

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS ASSOCIATION
RANCH MANAGER'S OFFICE
ARAPAHOE DRIVE
PARK CITY, UTAH
AUGUST 25, 2009

In Attendance: Hutch Foster, Dan Heath, Bob Burdette, Scott Clausen, George Ramjoue, Scot Erickson, Duane Yamashiro, Suzanne Larsen, Jennifer Kanzler,

Excused: Amy Jackson, Bruce Hutchinson

Ex Officio: Jody Robinson

Guests: Larry Holt, Lot PI-C-7; Gaylene Woodruff, Lot PI-C-7; Ted Bonnitt, Lot E-56; Bryan Owen; Lot FM-D105; Honey Parker, FM-D-138; Charles Goldstein; Lot FM-C-62; Joann Curran, Lot FM-C-19; Jane Goldstein, Lot FM-C-62; Laura Thorne, FM-B-29; Mike Lloyd, PI-D-45

Hutch Foster called the meeting to order at 6:39 p.m.

Approval of Minutes - July 28, 2009

MOTION: Bob Burdette made a motion to ACCEPT the minutes as written. Dan Heath seconded the motion.

Hutch Foster noted that the original draft of the minutes contained an error indicating that the SSD was dissolved in 1990. That was corrected to 1999 and was reflected in the current version of the minutes.

Mr. Foster referred to page 3 of the minutes, under Valley View Road Repair, and noted that the discussion was about road repair on Arapaho and not Valley View.

Mr. Foster corrected the minutes to reflect that Jody Robinson is the Battalion Chief at the Coalville Station and not the County Chief as stated in the minutes.

MOTION: Bob Burdette amended his motion to ACCEPT the minutes as corrected. Dan Heath seconded the amended motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Owner/Visitor Open Forum

Mr. Foster called for comment on items not scheduled on the regular agenda.

Ted Bonnitt, Lot E-56

Ted commented on previous discussions regarding the building boom that had occurred over the past few years and the future of the Ranch in terms of build out. He questioned if every lot is completely built out, would the Ranch be sustainable and how would it affect the quality of life and their overall investment. He asked if they had evolved to a point where everyone needed to be responsible for the direction of the Ranch and where it is going. Ted had investigated a number of ways for taking on that responsibility, recognizing that every property owner has the right to build on their property. He had investigated smart growth policies, which included land conservation, and found several non-profit conservancy organizations in Utah that are designed to help people promote, maintain and secure open lands. He thought it would be favorable to protect the moose and the wildlife and keep the mountain character of the Ranch.

Ted understood that the Ranch Owners Association owned a number of lots and there has been concern over the cost of maintaining those lots and that they should be sold. In speaking with the County Assessor, he was told that the County would reduce the assessment to a \$1,000 per lot for anyone who chooses to put a permanent conservation easement on their lot instead of building on their lot. That would reduce the taxes to \$1 per year. Ted stated that he had preliminary discussions with Bob Burdette about waving the yearly fees on those lots that choose the conservation easement. Ted pointed out that the actual carrying charge for lots with a conservation easement would be reduced to zero, other than the actual purchase of the lot. He remarked that two years ago real estate was going strong, but that is no longer the case and several lots are for sale. He felt this was an opportunity to make a change for the future. Ted explained that Federal funds are available to help support this movement. An example of how it would benefit everyone was provided. He stated that if the Board is interested in taking control of their vision, they need to begin thinking of ways to do it. If there truly is a concern regarding the cost of maintaining lots owned by the Ranch Owners Association, he felt this would be an opportunity for the Board to take the lead and demonstrate altruistic land conservation to other property owners on the Ranch.

In response to a question about whether the open space could be converted into a picnic area or park, Ted replied that it could be trails or other open space uses. Bob Burdette remarked that conserved land could not have a permanent structure. A collection of picnic tables and a water spigot would not be considered permanent structures that violate the conservancy easement. Mr. Burdette stated that when Ted first approached him, the lot that first came to mind was the field above the two parking lots. It would reduce the property tax on that land to \$20 per year instead of \$3,000 per year, and while he definitely favors saving money, he questioned whether or not he was in favor of binding that property so it could never be developed.

Mr. Burdette had requested a copy of the tax valuations on various parcels and

suggested that the Board look at keeping some of those parcels as open space for the future. They need to consider if a trail system throughout the mountain would be a benefit. Mr. Burdette also suggested the possibility of trading a prime lot for a larger parcel somewhere else on the mountain, and make that as open space.

Ted stated that another option for people with several acres would be to build on a portion of the lot and put a conservation easement on the remaining acreage. The property owner would pay full assessment on the developed portion and the taxes on the remaining acreage would be reduced. He was told that if the property owner ever reversed the easement, they would have to pay back taxes.

Mr. Foster remarked that an easement would be reversible if they worked only through the County Assessor. However, if they put a third party audited conservation easement on a piece of land, it can never be reversed and development could never occur.

Mr. Foster felt this was an interesting discussion that should be scheduled as an agenda item for another meeting. Mr. Burdette suggested that for the next meeting they provide a map marking which parcels the Owners Association owns and which parcels other property owners would like to consider for an easement on their property. Mr. Foster thought the Ranch survey for wildlife conservation would be valuable information to include for this process. Mr. Burdette believed the matter deserved further study. Mr. Foster agreed.

Lot SS-BDY-15-1

Dan Heath recalled a previous discussion regarding an appraisal on Lot SS-BDY-15-1 after first seeing if anyone was interested in purchasing the property. It is the unbuildable lot on the far west end of the Ranch. Mr. Heath had contacted three of the people whose property abuts this land and all of them were interested. As expected, their decision would be based on price. Mr. Heath presented emails from the owners of Lot PI-25 and PI-23. He was unable to communicate with the owner of Lot PI-24. The owner of PI-18 was not sure if they were interested. He pointed out that if the photo was accurate, that property owner had actually built on SS-BDY-15-1.

Dan Heath suggested a motion to set aside \$450 to have Lot SS-BDY-15-1 appraised so they could begin negotiations with adjacent property owners. Currently, the Ranch Owners Association is paying \$800 per month for unusable land. In addition, it could provide the opportunity to clear up boundary issues that go back many years. Mr. Foster thought they might also need to pay for a survey.

Mr. Burdette noted that the County was showing the proposed property tax at \$904 for

the current year, with an assessed value of \$132,000. It was unclear as to whether the \$132,000 was market value. Mr. Foster understood that the building permit for the lot in question has been removed and the lot has been deemed unbuildable. Based on that information, he wanted to know why the property value could not be immediately reduced to \$1,000 and eliminate the tax bill. Mr. Heath offered to speak with the County on that issue.

Mr. Heath felt an appraisal should be their first step to see if the adjacent neighbors are even interested in negotiating a price. If they are not interested, there is no point in having a survey. Mr. Burdette thought a survey would still be necessary to find out if a property owner has built on Association land.

Mr. Heath indicated a skinny piece of land approximately 75 feet that borders on four lots. He pointed to another 20 feet of open land that goes into the property of someone named Bacon, over in Stagecoach. He suggested that the Board look into obtaining that land for a right-of-way for the crash gate as a way to bypass Veterans.

MOTION: Dan Heath made a motion to set aside \$450 to pay for an appraisal on Lot SS-15-1. Scot Erickson seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Foster asked Mr. Heath to order the appraisal.

ECC Plan Review

Ted Bonnitt stated that he was adding a garage and storage to his home that was built eight years ago. He had reviewed the plans with his area representative, Duane Yamashiro, and with Hutch Foster. He believed they understood that his intent was to make the addition look like it was built with the original house. It will conform with the brown roof and the original stained, rough hewn siding. Mr. Bonnitt was in the process of budgeting his project and preferred to wait until he knows the exact cost before giving the Board his final plans.

Mr. Foster stated that the Board could give preliminary approval this evening; however that approval would not be valid until the final plans are submitted.

Mr. Foster asked about the square footage. Mr. Bonnitt replied that he would be adding 1600 square feet to the size of his home. He noted that the intention is to roof the addition prior to the first snow. Mr. Foster pointed out that a future item for the Board is to re-visit the wording in the winter construction guidelines. He thought it was fair to say that anything beyond a contractor's pickup truck after Halloween would count as winter

building. He informed Ted that the deposit for an addition was \$2 per square foot with 50% of the deposit eligible for a refund at the discretion of the Board, if no additional impacts were incurred. He reminded Ted that no winter construction was allowed.

The Board was comfortable allowing Duane Yamashiro to finalize the paperwork when Ted is ready to begin construction.

MOTION: Duane Yamashiro made a motion to approve the drawings for an addition to Ted's home as proposed. George Ramjoue seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Water Board Update

Mr. Foster stated that he continued to be the default Water Board representative and would stay in that role until another Board member was available to relieve him.

Mr. Foster reported that the main concern with the Water Board is water source. All of the active sources are producing significantly lower than expected. Bob Cat well was recently scrubbed and it is producing approximately five gallons. The lower Tollgate well is running lower fairly slow and Uncle Toms is running slower than expected. The Water Company is researching options for additional sources. Mr. Foster noted that the Water Company is looking at a well on Aspen Ridge that may turn out to be useful.

Mr. Foster clarified that the lower production does not affect the water supply for current build out; but it would affect the potential for full build out. The Water Company is trying to plan for the future.

Mr. Heath asked if the Water Company thought the slower water flow was a result of six or seven years of drought. Mr. Foster stated that the drought was not mentioned in their discussion. They believe that most of the wells drilled high on the Ranch do not reach the higher producing aquifer at Oyster Ridge. Oyster Ridge passes through the Ranch at a fairly steep angle and the higher you drill on the Ranch, the more distance it takes to reach it. The hydro-geologist thinks the aquifer runs a little below the Ranch, which is why the Water Company is more hopeful about some of the lower wells. Mr. Foster remarked that Salt Box is being considered again.

Mr. Foster noted that owners had attended the Water Board Meeting to request one-time reductions for excess usage charges. He was unsure how to recommend that all property owners keep track of front street bibs and make sure they are closed and not leaking. He pointed out that if the greenest spot in your yard is around the yard hydrant, that would indicate a problem. He noted that one person had used 200,000

gallons in a month period. He stated that excessive usage not only affects a personal water bill, it also drains the water tank.

Old Business

Plow Loop Proposal - Continued

Honey Parker, Lot FM-D-138, stated that this proposal was mentioned in two previous meetings. The proposal is to plow an emergency connection between the Pine Meadow side and the Forest Meadow side in the winter to allow two exits in the event of an emergency and one exit is blocked. Ms. Parker noted that the Board had requested that the neighbors put the numbers together and come back for further discussion. They returned at the last meeting with those numbers and started the conversation. However, the agenda was long and they ran out of time. They have come back this evening to continue that discussion.

Ms. Parker reported that for several years the owners on the Forest Meadow side have absorbed the cost for plowing the connection. Last year they did not have the funds and the exit remained closed. Fortunately they did not have an emergency, but they cannot count on that every year. Ms. Parker noted that during the winter a number of people who do not live on the Ranch come up to recreate. Many of those people are not prepared with the proper tires or vehicles and they get stuck and block the road. All of these conditions prompted them to look for a second exit.

Ms. Parker presented two options, both starting on Arapaho and plowing from the Tower House up and over Valley View, which is the shorter route that had been kept open. She noted that the road gets wind blown so the plowing needs to be kept up. She stated that going off the most expensive year, it would cost approximately \$6,000 to keep the road open in the worst case scenario.

Ms. Parker stated that another route considered started at the Tower House going up Arapaho, bearing to the left, and taking it to Forest Meadow Road. Even though that route is longer, it is not wind drifted, which makes it easier to keep plowed. Ms. Parker pointed out that this road has not been plowed open; however, they have talked to people on that road and over 50% agree to have the road plowed. After looking at the worst case scenario and comparable lengths of road, Catherine had estimated the cost at \$11,000.

Ms. Parker reminded the Board members of the number of people who attended the last meeting to support this proposal. She pointed out that several people had attended again this evening to emphasize the importance of this proposal. Ms. Parker stated that someone who lives up there has a blower and another person with a blade is ready

to be used as backup to help with this effort. Ms. Parker distributed copies of a handout showing the cost and routes.

Mr. Burdette asked if the \$6,000 and \$11,000 calculations included a per hour cost. Mr. Erickson stated that it was calculated on cost per hour with blowing and plowing. He believed it was based on \$60 per hour for a plow and \$80 per hour for a blower. Mr. Foster remarked that those costs were the going rate on the Ranch.

Sam Stanley, the owner of an SS Lot, stated that he has a blower and blade and he plans on clearing the road for the . He asked if he needed full coverage insurance. Mr. Foster clarified that this proposal was still in discussion. If the Board chooses to move forward, Sam could find detailed snow plowing requirements on line. One of the requirements is to secure a liability policy and name the Owners Association as protected on the policy.

Mr. Erickson wanted to know how the Board members felt about the costs that came in and what they feel they can support. He pointed out that the \$11,000 cost was for the road that was considered undriveable due to the water project in the Spring. Mr. Erickson suggested that it may be a good route eventually, but he was not convinced it was the best route to start.

Mr. Ramjoue asked Sam if the service would be suspended if the cost exceeds the allotted amount. Sam stated that he would plan to keep plowing. In the event of an unusual week, he would work with the .

Mike Lloyd, a property owner and president of PMEEF, stated that he served as a Board member for years and he was frustrated over the number of times this discussion has been tabled. It goes back to a time before most of the current members were on the Board. Surveys have been done and proposals have been presented. He encouraged the Board members to make a decision.

Mr. Burdette explained that the Board tabled this matter because they were seeking additional facts that were important for making an informed decision. He was grateful that the issue was raised several months ago because it allowed the time needed to search for the facts. Mr. Burdette felt the Board was closer to making a decision.

Mr. Heath asked Mr. Burdette if the Owners Association was in a financial position to consider this proposal and what money they have to put towards it. Mr. Burdette replied that at the last meeting he requested time prepare a revised budget outlining the money they have left and the bills they are committed to pay. The money left would total approximately \$20,000. Mr. Burdette remarked that Jody Robinson had pointed out that a \$7,000 sander was not included in the bills to be paid. He believed the Board

was leaning towards approving the acquisition of the sander. If the sander is purchased, the remaining amount would be \$13,000. Mr. Burdette noted that an additional \$70,000 is set aside in an emergency fund. Mr. Burdette stated that out of the \$13,000 remaining if the sander is purchased, they were spending \$1300 today on attorney fees that was not included in the revised budget. He remarked that there would always be unexpected expenses. If the Board authorizes spending the entire \$13,000, he would have no "wiggle room" to cover unexpected contingencies.

Mr. Foster noted that two-thirds of the proposal being discussed would be budgeted for 2010. November and December are token snow removal months. The billing cycle would be January 30th through May 30th, 2010 and not the remainder of this year's budget.

Mr. Ramjouw asked if \$6,000 was a realistic number given the problems with the shorter route from the Tower House down. Ms. Parker explained that \$6,000 was the cost two years ago during a heavy winter. The numbers are based on the costs experienced during the worst winter.

Mr. Erickson clarified that the proposal does not suggest that the Board pay for another access all the way down to the highway. Those who have always paid for plowing the Forest Meadows side out of their own pocket would continue to make the loop. The Owners Association would only pay to plow up to and across Valley View Circle.

MOTION: Dan Heath made a motion to set aside \$6500 towards keeping an emergency road open from Forest Meadow. If additional money is required later, the Board would further review the matter at that time.

Mr. Erickson requested that the Board review the cost each month to track the proposed budget. Mr. Foster stated that if the Board moves forward, they would create their own subcontractor time sheet to legislate the necessary information. Sam and any other operators would be expected to deal directly with the Owners Association as contractors and not through any other plowing organization.

Scott Erickson seconded the motion.

Mr. Heath noted that when making the motion he had inadvertently said Forest Meadow.

Mr. Heath amended his motion to set aside \$6500 towards keeping an emergency road open from Arapaho to Valley View.

Mr. Burdette stated that he would add this expense as a new line item in the budget.

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association
Board Meeting
August 25, 2009
Page 9

Mr. Foster clarified that the Owner Association would pick up the cost of plowing from where the Arapaho maintenance discontinues on the inside and carry that maintenance to Valley View Circle.

Laura Thorne, asked if this effort would free up funds typically used on Tollgate Canyon. Mr. Foster thought it could, but felt they needed to address this proposal on its own merits. If things change in the future, they may find themselves with additional money.

VOTE: The motion passed with two votes against the motion.

Scott Clausen liked the idea but he was concerned about the cost. Mr. Burdette could not understand why they would approve a motion at a cost greater than what was requested.

Mr. Erickson stated that his reason for requesting monthly cost reviews was to track the expense with an end point of \$6500. Mr. Burdette noted that the evidence presented with the proposal indicated that \$6,000 was a maximum cost at worst case scenario. He believed that if \$6500 is allocated in the motion, they would see the cost rise to that amount.

Mr. Foster stated that unless a new motion was made to override the previous motion, it would stand as voted.

Mr. Ramjoue did not think the amount exceeding \$6,000 was significant enough to make a change.

Fire Awareness

Mr. Foster announced that on Saturday a Fire Awareness event would be held at the gravel pit at 1:00 p.m. He encouraged everyone to attend to show the County that Pine Meadow Ranch is serious about safety.

Architectural Guidelines

Mr. Foster stated that he had found the missing guidelines document they have been searching for. It is nothing more than a one paragraph statement of vague guidelines. However, it is something they could use to begin evaluating the direction they want to take.

He would bring the document to the next meeting to begin their discussion.

Ranch Managers Report

Equipment Status

Jody reported that the grader was repaired. The motor was changed on the turntable and the solenoid was replaced. The dump truck was running great with the exception of leaking seals that needed to be checked.

Projects completed or in-progress

Jody stated that he had laid gravel on Pine Loop to repair areas that had been torn up. He had repaired rugged spots on one end of Forgotten Lane. He obtained metal for a sander frame for when they purchase a sander.

Mr. Foster recalled that the Board had authorized the sander purchase in the past. Mr. Burdette did not believe the Board had voted on a motion to purchase the sander. However, he understood that part of the approval to purchase the truck also included equipment for the truck to make it usable year-round. The sander was one of those pieces of equipment. He noted that the Briggs is a 6 horsepower sander and the Honda is 7 horsepower. The difference in cost was approximately \$1,000. Mr. Burdette suggested that the Board have a discussion and make a motion on the sander.

Jody clarified that the Briggs sander is 10 horsepower and the Honda is 11 horsepower. He felt it was obvious that a Honda would outperform a Briggs sander ten to one. The cost of the Honda is \$6,999. The Briggs is \$5,999. Both prices include installation and materials.

MOTION: Scott Erickson made a motion to purchase the \$7,000 Honda Sander. George Ramjoue seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Culverts

Mr. Foster stated that he and Jody had discussed putting in two culverts on the Ranch. One is on Alexander, which would be a fairly large culvert. A considerable amount of water cuts through the lower part of the road and makes it impassable each season. Because of how it crosses power and the fact that the water company recently came through, he had asked Jed, from JE Excavation to submit a bid for installing that culvert. If an excavator installs it, any mishaps with power would be covered under their insurance. For safety reasons, Mr. Foster was more comfortable subbing out that culvert. Mr. Foster stated that another culvert on Navaho needs to be dug and redone

and Jody is capable to do that culvert. The cost of the culvert would be the only expense.

Mr. Foster reported that Jody was able to track down a high pressure water pump for the trailer at little or no cost to the Ranch. With that piece of equipment added to the trailer, the trailer will have the pressure to clean culverts. The pump would also have a suction line so it can be filled from the ponds on the Ranch and not just from hydrants.

New Business

Mr. Foster reported that a number of people on the Ranch were motivated to talk about fire safety issues late this summer. It did not come through the Board, however, the fire safety representatives, Alan Powell and Sarah West were involved. Mr. Foster stated that he and Dan Heath were involved in the discussion process and the meeting was spearheaded by Ted Bonnitt. He thanked Ted for keeping up the energy on fire safety programs.

Mr. Foster summarized that the crux of the discussion was to plan an educational event. He reiterated his previous announcement about the Fire Awareness Event on Saturday at 1:00 p.m. Most of the regional emergency entities were planning to attend and bring their equipment. At 2:00 p.m. Air Med will bring in a helicopter. The event is being funded through generous donations. The only expenditure incurred by the Owner Association were copies of the fire safety protocol to be distributed to owners at the event.

Mr. Bonnitt explained that the goal for this event is to spearhead an awareness of the options and resources available for fire emergencies and emergencies in general. The short term goal is to get working on the reverse 911 Emergency Alert System and to encourage people to sign up for email to the website for more specific information. The longer term goal is to address the lack of evacuation routes on the mountain. Mr. Bonnitt commented on options that have been considered and he believed there could be a long term objective over the next year to establish one or two alternatives to evacuate the Ranch. The Sheriff, C.E.R.T, and other County Officials are on board with helping them accomplish these goals.

Dumpsters

Gaylene Woodruff, Lot PI-C-7 expressed concern regarding the condition of the dumpsters. She has taken license plate numbers on some people but she was unsure if anything had been done.

Mr. Foster explained that the dumpsters are on Ranch property. Anyone who dumps

outside the dumpsters can be pursued as dumping on land. Owners Association can use that recourse to address the problem. The people who abuse the dumpster by putting in construction waste and other prohibited materials are outside of the Association's area of authority because the dumpsters are a provision from Summit County. Unless Summit County or Allied Waste is interested in pursuing who dumps illegally, there is nothing they can do.

Ms. Woodruff clarified that she was talking about the couch and the lawn mowers that were left on the ground. Mr. Foster stated that those dumping on the ground could be pursued by the Owners Association. Because they are not law enforcement, it is difficult to use license plates and they would need to see if the Sheriff's Department was interested in working with them on that matter.

Scot Erickson noted that the Board has discussed mitigation factors, which included constructing an enclosure around the dumpster and realigning the road. He believed mitigation measures would help clean up the area; however, the Board has not had the budget to pursue it.

Someone commented on the church dumping their bags in the dumpster when they leave. Mr. Foster stated that the church is supposed to take their trash with them, but when they leave the dumpsters are completely full. He noted that if the dumpsters are full before pick-up day, they can call Allied Waste and they will come and empty the dumpsters.

Monthly Budget

Bob Burdette reviewed the list of unpaid bills, totaling \$8,357.85. He proposed to pay all the bills presented this evening. Mr. Burdette noted that the Clyde Snow Session and Swenson bill for \$1244 related to issues surrounding the annexation agreement, the SSD Statutes and the Bertignole case, as well as a meeting with Ted at the gravel pit.

In response to a question about the annexation, Mr. Burdette explained that the attorney, Ted Barnes had drafted an annexation agreement. When someone wants to annex into the Ranch, they must sign the annexation agreement, which binds them to the CC&R's of the Owners Association.

Mr. Burdette noted that \$144 for Clyde Snow Session and Swenson was for collection of bad debts.

Mr. Burdette noted that the \$27.25 for Home Depot was strictly late fees on the account. He remarked that their account with Home Depot is set up for charges, but it

does not get to Carol in time to be put into the system for payment. The payment is then extended to the next Board meeting.

MOTION: Bob Burdette made a motion to APPROVE payment for all the bills outlined. Dan Heath seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Foster asked what they could do about the Home Depot bill to avoid late charges. Mr. Burdette stated that the billing date is the 18th of the month, which is after the scheduled Board meeting the end of the month. He noted that Carol would contact Home Depot to see if the billing date could be moved to the 5th of each month. The suggestion was made for Carol to explain the circumstances and ask if the late fee could be waived. Mr. Foster asked that Carol handle the Home Depot billing issues.

Mr. Foster noted that a CAT 5 line would be run from the Water Company router to Jody's computer so he could use his email at the office and have the ability to do other communications and research. The Owners Association would pay a fraction of the Water Company's Catapultion bill. A number had not been negotiated but he estimated paying approximately \$20 of the \$80 monthly charge.

Mr. Burdette stated that he gets unlimited email access on his phone through T-mobile for \$20 per month. Mr. Foster suggested researching that possibility so they may not have to share the internet expense with the Water Company.

Area Representative Issues

Scott Erickson stated that the people at Trailside Park wanted to know their plans because they have not been using their facility for their meetings. He told them that they would be meeting at the Ranch in September and start at Trailside Park in October. They did not need to make a definite decision this evening, but he would like to let them know.

Suzanne offered to contact the Library for meeting possibilities. Mr. Burdette stated that he would have a conflict arriving on time for the next three meetings. He teaches a class on Tuesday nights and would not be able to arrive until 8:00 p.m. Meeting in the Valley for those three months would help him with timing.

Suzanne asked if there was a preference for using Millcreek over Trailside Park. Mr. Foster and Mr. Heath preferred Millcreek. Mr. Burdette pointed out that Millcreek was scheduled to be torn down in six months. Mr. Ramjoue asked if there was a library facility that was easily accessed of the freeway. The suggestion was made to check the

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association
Board Meeting
August 25, 2009
Page 14

Sprague City Library in Sugar House. Mr. Foster preferred to alternate on-Ranch and off-Ranch meetings during the winter. He suggested researching the availability of meeting sites options for discussion at the next meeting. The Board agreed to continue with the once a month meeting schedule.

Mr. Clausen asked if Jody was going to fix the road with wind rows before the winter. Jody replied that he intended to work on that road as soon as the church camp was finished.

Mr. Foster stated that he would be in the hospital on September 22, which is the date of their next meeting. Mr. Heath stated that he was also unable to attend on September 22. The Board agreed to move the meeting to September 15th.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association adjourned at 8:19 p.m.
