

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS ASSOCIATION
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING
VIA ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE
JUNE 16, 2020

In Attendance: Nick Jackson, Vice President; Michelle Sutor, Secretary; Andrew Pagel, Treasurer; Tom Brace (Area 1); Bennett Wetch (Area 2); Nicole Irving (Area 4); Bruce Hutchinson (Area 5); Paul Sutor (Area 6); George Sears (Area 7).

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

Excused: Pamela Middleton, President; Joe Pagel (Area 3)

Nick Jackson called the virtual meeting to order at 6:38 p.m.

The first part of the meeting did not record, and that portion of the minutes was prepared from notes.

Approval of Minutes

May 19, 2020

On page 2, fourth paragraph, third sentence, Navaho Road was misspelled. Minutes were corrected to read **Navajo Road**.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the Minutes of May 19, 2020 as corrected.

VOTE: The motion passed.

Ranch Manager Report

Jody reported that they were spending time grading and spraying weeds. The clutch on the Forest Ranger needed some general repair.

Paul Sutor mentioned adding asphalt to the lower Tollgate section so the road does not erode where water runoff is cutting under the asphalt. When the road is driven on, it crushes and breaks away. Jody thought the fiber optic company caused the issues when the cable was installed. Mr. Rosing was looking into whether there was a signed agreement for the company to repair any road damage.

Jody reported that the pavement schedule for every three years would occur this year either in August or September.

Fire Update

Alan Powell had sent two new documents for fire policy. The main changes on the

recreation policy is for an approved fire pit. He also added a line for the property owner to sign. The first violation offense is \$500. The fire violation is different than other violations because it does not require a warning. Mr. Rosing noted that the Board can adopt rules without the owners' approval as long as they provide notice that the Board will be voting on a rule change. If the change is just incorporating a county requirement, the owners do not need to be notified.

It was noted that last weekend residents were smelling smoke from a fire in the area. Jann LeVitre was going to post an update via the emergency text system, but she did not want to do it without approval from someone on the Board. Ms. Suitor, Bennett and Jann have the password and it was suggested that they also give the password to Mr. Powell. Mr. Powell did not want or need the password to text for emergency notification. If there is a fire, he would *not* be available. It was noted that anyone can post something on Facebook if it is a non-emergency situation.

Mr. Wetch and Mr. Jackson volunteered to join Alan Powell on the fire committee as assistants.

Mr. Hutchinson wanted to notify owners by email that there is a place to put cleared debris. He was told that the information was communicated on the website and Facebook; as well as through Textedly for the "in kind" dollars. Mr. Powell requested a representative from each area, Lewis Peak Estates, the Church camps as well as Pine Meadow, Forest Meadow, and Oilwell. He noted that the community program is the first step to being fire wise. It is not specific to the Ranch and includes the entire Tollgate Canyon Area.

Mr. Sears thought the HOA should have a prepared packet to give to new owners rather than sending them to the website. The packet should include key information such as where to take cleared off trees.

Mr. Powell stated his interest in doing the fire picnic every summer. Someone asked if the fire hazard alert board at the bottom of the canyon was accurate. Alan replied that he, Cheryl, Jody, and Ken Smith have the ability to change the Fire Board at the bottom of the canyon. They watch humidity, winds etc. It was showing low restriction, at the moment, and it was accurate.

Water Board Report

Mr. Hutchinson attended the Water Board Meeting last Thursday. He reported that the Water Company was having problems with the booster pumps and they plan to upgrade them. There is money in the budget for the upgrade and the work will be done next

week. He noted that the water system relies on a very low water flow from three sources. Water is pumped into the booster pump and into the tank. Those pumps run continuously and the cost is significant.

Mr. Hutchinson noted that the Water Board meeting is not held virtually. There are only five members on the Board and meetings are postponed or cancelled if they do not have a quorum. Andrew Pagel thought the HOA should be notified when a Water Board meeting is held so people can attend. They should also be notified when a meeting is cancelled or postponed. Mr. Rosing pointed out that under the Covid-19 yellow restriction, physical meetings can be held with a cap on the number of people. However, because many on the Ranch are in the high-risk category and cannot attend, the Water Company should accommodate those people with some type of virtual participation.

Ms. Irving stated that Cheryl had made a new sign for Bobcat and it needs to be up. They would like to post it on the pump house at Bobcat, but the pump house is owned by the Water Company. Nicole will send pictures of the sign to Mr. Hutchinson so he can show them to Eric Cylvick, President of the Water Company. She would like approval from the Water Board to post the sign on the pump house.

Parking

Mr. Jackson noted that they were still waiting on Summit County to finalize the enforcement capability for the lot by the mailboxes and across from the mailboxes. It was still moving forward, and he anticipated further updates from the county.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that he had spoken with the foreman for Dominion Energy working on that project and he asked about their intentions. Mr. Hutchinson remarked that due to the shallowness of the cover of the pipe and the fact that someone with a backhoe nicked their pipe and created the problem, their engineers are evaluating whether they will be able to drop it at least six feet under; or whether it will be a 6-foot berm with either rocks or some type of barrier around it. Mr. Hutchinson suggested that the Board might want to rethink parking in that area. Mr. Jackson noted that the Board has no way to control what happens and they will wait to see what Dominion Energy decides to do.

Mr. Jackson thought the dumpster lot was going well. One day a couple of trailers were parked in that lot outside of the signs, but otherwise whenever he drives by, an appropriate number of cars are parked between the signs. Ms. Suitor thought they would have a better idea over the Fourth of July weekend. Paul Suitor asked if the Board members know which tow company to call when a car is parked in violations of

the signs, and what steps should be taken.

Ms. Irving stated that she and Ms. Middleton planned to put together the procedures, but their schedules have been a problem and they were still trying to find a time that worked for both of them. It was open to anyone else who was interested.

Mr. Jackson did not believe stickers were needed for the dumpster lot because it has clear signage. If someone parks in violation of the signs, they can call a tow company immediately. He understood that two tow companies are willing to work with Pine Meadow on the lower mountain. He asked if the Board was comfortable with that process for this summer. Ms. Suitor was comfortable with it, as long as someone parks on an HOA lot and the lot has a sign regarding parking. She believed that was sufficient notice.

Mr. Jackson reiterated that they cannot control parking by the mailboxes and the utilities; however, the dumpster lot is separate, and they can call a tow company whenever someone is in violation of the parking signs. Otherwise, the policy is to put a sticker on the car or warn the car owner through Carol.

Someone commented on the parking permits and asked if the Board members have access to a list of which permit numbers belong to which owner. There may be times when Carol cannot be reached right away and the vehicle needs to be moved. He would not want to tow the vehicle of an owner on the Ranch that they might have been able to contact. It was suggested that the permit information be available in the dropbox where every Board member could access it. Mr. Sears stated that Carol has a list and he was certain she could put it in the dropbox if needed.

Mr. Sears asked the Board members if they have parking stickers on their vehicles. He noted that the original requirement was that every vehicle an owner brought to the Ranch, including snowmobiles, trailers, and ATVs, was to have a Pine Meadow sticker to validate they were part of the Ranch. Mr. Sears thought it would be beneficial to reimplement that requirement and enforce it.

Mr. Hutchinson reported that he spoke with Jody about contacting the people who have trailers and other vehicles and items in the lower parking lot. Jody was struggling to find the owners. Mr. Hutchinson stated that those items need to be moved out during the summer, as the Board discussed last year. People leave snowmobiles and trailers in the lot year-round, and that is not the purpose of the lot.

Mr. Jackson agreed that it was a problem. He suggested that they could start by contacting the people who have parking stickers. Mr. Jackson thought it was

appropriate to first give a warning and allow people time to remove or adjust their vehicles. Mr. Sears stated that if the Board decides to reinstate the sticker policy, they need to inform the owners that trailers, snowmobiles, etc., also need to have a sticker.

Mr. Sears thought they should defer this issue to the parking committee to work through these issues, and then come back to the Board with options and ideas for a collective discussion. Ms. Suitor remarked that the only person on the parking committee is a non-Board member. She tried to call him and sent an email, but he did not respond.

Mr. Jackson replied that he, Nicole Irving and Pamela Middleton were also on the parking committee. Mr. Sears thought they should verify the committees and the people on each committee and post it on the website. He believed the committees need to be accountable and bring back proposals to the Board. The Board only meets once a month and it is difficult to address all the issues at each meeting. Ms. Suitor stated that the list of the committees was on Facebook and on the HOA website page under Contacts. However, it does not list individual names to avoid a specific Board member being targeted. She was willing to add the names of all the committee members if the Board wanted them added. She also corrected the parking committee to include all the members. Ms. Suitor agreed that the committees need to start being accountable. She had a list of five outstanding items that were discussed in previous meetings that were still unresolved.

Mr. Rosing offered suggestions on how the Board could focus the committees and have a process for reporting to the Board.

Tom Brace thought the committees should also be added to the list of future rule changes. Mr. Jackson noted that later in the meeting the Board would discuss forming an election committee. They would also hear from the Architectural Committee when they discuss new construction, as well as the CC&R committee.

CC&Rs Update

Mr. Sears stated that the current vote count was 154 approved the CC&Rs; 224 were against the CC&Rs. The vote on rentals was 138 approved and 209 were against rentals. They had received a total of 382 votes, which was only slightly higher than the count reported at the last meeting. Mr. Sears again asked the Area Reps to email the people in their areas who have not voted to encourage them to vote. He had been contacting people in his area more aggressively, and most were not aware that they could still vote. Mr. Sears remarked that voting for or against was not the issue. The issue is to encourage at least 550 to 600 lot owners to be actively engaged.

Architectural Committee and New Construction

PI-B-30

Mr. Jackson noted that Ben Gibbs, PI-B-30, attended the last meeting to talk about putting up a yurt on his undeveloped lot in Pine Meadow. Mr. Jackson reported that Mr. Gibbs contacted Summit County and provided the records to Pine Meadow in terms of what the county needed. Mr. Gibbs is ready to proceed with what Summit County calls the "temporary route". He would basically lay the wood footing on the ground so it could be taken up in the winter. Mr. Gibbs was aware of the 180-days requirement for a temporary structure.

Mr. Jackson believed Mr. Gibbs had taken the necessary steps and his proposal would have a minimal impact on the roads and on the Ranch as a whole. In his opinion, he thought the Board should approve his proposal based on the plans and information submitted.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that the Board needs to follow the current CC&R schedules. It allows for a temporary use of tents, trailers, and other temporary structures, and he was comfortable with that. However, the question he asked at the last meeting was how Mr. Gibbs intends to handle sanitation and water in a structure that is up for 180 days. He had not heard an answer on how that would be handled.

Mr. Jackson understood that the plan is to use a composting toilet and all the waste would be carried off the site. Mr. Gibbs would bring up water when he comes to use the yurt. Mr. Jackson noted that the Yurt would be used for occasional camping trips and it is not intended to be used continuously for 180 days.

Ben Gibbs, the property owner, stated that Mr. Jackson was correct in outlining the intended use.

Mr. Hutchinson explained that in the past there was a lot of this type of "development" on the Ranch that was not approved by Summit County. People would put up a shack and a hole in the ground and then sell the property. He was uncomfortable with allowing the Yurt because of past experiences.

Mr. Sears stated that he reviewed all the documents and Mr. Gibbs went through the process the Board asked him to go through last month. Mr. Sears stated that when he first owned his property, he brought up a tent four or five times a year and did

everything they were required to do. He noted that the HOA at that time was not as involved or as strict as they are today. He got water from either the neighbors or from the springs where there was a spigot available for anyone to use. Mr. Sears thought Mr. Gibbs has a good plan and he made a commitment to proceed as directed by the Board. He understood Mr. Hutchinson's concerns, but he did not think the Board could do anything other than what Mr. Gibbs has committed to.

Mr. Hutchinson asked if Mr. Gibbs may be willing to sign a document stating what he and the Board agreed upon, and if the Yurt is not taken down in 180 days, he would pay a fine.

Andrew Pagel asked why Mr. Gibbs needed to take down the Yurt every 180 days. Mr. Hutchinson replied that it is a temporary structure, and per the CC&Rs a temporary structure cannot be up more than 180 days. It can be erected again, but it must come down. Mr. Pagel read from the CC&Rs. "Any structure or vehicle, including but not limited to cabins, homes, sheds, garages, barns and other outbuildings, a trailer, tent, TeePee or Yurt that is erected or remains on a lot for more than 180 cumulative days per calendar year, shall be considered a permanent structure requiring approval from the Pine Meadow Ranch HOA. In the event any structure, vehicle, or similar improvement becomes an eyesore or appears to be abandoned, the HOA reserves the right and has sole discretion to require removal of the property or any other remedy acceptable to the Board". Mr. Pagel understood from his reading of the CC&Rs that if Mr. Gibbs wants to put up a Yurt and keep it there for more than 180 days, the Board would designate it as a permanent structure. Mr. Pagel pointed out that Mr. Gibbs would need Board approval to make it a permanent structure.

Mr. Pagel noted that Summit County has a separate ordinance stating that someone cannot live in that structure for more than 180 days, but that was different than removing the structure entirely. Mr. Pagel pointed out that Mr. Gibbs wants to put up a yurt on his land for when he occasionally visits his property. He thought the Board could allow him to keep the Yurt erected full-time, but if it becomes neglected or deteriorates, the Board could require the Yurt to be removed.

Mr. Hutchinson understood Mr. Pagel's interpretation, but he did not believe the HOA enforced it because there are several shacks on the Ranch that have been there for years. Mr. Pagel clarified that he was suggesting they follow the HOA Guideline, and if the Yurt becomes rundown, he agreed that the Board should enforce removal.

Mr. Jackson thought there might be an ambiguity in the rules if someone was applying to live in a Yurt full-time. However, this application specifically proposes to leave the deck footing on the ground and to take the Yurt down in the winter. Mr. Gibbs was not

applying to keep the Yurt up year-round. When the Yurt is taken down, the only thing left will be a few pieces of wood on the ground throughout the winter.

Mr. Rosing stated that due to the contradictory provisions of the governing documents, that apply to the Mountain. In the update, he tried to address the provision that says, “no temporary structures” and another provision that says, “it is possible for something like a Yurt to be a permanent structure”. Mr. Rosing noted that even if the provision Mr. Pagel read was the only provision, it still needed approval and the Board could take the position of not allowing permanent installation of Teepees and tents, even though in theory they could be permitted. Mr. Rosing remarked that if they dig too deep into both provisions of the CC&Rs it could potentially be problematic because they are contradictory.

Mr. Pagel noted that the Architectural Guidelines later talks about tents, trailers and other temporary structures and cites Pine Meadow Ranch CC&Rs #4, “Only permanent structures in conformance with the specifications and requirements of and after proper approval from the ECC, Summit County, and any required State agents, shall be constructed, erected, moved on to or maintained on said property”. He believed that rule in the Architectural Guidelines supersedes the provision he read earlier. The provision in the Architectural Guidelines clarify that the HOA does not allow anything to be a permanent structure that the State or Summit County would not allow to be a permanent structure.

Based on the Architectural Guidelines, Mr. Pagel agreed with Mr. Hutchinson that the Yurt would be confined to 180 days.

Ms. Suitor was comfortable approving the Yurt as proposed and trusted that Mr. Gibbs would take it down after 180 days as stated in his proposal. If it becomes an issue, the Board could address it at that time. She did not think Mr. Gibbs needed to sign an agreement that he was willing to take it down.

MOTION: Paul Suitor moved to approve the Yurt as a temporary structure for Ben Gibbs, Lot PI-B-30, as proposed. Nicole Irving seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Lot PI-81 Jonathan Tanner – Tollgate Road

Mr. Hutchinson stated that in looking at the structure from the roadway, it appears to be 41’ from the driveway to the peak. He recalled that the maximum allowed is 32’. Other than that issue, Mr. Hutchinson was in favor of this application because it complies with

the Architectural Guidelines.

Scott Sorensen, representing the owner, understood from talking with Summit County that it is 32' up from existing grade. The red line shown on the elevation plan is the excavation line where the earth will be removed. Mr. Sorensen noted that the house will be set down enough to make the 32' work. He pointed out that it was difficult to place a house anywhere on the lot, and they had pushed it back to the limit to make it work for the water and the septic system. Mr. Sorensen clarified that it was 32' from existing grade to the highest point of the roof at any point around the structure.

Mr. Pagel noted that the gross square footage on the Lot Improvement Plan Agreement was marked at 3500 square feet. The construction fee is \$6,000 for new construction up to 3500 square feet; and anything over 3500 square feet will be an additional \$2.40 per square foot. Mr. Pagel referred to the stamped document that was attached, which shows the main level at 1433 square feet, garage 330 square feet, second level 1052 square feet, basement, 1,047 square feet for a total of 3,862 square feet. Mr. Pagel pointed out that the additional 362 square feet needed to be paid at the additional rate.

There was discussion among the Board as to whether the garage counts as livable square footage. Mr. Sorensen did not think the garage counted because he had read that it was "livable square footage". Mr. Pagel explained that the garage is counted, but they specify livable and non-livable because they also count unfinished basement area. There is also the potential to expand livable space. He pointed out that the Board decided to count garages because some people were proposing three and four car garages. Mr. Pagel stated that non-livable space is also counted because they look at the footprint of the structure on the property.

Mr. Sorensen was not opposed to paying for the additional square footage. Mr. Pagel calculated the additional amount owed to be \$868.

MOTION: Bruce Hutchinson moved to approve the plans for Jonathan Tanner on Tollgate Canyon Road, pending receipt of the additional fees at \$2.40 a square foot for a total of \$868. Michelle Sutor seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Lot PI-F-39 Kim Mosby

Mr. Hutchinson reported that he was contacted by a neighbor claiming that the access point that was cut to put in the septic last year on PI-F-39 tore out the posts in their driveway. Mr. Hutchinson had no issues with the proposed structure and all the

documents were in order. However, as the Area 5 Rep, he would communicate with the owners to verify where the driveway would be located to make sure it is not on the neighbor's property. Mr. Hutchinson stated that last year they also made a mess on Pine Loop with gravel on another neighbor's property; however, the owner needs to make the builder aware of that issue.

Mr. Pagel could not find color samples in the proposal. Mr. Hutchinson replied that it was an A-frame structure with cedar planking. Mr. Pagel pointed out that without a color sample the owner could stain it whatever color they choose without Board approval. Mr. Jackson noted that color samples were not provided, and it should have been done two weeks ago when the application was submitted.

Mr. Pagel was not opposed to approving the proposal this evening pending color samples. Mr. Hutchinson stated that he would talk to the owners about color samples when he contacts them regarding the driveway. Mr. Pagel emphasized the need to have color samples included with every submittal. Mr. Jackson suggested a procedure where the Architectural Committee could see the samples ahead of time and come to the Board with a committee opinion. He thought they needed to find a more efficient way to run the Architectural Committee to save time at each meeting.

MOTION: Andrew Pagel moved to approve the plans for Kim Mosby, Lot PI-F-39, as proposed, pending samples of the color and materials referenced in the Lot Improvement Plan Agreement. Paul Suitor seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

DMS-5 McAllister Application

Mr. Jackson noted that this item was for two sheds. Ms. Suitor understood that only two structures are allowed on a lot and asked if they intended to build a permanent structure. Mr. Hutchinson stated that there were 20 acres on this lot. Temporary structures are only allowed on the lot if the owner plans to build a permanent structure. He pointed out that this application was only being used as a storage shed and a permanent structure would not be built. Mr. Hutchinson remarked that the Board would be approving two storage sheds against CC&R Item #4.

Mr. Jackson asked about colors. Mr. Hutchinson stated that the structures were too small to meet the criteria for color. Ms. Suitor stated that when they put up their shed initially, they had to provide colors and pay an impact fee. Mr. Jackson noted that there were no colors samples and that would need to be provided.

Someone asked if the Deer Meadows CC&Rs were different. Mr. Hutchinson clarified that there were no Deer Meadows CC&Rs. This property was annexed into the Ranch last year. However, an Area Rep for the Deer Meadows property was never discussed. He asked if that would be Area 7.

Mr. Rosing was unsure. Mr. Jackson thought it was important to determine an area rep.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that if this proposal anticipates the sheds as permanent structures, it might be acceptable. However, as pointed out earlier, there are conflicts between provisions of the CC&Rs. It was noted that the proposed sheds are 10' x 20' and 14' x 14'.

Ms. Irving had no issue with the storage sheds as long as they fit with the mountain vernacular. Some of the Board members thought use was the issue. It was not certain whether the sheds would be used for storage or possibly living space. It was noted that the CC&Rs allow sheds to be used for brief vacation periods. Mr. Hutchinson argued that a permanent shed on a vacant piece of property is not in accordance with the CC&Rs.

MOTION: Nicole Irving moved to approve the 10' x 20' and the 14' x 14' shed per the McAllister application, pending color samples and payment of the impact fees of \$950 both units. Paul Suitor seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Bruce Hutchinson abstained from the vote.

The Board discussed the rule of only two structures allowed on a lot. Mr. Sears pointed out that some people have cabins with detached garages and a storage shed on their lot. He wanted to know how that issue is addressed under the two structures rule. Mr. Sears suggested that the Board needed to relook at the Rules and Regulations and the Architectural Guidelines and clarify the meaning of "additional structures". Mr. Rosing stated that if some lots have a cabin, garage, and shed, it would appear that the limit is three structures.

Mr. Pagel clarified that there is a limit from Summit County for only one primary residence per a Tax ID. In addition, an accessory dwelling unit less than 1,000 square feet is allowed on the property if approved by Summit County. Mr. Pagel stated that Summit County does not enforce or place restrictions on the number of structures under 200 square feet on a property. That restriction and enforcement is the responsibility of the HOA. Mr. Pagel stated that when talking about multiple structures on a property, it pertains to livable residences.

Mr. Rosing stated that his concern related to multiple non-livable structures, such as the sheds on the McAllister lot. He believed that question was answered by Mr. Sears' example. The Association has imposed a two structure plus garage limit on a lot. He thought that restriction was defensible, which was his initial concern. He understood that the HOA and Summit County have separate concerns.

Mr. Pagel thought the Board needed to keep an eye on the McAllister property to make sure additional structures are not added. Mr. Jackson added this issue to the list of rules for later consideration.

Election Committee

Mr. Jackson stated that Pamela Middleton asked him to talk about forming an election committee to make sure everything is in place by the relevant deadlines and in accordance with the election rules in the Bylaws. He noted that any Board member could volunteer to be on the committee, except for himself, George Sears, or Tom Brace, because their terms were ending and they were up for re-election.

Ms. Suitor noted that there is an existing election committee consisting of herself and Tom Brace. Mr. Wetch volunteered to be on the committee. Ms. Suitor assumed the committee would be responsible for communicating to the members that there are three open board positions. Anyone interested in running for a board position should submit a bio, what the bio should contain, and a deadline for submitting their bio to either Ms. Suitor or Mr. Wetch. Mr. Sears agreed with the responsibilities outlined. He also suggested that the committee send an email to everyone in the specific area that has an Area Rep position open for election candidates. They should send an email to all the owners to announce Mr. Jackson's open position as Vice-President. Mr. Wetch stated that he and Michelle would coordinate with Carol to find out how they can help facilitate the usual process. Mr. Jackson noted that the Bylaws have the deadlines for submitting the bios. Mr. Sears commented on some of the conflicts that occurred last year. Ms. Suitor recalled that last year some of the bios were not submitted as outlined in the Bylaw. She thought the bios should come to her and Mr. Wetch so they can look them over first and approve the bios before they are sent out.

Ms. Suitor asked if the members vote on the candidates at the Annual Meeting. Mr. Sears stated that Carol mails everyone a ballot and the ballot needs to be returned by a specific date. Ms. Suitor thought the bios should be submitted no later than a date in mid-September so they can be reviewed before the bios and ballots are prepared and sent out. When the Board establishes an Annual Meeting date, they should make sure the ballots are ready to send the next day. Mr. Suitor thought September was an accurate timeframe.

Mr. Rosing suggested that the election committee ask Carol to send them the final email and all the attachments to review before it is mailed out to make sure it is consistent and accurate.

Ms. Suitor stated that she would post an announcement on Facebook and on the Website indicating that there are three Board openings; and anyone interested should submit their bios by mid-September.

Real Estate Signs and Enforcement

Mr. Hutchinson stated that a real estate sign came up in his area that was similar to the other real estate signs. He called the realtor who is well-known to the area, and he was quite belligerent, claiming that real estate signs have been on the Ranch for a long time. Mr. Hutchinson provided a brief history of the real estate company and the person he spoke with. Mr. Hutchinson pointed out that on the website, under Article III, the language states, "In no event shall a for-sale sign or other visible displays ever be allowed on said property".

Someone understood that HOAs can prohibit or regulate real estate signs or other signs, provided they are properly addressed in the CC&Rs. Mr. Rosing agreed. He suggested that the Board identify the lots with signs and ask Carol to send a warning letter. If the sign is still left up, the HOA could impose a fine.

Mr. Hutchinson offered another suggestion. If an Area Rep notices a sign within their area, they could call and ask that the sign be taken down because it is not allowed by the current CC&Rs within the HOA. Mr. Hutchinson stated that he belongs to another Association in Mesquite, NV. That HOA remedies the sign situation by hanging a wire image of a house on the front of the house to indicate it is for sale. Mr. Hutchinson suggested that the Pine Meadow HOA could allow real estate agents to put a purple post on the lot that is for sale. People looking for those lots could then contact a real estate agent. Mr. Hutchinson was not opposed to finding a way for people to identify which lots are for sale.

It was noted that lots could be identified by the bulletin board at the bottom. Ms. Suitor stated that it is difficult to find a lot because there are no fences. When they were looking for a lot, they walked with a realtor for hours in a snowstorm trying to find the road the lot was on.

Mr. Wetch could think of 15 or 20 different realtor signs in his area. He did not expect that he would need to contact those people to let them know that signs are not allowed.

Mr. Wetch thought it was a prevalent expectation that people are allowed to use a sign to advertise that their lot or cabin is for sale. He thought they needed a systematic way to communicate their expectation to people. It should not be on a case by case basis. Mr. Wetch stated that as an individual homeowner, he would assume that he could put a sign outside of his house, but if that is not the case, it was not well-communicated. He did not think it should fall to the Area Reps to triage the situation. Mr. Hutchinson noted that the CC&Rs specifically states in two different places that signs are prohibited. Mr. Wetch replied that it was more about the expectations that have developed over the years. He thought it was important to reset those expectations if they want people to adhere to the rule going forward.

Mr. Sears stated that there are already three signs on his road, and cars are blocking the road when realtors bring potential buyers to look at the property. He agreed that they need to reset expectations and inform the realtors that the HOA will start enforcing the Rules and Regulations in August or September to give them a window of time to adjust. Mr. Sears did not think it was the responsibility of the Area Rep to go after each realtor. He thought they could set up a process and have Carol send a letter to the owner. The Area Reps should be responsible for identifying the realtor and how they can be contacted and send that information to Carol. Ms. Suitor thought the owner should know that a realtor cannot post a sign on their lot. Mr. Sears agreed that the Board has an obligation to educate the owners. However, he was surprised at how few of the people in his area have even accessed the website to understand the Rules and Regulations and the CC&Rs. He thought the Board has some obligation in the process to educate the owners.

Mr. Rosing stated that legally they should reach out to the owner. He thought setting a grace period and sending a notice was a good idea, but there should not be an expectation that the Board members need to make all the phone calls.

Nick Jackson suggested that if they resolve to start enforcing the sign rule within the CC&Rs, they should begin with a three month from today grace period and notice it on the website and Facebook. Any Area Reps or executive members who want to speak to a realtor or an owner are free to do so. Area Reps that do not want to take that approach are free to refer the matter to Carol, and she can send a letter to the owners announcing the new policy. He thought it was a way to balance notice to the owners and also be clear that the HOA will move forward with enforcement after this summer period.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that a previous HOA President, Scott Boyle, also told him that this issue has plagued the Ranch for some time. Mr. Boyle believed that most people understand the CC&Rs and no one will be surprised that signs are not allowed. The

issue is that the HOA has not enforced it.

MOTION: Michelle Suitor moved to start enforcing the sign policy within the CC&Rs beginning with three months from today, June 16, 2020, as a grace period, and to notice the enforcement on the website and Facebook. Paul Suitor seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Rule Changes

Mr. Jackson stated that if anyone has a rule change to add to the list, they should send him an email and it will be addressed at the next meeting.

Plowing Request – Pine Meadow Road

Ms. Irving reported that the Pine Meadow Road plow route is in Area 4. There is not a lot of participation in terms of people donating money towards plowing, even though people use that particular route to reach other areas. Ms. Irving thought the Area 4 owners wanted some discussion on whether they could be included into the overall HOA plowing.

Mr. Hutchinson thought this was a slippery slope because everyone in the Ranch would like their road plowed at someone else's expense.

In the interest of time, Mr. Jackson requested that the Board table this item to the next meeting. Mr. Sears agreed with waiting until the next meeting, but whoever added it to the agenda needs to explain what it actually means. He noted that Pine Meadow goes a long way past Elk Road and the Church areas. Ms. Irving stated that she had that information. The request was only for a small section in Area 4. She will provide that information at the next meeting.

Benelli Bench

Ms. Irving stated that last Fall the Board discussed putting in a memorial bench in honor of Bill Benelli. She believed it came under the community improvement committee. Ms. Irving reported that nothing has been decided at this point and the discussion could be tabled until the next meeting.

Ms. Suitor noted that she asked about the bench at the last meeting and Ms. Middleton had said that Ms. Irving was working on it and would provide an update. Ms. Suitor stated that she would follow up with Ms. Irving through email since they were both on

the community improvement committee.

Monthly Budget Review

The Board reviewed the unpaid bills detail.

MOTION: Michelle Suitor moved to approve the unpaid bills. Bruce Hutchinson seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Insurance

Mr. Jackson noted that this item was left off the agenda; however, he would be emailing everyone for a vote on the insurance. He had obtained a new insurance quote for everything and it was considerably better than the last insurance package. The D&O Insurance is better, and it also increases the limits for general liability. The package also includes crime and fraud protection. The increased cost is less than \$3.00 per lot per year. Mr. Hutchinson thought the median cost was doubled. Mr. Jackson did not think it doubled taking everything into account. Mr. Hutchinson asked if they had a budget for the additional expense, or if they need to wait for a budget approval. Mr. Jackson thought they could wait. He will send out an email and Andrew Pagel could address the budget or other questions at the next meeting. Mr. Pagel asked for the total cost. Mr. Jackson stated that the premium would increase from approximately \$4600 to \$7700.

Mr. Rosing stated that he constantly fights with insurance companies and he recommended that getting the best insurance possible. Mr. Pagel stated that if the difference was only \$3,000, he was comfortable moving forward. Mr. Sears had read through the entire policy and he thought it was much better than what they were currently operating under. Mr. Jackson stated that he would send everyone a copy, including Mr. Rosing, for a decision at the next meeting or through email. He emphasized that it was important to move forward quickly.

Public and Open Forum

Nanette Palmer, Lot PI-E-59, stated that her application was submitted today. She understood the two-week policy, but she was told to submit her application anyway to see if could be discussed at this meeting. Ms. Palmer noted that she paid her fee when she submitted the application. If she waits 30 days to get an approval, she was not sure whether she would have enough time to do everything before winter. Ms. Palmer asked

if she could change her mind and get a refund on the fees paid. Mr. Hutchinson answered yes.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that he is her Area 5 Rep. He noted that her address is on Uintah View; however, her access was coming in from Pine Loop. Ms. Palmer stated she asked the engineer that question because the tax notices shows two addresses, one for Uintah View and one for Pine Loop. She wanted the road off of Uintah View, but the engineer told her the access needs to be off Pine Loop. She would ask Summit County how to handle the situation. Mr. Hutchinson thought the engineer was correct, and that the likely address will be on Pine Loop.

Mr. Hutchinson noticed that Ms. Palmer was proposing a large log structure with a lot of logs. He asked if there was sufficient room for staging. Ms. Palmer stated that staging would be on her two-acre lot. She assumed the logs could be placed on a flat portion on the bottom half of the lot.

Mr. Hutchinson thought the application looked acceptable and all the pertinent documents were submitted. He looked forward to having her as a neighbor. Ms. Palmer reiterated that her biggest concern was having enough time to at least build the structure and enclose it before winter.

Mr. Pagel asked Ms. Palmer if she was requesting a refund and to retract her Lot Improvement Plan Agreement, or whether she intended to proceed if the Board could review her structure and approve it through an email vote within the next 30 days. Ms. Palmer clarified that she wanted to build if they can start fairly soon, but she still needed to work with Summit County. Mr. Hutchinson informed Ms. Palmer that Summit County is very backlogged and that could hold her up.

The Architectural Committee members thought they could go through the process and review Ms. Palmer's submission within the next two weeks and make a decision through an email vote.

The Board adjourned the Regular Meeting and moved into Closed Session.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Owners Association Board adjourned at 8:56 p.m.
