Planning Commission on the current proposal. He explained that the Board would give negative feedback based on the fact that the SPA application increases the density from the original proposal, and that \$3500 per lot is a small amount considering the long term use of the roads. It would improve the roads

briefly and some projects could be done immediately. However, over the long term the Deer Meadow project would add density and impacts without any benefit.

Mr. Foster stated that he had not yet forwarded the Board's opinion to the Planning Commission because he was waiting for the item to appear on their agenda. Mr. Foster requested owner feedback on the proposal.

Scott Boyle, Lot PI-I-18, stated that Deer Meadow had signed an agreement with Pine Meadow Ranch to become a part of the Homeowners Association, and that agreement was still in place. Mr. Foster stated that the commitment was unclear because no one could find the document and it was not recorded with Summit County. It appears that the documents were never returned to the attorney who drafted the agreement. The developer had provided him with a copy of the document and Ted Barnes was still researching the matter.

Mr. Boyle emphasized that there was a signed document. He agreed that it may not have been recorded with Summit County, but the document exists and it should have been filed with the minutes. Mr. Boyle could not verify whether the documents were returned to the attorney, but the agreement was between the Owners Association and the developer and it was signed. Mr. Foster clarified that the agreement pertained to the Deer Meadow TDR application. Summit County was requesting input on a new version of that application.

Zoning

Mr. Foster stated that currently Pine Meadow Ranch is in the AG100 zone, which is Agricultural zoning intended for 100 acre parcels. Pine Meadow Ranch was platted at a time when the County did not have an appropriate zone for the use and, therefore, designated the AG100. Several other communities were also affected. Mr. Foster stated that the Summit County Planning Staff would like to retroactively rezone these cabin communities as a Cabin Area Zone. The Cabin Area Zone is being written to move places like Pine Meadow Ranch into zones that are for residential and recreational use, and eliminate unrelated uses in the AG100 zone such as drilling for petroleum, bunkhouses for agricultural workers, commercial stables, etc. Many of the permitted uses in the AG100 zone are inappropriate for residential and recreational cabin areas.

Mr. Foster noted that the zoning process was in the early stages. He expected to receive a card from the Eastern Summit County Planning Department requesting input from the Owners Association on the proposed zoning. Mr. Foster stated that the Planning Department would eventually send a request for feedback to all property

owners who fall within the areas of the proposed rezone.

Mr. Foster stated that anyone who wanted more information on the zoning could find the conditional and permitted uses and other related information on the Summit County website.

Someone asked if the rezoning would impact taxes. Mr. Foster was unsure; however, he believed it would only impact taxes if it changed the property values. Dan Heath asked if Pine Meadow Ranch would be the only subdivision rezoned within Tollgate. Mr. Foster named Forest Meadow and Pine Meadow Ranch, Bridge Hollow and Rockport as examples of cabin area communities. He clarified that the proposed rezoning specifically names subdivisions. It would not change zoning on agricultural lands that are not part of a subdivision.

Approval of 2010 Minutes – Continued

Debra Rakes, Lot D-37, referred to page 9 of the minutes under Newsletter, and noted that the language indicated that written newsletters were no longer sent to the members because of the cost. It also stated that Mr. Foster was the only one who had time to update the website and he would appreciate a volunteer to take on or help with that responsibility. Ms. Rakes stated that during the annual meeting she had suggested that the website should be updated twice a month. She pointed out that the minutes did not reflect that during the meeting she had offered to update the website regularly if people would supply her with the appropriate information.

Mr. Foster apologized that Ms. Rakes' offer to volunteer had been missed and it would be corrected in the minutes.

Gary Clark, Lot D-83-A, amended his motion to include the correction as stated by Debra Rakes.

Mr. Foster called for a vote on approving the 2010 Annual Meeting Minutes as amended.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Financials Report and 2012 Budget

Mr. Burdette reviewed the accomplishments for 2011. He commended Jody Robinson, the Water Company employees, and Ranch owner volunteers for their efforts to preserve access to the Mountain during a tremendous spring runoff.

Mr. Burdette noted that aggregates were added to improve the roads. They paid all the operating bills and expanded the winter snow plowing for the second year to plow a connector between Pine Meadow Ranch and Forest Meadow.

Mr. Burdette stated that with the equipment purchased by the Owners Association they were able to haul loads of aggregate for small jobs, and spread the aggregate and compact it. They can plow roads in the winter with both the road grader and a snow plow on the truck; and they can sand the roads once they are plowed. Mr. Burdette outlined the savings benefit to the Association because Jody is able to do the work rather than hire contractors or pay rental expenses for equipment. The Association was able to pay cash for the equipment and it was used extensively.

Mr. Burdette showed a slide of the new culvert that creates the road that leaves I-80 at exit I50 and enters into the Ranch. It is a large culvert that secures and protects their access during the runoff season. Mr. Burdette reviewed projects for 2011, which included re-building bar ditches, installing culverts in critical drainage areas, laying good base material underneath the roads and compacting the base material in place. Those were all efforts to improve the roads. Mr. Burdette encouraged the members to drive slower to avoid spinning wheels and creating a washboard effect.

Regarding the quality of roads, Mr. Burdette pointed out that they could have any quality of roads they were willing to pay for. Mag water, grading and other improvements come from what the members pay each year.

Mr. Burdette reviewed the proposed budget for 2012. He estimated the total revenue at slightly over \$219,000. He had broken expenses into fixed and variable expense categories. Fixed expenses are typical and normal expenses that can be estimated and pre-determined. Mr. Burdette had budgeted \$155,000 for fixed expenses. He noted that due to the time involved with installing the culvert and securing the access, it was necessary to hire a temporary employee for eight weeks to help Jody with other projects on the Ranch. He had budgeted that expense as Project Labor as a separate line item for 2012 in case the need arises again. Mr. Burdette noted that the Owners Association owns 11 pieces of property on the Mountain and the property taxes went down in 2011. Therefore, he had budgeted less for property taxes in 2012 based on the assumption that taxes would remain lower.

Mr. Burdette reviewed the variable expenses, which consume the remainder of the budget. Mr. Burdette had broken the legal fees into two categories. The \$2,000 in legal fees for SSA had already been approved by the Board and would be spent on pursuing a Special Service Area to possibly take over the maintenance of the two

entrance roads. The second \$2,000 in legal fees was an estimate of what may be spent if they continue collection matters on some of the oldest delinquent accounts. He clarified that currently there were no lawsuits pending against the Ranch.

Someone asked for an estimate of outstanding unpaid assessments. Carol replied that it was approximately \$30,000 and included people who have never paid. Mr. Burdette explained that collection of old accounts is based on the year in which it was collected. In 2011 they collected approximately \$25,000 of dues that were prior to 2011. Mr. Burdette pointed out that the budgeted revenue was only the current year assessment. Anything collected on prior years was over and above that amount.

Mr. Burdette remarked that the Board took a major step to build a relationship with a collection agency. The Board does not have to make individual decisions on which lot owners to collect on because there is a set policy. Invoices are sent out for dues. If those dues are not paid by the time of the first trigger point, those accounts are sent to collections regardless of who it is. The current agreement is that any collection fees charged by the collection agency is added to the delinquent balance and paid by the property owner.

Debra Rakes asked about the trigger point. Carol stated that they begin sending demand letters in May. If accounts are still delinquent in July they are sent to collections. Carol explained that she is willing to work with any owner who contacts her and tries to make payments. Mr. Burdette stated that once it appears that money will not be collected, they can lien the property and take legal action to force the property to be sold.

Bruce Hutchinson noted that the Board usually has the opportunity to review the proposed budget prior to the annual meeting. Mr. Burdette explained that he had not been able to prepare the budget in time for Board review. Mr. Hutchinson wanted it understood that the Board had not seen the budget prior to this evening.

Someone asked if there was enough revenue to take care of the roads the way the Board believes they should be taken care of. Mr. Burdette replied that there are eleven Board members and each one has their own opinion on that question. He explained that some people want to keep the Ranch as it is. Others believe that good roads encourage fast driving and that equals a more dangerous Ranch. Many believe that the roads are sufficient if they provide access to their properties. On the other side of the argument, people who use the roads frequently want roads in the same condition as I-80.

Mr. Burdette thought the Board has been frugal with managing the money, considering

that Pine Meadow has the lowest dues of any similar organization in the State. Mr. Burdette noted that the Association has a surplus to cover emergencies. They are also building a cash reserve fund so there will be enough money to replace equipment without having to sell land or go into debt.

MOTION: Marion Palmer, Lot 76, made a motion to APPROVE the budget proposed for 2012. Tom Deaver, Lot E-71A, seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Debra Rakes agreed that it was good to have a budget, but the budget should be compared to the financial report to see how it actually turned out. She pointed out that the budget is a projection and its accuracy is determined by the financial report at the end of the year.

Mr. Burdette stated that when 2011 ends, he would put the financial report on the website so people could compare it. He clarified that when the 2011 budget was prepared, he did not anticipate the largest snowfall in Northern Utah. Therefore, the damage caused by the significant runoff drastically changed spending. They adjusted spending to accommodate the culvert project and took a conservative approach since they were unsure of the final cost. Because they were conservative, Mr. Burdette estimated that they had under spent by approximately \$50,000. That money would roll into the 2012 budget.

Ms. Rakes noted that last year she asked to see the 2009 Financial Report and she was told it would be posted at the end of the year. She had not seen the 2009 or the 2010 Financial Report and she was concerned that the 2011 Financials would never make it to the website.

Mr. Burdette offered to mail Ms. Rakes a copy in addition to posting all three years on the website. Ms. Rakes clarified that she did not suspect that there were issues or problems. She just personally likes to know where money is spent.

Someone asked if there was a capital expense budget outlined for what they would like to do next summer, and if so, how much was in the account. Mr. Burdette stated that the capital expenditures for the Board to consider was listed on the 2012 Budget under variable expenses. It would include aggregates, asphalt, ordinary maintenance, cleaning out bar ditches, and mag water.

Mr. Burdette presented a list of goals to be considered in 2012. They would continue to build the cash reserve fund, and they are looking to construct a building to house the

equipment.

Someone asked about the cost of building a structure to house the equipment. Mr. Burdette estimated \$50,000 to \$80,000. He noted that the building needs to be a substantial size to accommodate the grader.

Miscellaneous Issues and Comments

Someone asked about the bottom of the Canyon and the old shed.

Mr. Foster stated that the Board has been talking for several years about reorganizing the lower part of the Canyon to make it more attractive and safer. They have been talking to the Postal Service about moving the mail boxes into the area where the shed was located. Mr. Foster noted that the shed served no purpose at the bottom and it was moved to the gravel pit area for Jody to use. An issue regarding the property line was resolved but now they need to obtain a grading permit. The ultimate goal is to re-grade the area, do some stone work for retaining, and move the mailboxes to that location.

Mr. Foster stated that there were longer term visions for discussion. One idea is to install a screening fence where the mailboxes are currently located to create a hidden trash area. The fence would prohibit people from throwing large items off a truck and driving away because trash would need to be carried through the gate to the dumpsters.

Dan Kemp, Lot D-19, commented on the lower Tollgate issue and the idea that letting the roads deteriorate to some degree would slow down cars. He drives the road every day and besides the annoyance and the hazard of people trying to maneuver, he believed the condition of the road would require at least \$500 per year in additional maintenance on a vehicle. Mr. Kemp stated that he would be willing to pay an additional assessment to improve the road.

Mr. Foster was unsure what the impetus would be to create a larger budget to do substantial road work. He likes the roads being washboard and dirt and he loves that animals hang out in the roads. However, his personal opinion for the lower part of the Canyon is that since it was spread with Roto-mill the first time and has been patched up or surfaced with asphalt over the years, he felt they were stuck with an asphalt road in that section and they should make it serviceable. He clarified that the Board as a whole had not decided to generate additional funds for that project. It would need to be a Board decision, and a substantial number of people on the Ranch would need to be in favor before the Board would move in that direction.

Mr. Burdette remarked that a decision needed to be made about dues for 2012 and it

needed to be approved by the membership this evening.

A member asked for a breakdown of the 830 lots. Mr. Foster stated that approximately 50% of the lots are built and approximately 20% are full-time residents. The member stated that he has been a seasonal user for nearly 40 years. He likes the five mile an hour drive up the Canyon, but he has empathy for those who drive the road every day. From his observation, the full-time residents tend to drive faster because they drive the road every day. He agreed that speed increases the danger, but it could also be argued that a better road might make the Ranch safer. Mr. Foster pointed out that it was a complicated issue because what makes Pine Meadow Ranch unique is the wide range of different types of users. The 11 member Board will continue to hammer out the issues and take whatever direction comes out of the process.

Ms. Rakes stated that she sits on a number of boards and councils and they are able to get their minutes out within two weeks after a meeting. She was frustrated that it takes three or four months to make the Pine Meadow minutes available. She noted that the last set of minutes posted on the website were dated August 23rd. They were posted for the September 27th meeting, but the minutes were from the August meeting. She was told that the Deer Creek matter would be discussed at a meeting and if she could not attend, she could read their discussion in the minutes. She was still waiting for those minutes. Ms. Rakes clarified that drafts could be posted as long as they indicate that it is a draft copy that has not yet been approved.

Mr. Rakes requested that they post the agenda, the previous year's minutes, and the proposed budget prior to the annual meeting so members have the opportunity to formulate their questions and comments and come to the annual meeting prepared. They want to be responsible members of the Association and they can only do that through communication.

Mr. Foster clarified that he does not see the minutes until a week or two after the meeting and they are approved at the next Board meeting. He was willing to discuss the idea of posting unapproved draft minutes. Mr. Foster pointed out that the minutes they post are not the minutes required by State law. They are only required to post a list of decisions and motions made at the meeting, which is considered a legal set of minutes. The Board posts the full set of minutes as a courtesy. He explained that the Board prefers to approve the minutes before they are posted because sometimes they are misquoted and their comments are inaccurate. Mr. Foster stated that Carol has started to provide a table of contents with a list of decisions and he tries to post that as quickly as possible.

Mr. Foster suggested that the Association consider increasing the budget for

professional services and pay Carol to post the minutes as soon as they are approved. Ms. Rakes remarked that she is forced to drive to a meeting to hear the discussion because she is unable to read about it in a timely manner. Mr. Foster replied that attending meetings is how the owners participate and he encouraged that participation.

Carol encouraged all the members to sign up on the website because that is the best way for members to obtain information and to be involved. Ms. Rakes stated that she checks the website a lot, but she felt more informed when newsletters were sent to the owners.

Marian Palmer thanked the Board for the time and effort they put in for the Ranch and the Owners Association.

Someone noted that in the past a security guard was at the bottom during hunting season. There was not a guard this year and she understood that a large bull was shot. Mr. Foster clarified that the bull was shot weeks prior to when they normally have a guard scheduled. Mr. Foster explained that Jody had been doing hunt security. He had a hunt scheduled with his children and since he takes very little vacation time, Mr. Foster and the Board approved his hunting vacation. Mr. Foster stated that he spent early mornings guarding the bottom when Jody was gone and others volunteered their time to help.

Mr. Foster reviewed a map of the posted plow routes. He noted that vehicles left on the roads during the winter would be towed. Mr. Foster identified the roads the Owners Association is responsible to plow. He noted that there is a signed agreement with a contract plower to maintain a connection to the Forest Meadow side. Mr. Foster reviewed the specific guidelines that must be followed for plowing and he reiterated that anyone who plows privately must have a signed agreement on file with Carol. Anyone who does not have a signed agreement or does not follow the guidelines would be fined and prohibited from plowing. Any plower who is not included under the umbrella policy of the PMEEF group is required to have a \$1 million insurance certificate naming the owners Association and the Board as the insured.

There were no other comments or questions.

The annual meeting of the Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association adjourned at 9:02 p.m.
