

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS ASSOCIATION
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING
TRAILSIDE PARK CONFERENCE ROOM
5705 TRAILSIDE DRIVE
FEBRUARY 23, 2010

In Attendance: Hutch Foster, Dan Heath, Sue Larsen, Bob Burdette, Amy Jackson, Tom Deaver, Bruce Hutchinson, Scott Clausen

Excused: Scot Erickson, Alan Powell, Duane Yamashiro

Ex Officio: Jody Robinson

Hutch Foster called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

MOTION: Dan Heath moved to APPROVE the minutes of the January 26, 2010 Board meeting. Bruce Hutchinson seconded the motion.

Bob Burdette referred to page 5 of the minutes and the discussion regarding the issue with Mr. Perry. He noted that the minutes stated that, "Mr. Hutchinson noted that there was a motion on the floor to postpone a decision until the Board could get more information from Carol. Mr. Hutchinson seconded the motion." He asked for clarification as to who made the actual motion that Mr. Hutchinson had seconded. He recalled that the Board had discussed involving Carol but he did not believe it was in the form of a motion.

Mr. Hutchinson recalled that Mr. Burdette had made a motion to obtain additional information from Carol before making an offer to Mr. Perry to accept \$500. That was the motion he thought he had seconded. Mr. Burdette felt that was acceptable as long as they had not voted on a motion to accept \$500.

Mr. Foster clarified that the motion that passed unanimously, as reflected on page 6, was a motion to table the matter until they received additional information from Carol. Mr. Foster requested that Carol correct the motion on page 6 to reflect that it was a motion to table the discussion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously to approve the minutes as corrected.

Owner/Visitor Open Forum and Owner Communications

Mr. Foster read communications Carol had sent from various owners.

The first was correspondence from PI-51, Area 3, protesting his assessment. The owner stated that he had not witnessed any road work in his area and felt the Ranch

should have an independent audit of the accounts. Mr. Foster believed an adequate amount of work had been done in A-Plat this season. He did not mean to dismiss the complaint, but when only one or two out of 800 owners complain, he feels the Board is doing well.

The second correspondence was from an owner on Navaho Drive. The letter stated that their assessment is paid each year, but last year the road was not graded and trucks went down their road with the blades up. Mr. Foster commented on the amount of work that was done on Navaho last year. It was possible that Jody Robinson may have been passing through Navaho with the blade up to get somewhere else, but that was irrelevant.

Mr. Hutchinson felt the Board should respond to these owners and encourage them to attend the annual meeting where they can hear an explanation of where the money is being spent. Mr. Foster stated that he intended to pass these letters to the Area Reps and ask the reps to send a courtesy response.

Tom Deaver asked if the complaint for Navaho Drive related to road surface and maintenance on the dirt road, and not snow plowing. Mr. Foster assumed it was road maintenance. Mr. Deaver noted that Navaho Drive is still 3" rock and really rough, and it has been that way since the Water Company dug up the water pipes.

Mr. Foster agreed that some areas of the Ranch are still impassable, and he explained that the work is prioritized in terms of access.

Ms. Jackson reported on a letter she received from an owner outlining very good points against plowing on Elk Road. She did not have the letter with her and offered to send it to the Board members. Mr. Foster stated that he had several conversations with that owner and when they last spoke, he had decided to accept the plowing for this year.

Mr. Foster reported that an Ms. Rakes continued to be in contact with him regarding rental issues and is eager to push the Board towards an enforcement program. Per comments at the last meeting, he told Ms. Rakes that the Board was currently not taking the direction of more strenuous enforcement, but they would continue to discuss the matter. Mr. Foster felt that Ms. Rakes was more interested in putting together a position and a letter writing campaign that she was constructively working with the Board on the matter.

Mr. Foster suggested that at some point the Board should have a closed executive session to discuss the complications involved with this matter.

Environmental Control Committee Plan Review

There was no discussion.

Water Board Update

Dan Heath had attended the Water Board Meeting. Eric Cylvick was not present and the meeting was short. The Board discussed installing a line up through I-Plat to increase the water pressure. The Water Company is also looking into scrubbing the well at Salt Box and possibly drilling in that area.

Mr. Foster stated that if the Water Company decides to scrub Salt Box, it might be a good opportunity to open up the discussion of the gated Salt Box Circle. He noted that gating a public road is prohibited in the CC&Rs and he would like someone who knows the history to explain why the road has been allowed to stay gated and locked for years.

Ranch Manager's Report

Jody Robinson reported that he has been plowing snow and helping the Water Company. Everything else has been slow. All the equipment is running well. He still needed to do the shop painting that was approved at the last meeting.

Mr. Deaver complimented Mr. Robinson on the rock from Salt Box and around Boyce's and expressed his appreciation. He asked if that work had caused them to dig too deep into the materials supply. Mr. Robinson replied that they were fine on materials.

Mr. Hutchinson asked about the status for finding a roller. Due to the economy, he believed this was a good time to pick up equipment at a lower cost. Mr. Burdette encouraged Mr. Robinson to make that purchase within the next 30 days. He believed it would be less expensive to purchase a roller in March than if they wait until summer, and that \$30,000 was budgeted to purchase a roller.

Old Business

Lot SS-BDY-15-1 Appraisal

Mr. Foster asked Mr. Heath if the appraisal for Lot SS-BDY-15-1 had been re-adjusted by the County. Mr. Heath stated that he spoke with the County and they told him they would look into it for taxes next year. The person he spoke with was not aware that the lot was unbuildable. Mr. Foster thought "look into it" was vague and he wanted to know what they needed to do to make sure it did not fall through the cracks. Mr. Hutchinson

thought it should be submitted as a formal request for protest. Dan Heath would follow through and submit a written request.

Mr. Burdette stated that prior to the meeting, he gave Dan Heath a list of all the properties owned by the HOA. He asked Mr. Heath if he would compare the assessed values to current market value to see if other properties may need to be re-evaluated. Mr. Burdette felt that Mr. Heath was the most experienced to handle this matter.

Mr. Hutchinson believed the County had recently changed the policy to re-assess properties yearly as opposed to every five years. Mr. Burdette stated that 20% of the properties are evaluated each year; therefore each property is assessed every five years. Mr. Foster clarified that if they find a property that is over-assessed, it could take several years following a written request before the property would be re-assessed. Mr. Burdette replied that this was correct.

Mr. Hutchinson pointed out that values are based on the most recent appraisal of the area. Consequently, appraisals that were done two years ago are out of line with the current market value. He suggested that they may not achieve much of a tax break if the values are based on old appraisals. Mr. Foster remarked that the unbuildable lot definitely needs to be re-adjusted as quickly as possible because they are paying the same amount as a buildable lot. He clarified that Mr. Burdette was only conducting an investigation on the other lots.

Mr. Burdette stated that this summer he hoped to continue the work on evaluating whether or not affixing a conservation easement on property would drop the taxable value of the property. If they placed a conservation easement on the property uphill from the Gravel Pit and could get agreement from the County to drop its appraised value to \$100 per acre, the taxes would decrease on that property. The HOA would be restricted from building on that property in the future. If that can be accomplished, Mr. Burdette intended to bring a list of all the properties to a meeting so the Board could discuss the long-term use of each property.

Meeting schedule and locations

Ms. Larsen stated that the meeting dates were confirmed for the Whitmore Library on the fourth Tuesday of the odd months. In Scot Erickson's absence, no one was able to confirm if the Trailside Park meeting room was confirmed on the fourth Tuesday of the even months. Mr. Foster would try to confirm that with Mr. Erickson.

Architectural Guidelines

Mr. Foster felt it was important for the Board to clarify the issues regarding impact fees and the architectural guidelines before owners present building plans.

Mr. Foster had outlined a draft of architectural guidelines for discussion purposes only. The intent was to give more information and more room for owners to make their own building decisions, and at the same time maintain the desired mountain feel of the Ranch.

Ms. Jackson liked the draft Mr. Foster had outlined because they were simple and to the point.

Mr. Burdette felt the problems they encountered in the past were due to the fact that the guidelines are vague and leave people with the impression that something like a red roof is within their right and purview. As he read through the draft guidelines, he noted that Section 3 addresses cabins and homes but there is no discussion in the text regarding outbuildings. He thought outbuildings should be discussed the same way as any other structure. Mr. Burdette noted that the guidelines list sample colors that might be approved, such as browns, tans, dark greens and dark grays. However, there is no color recommendations for roofs. Mr. Burdette proposed that they list acceptable and non-acceptable colors in the guidelines. He preferred to be specific and provide more guidance to the owners.

Mr. Burdette wondered if setbacks and maximum heights should be addressed in the guidelines. He noted that most of the setbacks written in the CC&Rs make it impossible to build on many of the lots within the Ranch. A fifty foot setback from the property line renders some lots unbuildable because there is not enough room to meet the setbacks. Mr. Burdette thought the guideline should give the owners options that the Board would accept, even if it differs from the CC&Rs. If they intend to default to the County requirement, that should be spelled out in the guidelines.

Mr. Hutchinson suggested that the Board should look at the setbacks when reviewing plans to make sure the proposed structure would fit on the lot.

Mr. Burdette noted that Sec 5 of the guidelines have a minimum size requirement for the main floor, but not a maximum size. He suggested adding language to say, "However, the ECC will evaluate a structure to be commensurate with the scale of the lot upon which it is intended to be built."

Mr. Heath did not think the Board had the power to be that restrictive. As long as the

owner meets the County setbacks they should be able to build what they want.

Mr. Foster stated that his interpretation of the CC&Rs gives the ECC the capacity to set standards. In terms of size, the language in the drafted guidelines was taken directly from the old document. Mr. Foster thought it would be difficult for the Board to judge an appropriate size for individual owners.

Mr. Heath felt the current Board was fairly reasonable, but he was concerned about the latitude they would be giving future Boards if the guidelines are too restrictive and give the Board too much power.

After further discussion, Mr. Foster was comfortable eliminating the entire paragraph addressing size and let the size issue default to County regulations. Mr. Clausen agreed. Mr. Burdette asked if they would still keep the language on Sec 5 requiring a 400 square foot minimum.

Mr. Hutchinson did not believe the Board should change anything that was already in place if it meets the County ordinance. Mr. Foster agreed. He stated that the paragraph addressing size should be changed to indicate that the County designates massing, setbacks and height under the Eastern Summit County Planning Code. Mr. Foster believed that the County Code also sets a minimum size and he suggested that they let the Code dictate the minimum livable size.

Mr. Foster noted that he had re-written the language for roofs and eliminated the word "should" when talking about what roofs "should" be. He did not think it was right to tell people how the roof should be built. The Board can discourage flat roofs because it does not fit within the mountain vernacular; but they are not in a position to prohibit a roof because they think it is unsound. Structural requirements should be enforced by the County and not the HOA.

Mr. Foster noted that he had removed wood shingles as a roof material when he incorporated language from the old document. Mr. Clausen asked if there are fire-resistant wood shingles. Mr. Foster replied that there are, but they are not fire-proof and only slightly more fire-resistant.

Mr. Foster summarized the changes based on their discussion. These include removing the size restriction and shifting it to the County Code. He would research the County requirements for size, setbacks and height. He would verify whether or not the County stipulates a minimum size. Mr. Foster suggested that they insert the color list for structures into the language for roofs, unless there was a reason to generate a different set of roof colors.

Ms. Larsen noted that the language states that all roof colors shall be earthtone. Mr. Foster thought the colors should be better defined as suggested by Mr. Burdette. Mr. Burdette stated that he had added black to the list as an acceptable roof color. Mr. Foster noted that the Board had approved a black roof last year.

Mr. Heath wanted to know the Board's position on the ability to enforce roof colors. Mr. Foster explained that the ECC is allowed to approve or not approve buildings based on whether or not a structure meets the guidelines of the HOA. He felt their enforcement position becomes more difficult when building occurs outside of the process and leads to a violation of the guidelines. Mr. Foster pointed out that the Board does not review plans for a remodel on activities such as exterior color changes, re-siding or re-roofing a house. Therefore, they are restricted on that enforcement as well, since they have no approval authority.

Mr. Foster believed that most HOA's require owners to re-apply when they change color schemes or siding or re-roof their homes. He personally lived in a neighborhood where you had to submit an application to change your front door.

Mr. Burdette recalled that the issue began with the red roof cabin on Arapaho which violated the agreement. Mr. Foster asked if the HOA had a written agreement at that time. Mr. Burdette replied that there was a written agreement but it was not produced until several months later when it was actually found.

Mr. Foster remarked that enforcement by the Board comes with the fact that an owner needs to have Board approval before construction. An owner cannot obtain approval until the construction agreement is signed. Mr. Foster explained that the agreement is the only point in the process that gives the Board any enforcement capability. If the agreement is violated, the Board can contact the attorney to begin the process of informing the property owner that they have violated the agreement. Mr. Foster hoped that the area rep or another Board member would catch the violation and reason with the owner before it turned into a legal matter.

Mr. Heath disagreed that the Board would have the right under any circumstance to tell someone they could not have a red roof or do something on their own property. Mr. Foster felt the CC&Rs, in a very specific way, grant the ECC the ability to create and enforce guidelines for building. Even though the guidelines appear to be broad, he believed it encompassed what they were trying to do. Mr. Hutchinson thought people should understand that they are part of a community and there are guidelines to follow.

Ms. Larsen asked if an owner could go to the County if the Board denies them a red roof. Mr. Burdette stated that the County does not enforce CC&Rs.

Mr. Heath remarked that the Water Company is not in the position to deny water based on the Owners Association because they are separate entities. Mr. Burdette stated that the Water Company is only required to give water to lot owners in Pine Meadow and Forest Meadow. Mr. Heath agreed, but believed that the Water Company has the right to go outside those areas if they have extra water shares. Mr. Burdette replied that the Water Company is bound by Articles of Incorporation which states that they can only provide water to members of Pine Meadow and Forest Meadow Ranch. Mr. Foster confirmed that this was correct.

Mr. Heath wanted to know how people were able to be annexed. Mr. Foster replied that annexing occurs with the Owners Association. A legal annexation process is now in place and a person is required to complete the process before the Water Company can give them water.

Mr. Clausen suggested that the HOA representative periodically mention this when they attend the Water Company Board meetings. Mr. Foster noted that the Board still has a viable process for approving construction. He believed the issue of whether or not the Board has the ability to create specific guidelines could be an ongoing debate. Mr. Heath agreed, but preferred to err on the side of caution to avoid lawsuits. Mr. Clausen commented on times when it becomes necessary for the Board to sue an owner for violations. If someone insists on having a blue roof, it would be appropriate for the Owners Association to sue them. Mr. Clausen believed that most owners are willing to comply, but the Board cannot back away from the few who don't because they would begin to see more red and blue roofs. If the Board controls the situation, they would probably have 95% compliance.

Mr. Foster stated that he had brought this subject back to the table this year, because for five years it was impossible to get written building guidelines from the Board. When he came to the Ranch in 2004, he requested a set of written set of building guidelines. The response from the Board at that time was for Mr. Foster to tell them what he wanted to build and they would let him know if it was acceptable. Mr. Foster stated that his goal was to locate the original document and update it to encompass issues that the Board has faced since that time. He believed an updated document with specific guidance would help eliminate most of the issues. Mr. Foster remarked that some of the arguments come from people trying to design in a vacuum without any guidelines. Mr. Foster reiterated that the CC&Rs allow the Board to define specific guidelines.

Mr. Foster stated that he felt strongly about this project and offered to continue writing the guidelines for the Board to review and discuss.

Mr. Clausen referred to the second paragraph under structures, “natural stone and wood siding” and preferred the old language that recommended “logs and log siding or natural manufactured wood.” Mr. Foster pointed out that wood was the recommended siding in 2005 and he had only replaced the word “manufactured” with “engineering.” Mr. Clausen thought “logs” should be added back into the language. Mr. Foster assumed that logs would be considered natural wood siding, but he would identify “logs” in the language.

The Board discussed stain and paint colors. Mr. Burdette suggested adding steel siding to the list of unacceptable building materials. Mr. Foster appreciated the comments. He felt the Board could come to some agreement on guidelines that would give people room to express their own taste without negatively impacting the Ranch.

New Business

Whiskey River Trucking

Mr. Foster reported that an attorney from Coalville has given the Owners Association until Friday to settle accounts with Whiskey River Trucking. Mr. Foster noted that the Board was under the impression that the accounts were settled last year. In 2008 he spent four or five days inventorying culverts on the Ranch. He also spent a full day with Whiskey and Kip O’Brien driving around identifying culverts and deciding who had paid for what and who still owed money. Mr. Foster stated that at the end of that drive, he and Whiskey wrote a final bill to the Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association, which they both signed. The bill totaled \$960, which was their best estimate of what Whiskey had paid out-of-pocket, but had not been paid back. Mr. Foster stated that the check was cut and Whiskey was reticent to accept it. He finally accepted the check after meeting with Mr. Burdette, but apparently the check was never cashed. Whiskey held on to that check because there remained outstanding balances for work on Elk Road that he felt was the Water Company’s responsibility. Mr. Foster clarified that there were outstanding culverts two years ago that did not appear to be the responsibility of the Owners Association. Therefore, they let that go in an effort to close the Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association account with Whiskey River.

Mr. Foster stated that by not cashing the check, Whiskey unexpectedly put the matter back in the lap of the Owners Association. The Association has now received a bill from Whiskey for \$5,000 and they have been given until Friday to settle the account. Mr. Foster stated that he and Mr. Burdette have discussed the matter and he had also spoken with Ted Barnes. Mr. Foster noted that there are culverts in Elk Road that were installed before the road was resurfaced, and there may be outstanding balances for the installation of those culverts. The Board had expected those to be part of the

overall Water Company project. Mr. Foster has spoken with Eric Cylvick and Brody Blonquist, and both feel that the Water Company did not neglect to replace any culverts that were already in place, and anything that was added was not their responsibility. Mr. Foster remarked that a significant number of new culverts were added to that road and the question was whether or not anyone paid for them. The answer was unknown because no records were kept.

Mr. Robinson stated that if Whiskey had gone to the Board and received reimbursement approval, that should be reflected in the minutes. Mr. Foster replied that the process was not clear and there was no way to know if an agreement was made. In the past many things happened on the Ranch without approval. The problem is that there are culverts in the ground on Ranch property. He clarified that the \$960 check did not include culverts on Elk Road. It was evident that Elk Road needed culverts. The Ranch now owns those culverts, but there is no way to know the actual cost.

Mr. Foster presented a proposal he had discussed with Ted Barnes as a viable position for the Board. He recommended that they gather available documentation that shows which culverts they definitely paid for. Based on the inventory and using paid receipts, he and Mr. Barnes were able to determine an outstanding balance. Mr. Barnes recommends that the Board offer Whiskey a split to resolve the matter. Mr. Foster pointed out that if they pay Mr. Barnes to legally fight this, they could easily spend \$5,000 in legal fees and still lose. Mr. Foster proposed that the Board allow Ted Barnes and Bob Burdette to determine a settlement amount that would end this issue. It would be a final payment made through Ted Barnes with no further negotiations or discussion. All accounts with Whiskey River would be closed with the Water Company and with the Owners Association.

Ms. Jackson asked if paying Ted Barnes was necessary and suggested that Bob Burdette was capable of determining a settlement. Mr. Foster and other Board members felt it was better to work through the attorneys. Mr. Foster pointed out that even if they have to pay Whiskey the total \$5,000; the amount was not that large in comparison to the cost of going to court. Ms. Jackson agreed, but wanted to know why they were given such a short deadline. Mr. Foster replied that this has been an ongoing issue for years. Ms. Jackson did not agree with the Friday deadline.

Mr. Robinson question why Whiskey paid for the culverts out of his own pocket. Mr. Burdette explained that Whiskey, operating as the Ranch manager, took authority that the Board never intended him to have. The Board wanted Elk Road re-surfaced before winter and gave Whiskey a \$30,000 budget. At that point, Whiskey chose his personal trucking business to haul gravel from the Geary Pit up to Elk Road.

Mr. Deaver asked if anyone challenged his actions as a conflict of interest. Mr. Burdette replied that there were all kinds of conflicts of interest, which contributed to the reasons why the Board decided to terminate Whiskey as an employee. In addition, the Board took steps to make sure that a future Ranch manager could never develop that conflict of interest. Mr. Burdette pointed out that as a Ranch employee, Whiskey was purchasing culverts under his name, installing them on individual lot owner's driveways, and then billing the lot owner for the work. Since the culverts were not purchased on the Pine Meadow Ranch account, the Board did not think the Ranch owned the culverts. Mr. Burdette noted that many of those culverts were installed on Elk Road. Mr. Heath recalled that some of the culverts also went into Whiskey's place at Chalk Creek.

Mr. Deaver felt this was a no-win situation and he favored Mr. Foster's proposal. Ms. Jackson was not opposed to having the two attorneys negotiate, but she was opposed to being given a deadline. Mr. Burdette pointed out that culverts were needed on Elk Road. Therefore, if Whiskey had not installed the culverts in Elk Road, the Ranch would have either paid someone else to do it or they would be doing it now in an effort to save the surface on Elk Road. He felt the Board should realize that the Ranch has benefitted from those culverts, regardless of the situation.

MOTION: Tom Deaver made a motion to allow Ted Barnes and Bob Burdette to enter into negotiations with Sheldon Smith, the attorney representing Whiskey River Trucking, to resolve the matter. Bruce Hutchinson seconded the motion.

Bob Burdette requested that the Board put a dollar cap on the authority the Board was extending him to negotiate. Mr. Hutchinson pointed out that in his proposal, Mr. Foster suggested negotiating an amount up to the requested amount of \$5,000.

Mr. Deaver amended his motion that the negotiated amount be no more than what is stated in the demand letter, or less.

Mr. Heath suggested that the Board request a letter from Kip O'Brien releasing the Owners Association from any obligation by saying that any work done on Pine Meadow Ranch has been paid for either by the Owners Association or by Whiskey. Mr. Foster remarked that historically Kip has been honorable and fair to the Ranch. However, he was not opposed to a letter insuring that Whiskey has cleared all accounts with Kip in the Associations name.

Mr. Burdette assumed Whiskey still considered the \$960 check that he was holding as a separate issue from the \$5,000 demand for Elk Road. Mr. Foster clarified that the \$960 check needed a stop payment. Whatever offer the Board makes through Ted

Barnes would be a final offer.

Mr. Foster summarized the motion on the floor. The motion was to authorize Bob Burdette to work with Ted Barnes to make a final offer to Whiskey River Trucking, to a maximum cost to the Ranch of up to, but not more, than the amount stated in the demand letter from Sheldon Smith. He believed that amount was approximately \$5,000. In closing the account, they need to insure that the Pine Meadow Ranch accounts with Kip O'Brien are paid in full and that there is no lingering debt.

Mr. Foster asked Carol to clarify that the Ranch accounts have been separated from Whiskey River Trucking to avoid further liability with Contech.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Burdette stated that once the issue is settled, he would email the Board members with the final results.

Monthly Budget Review

Mr. Burdette reviewed a list of unpaid bills totaling \$8,629. He noted that the bill from KGC Associates was higher than normal, because it included the yearly invoicing and they have been receiving more payments. Carol had reported that more people were paying by credit card over the phone, which is the fastest way for the Association to receive their money. Mr. Burdette stated that the \$465 bill from Wheeler Machinery were the service manuals for the grader. The cost was approximately half of what they expected. Mr. Burdette remarked that the service manuals will allow Jody Robinson to perform service on the grader, and the savings would far exceed the cost of the manual.

Mr. Burdette referred to the invoice from Sam Skaling, which was discussed at the meeting last month. He noted that Mr. Skaling had resubmitted a bill with the correct hourly rates. The new charge of \$295 had already been drafted from the account and paid to Mr. Skaling.

MOTION: Bob Burdette made a motion to pay all the bills presented in the amount of \$8,629. Sue Larsen seconded the motion.

Mr. Heath stated that Scot Erickson told him earlier that day that Sam Skaling had not yet been paid. Mr. Burdette remarked that he had authorized Carol to issue a bank draft. The bank draft was dated February 3rd and Mr. Skaling had received his money.

Mr. Burdette pointed out that Mr. Skaling had not submitted a bill for plowing in January.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Assignments Review

Mr. Foster stated that he and Mr. Robinson had talked about purchasing a light rack for the truck to make Mr. Robinson more visible on the road. Mr. Robinson recalled that the cost was approximately \$334.

MOTION: Scott Clausen made a motion to authorize \$400 for Jody Robinson to purchase a light rack for the truck. Mr. Deaver seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Burdette asked for an update on the sand piles. Mr. Robinson stated that they are still above half of what they purchased and it should last through the winter. He has not had to call Geary Construction for any sanding. Mr. Burdette commented on the amount of money that was saved by purchasing equipment that enables Jody to do the work.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Owners Association Board adjourned at 8:30 p.m.
