

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS ASSOCIATION  
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING  
RANCH MANAGER'S OFFICE  
PINE MEADOW RANCH WINTER PARKING LOT  
MAY 20, 2014

Board Members: Tony Tyler – President; Dan Heath – Vice President; Pat Kreis – Treasurer; Honey Parker – Secretary; Matt Brown (Area 1); Jeremy Jespersen (Area 2), Alan Powell (Area 3), Tom Deaver (Area 4); Mark Hodgson (Area 5); Mike Gonzales (Area 6); Nick Boyle (Area 7)

Ex Officio: Jody Robinson, Ranch Manager

Guests: Paula Lee, Lot E-65; Paul Kroge, Lot E-65; Christopher Lee, Lot E-65; Don Kreis, Lot F-23, Evelyn Wilson Lot D-178; Greg Pack Lot FM-D-87-B; Ken Smith, Lot A-59.

Tony Tyler called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

#### **Approval of Minutes – April 15, 2014**

MOTION: Honey Parker moved to APPROVE the minutes of April 15, 2014 as written. Pat Kreis seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Tony Tyler, Tom Deaver and Dan Heath abstained from the vote.

#### **Owner/Visitor Open Forum and Owner Communications**

Mr. Tyler reported on communication he received from Evelyn Wilson, Lot D-178, on Porcupine Circle, which is the small section that splits off from Porcupine Loop. They were experiencing mud issues and requested that the Board address the road in their area. Mr. Tyler stated that the road goes up and there is a section that the HOA maintains and the road itself is the responsibility of the HOA. To his knowledge that road has never been worked on.

Mr. Tyler had spoken with Jody and the road immediately needs 3" minus road base. Jody stated that it also needs gravel and ditching. They would also need to plan for culverts. Ms. Wilson commented on the need for small culverts on Porcupine Loop as well. Mr. Tyler informed Ms. Wilson that the Board would discuss it later in the agenda when they talk about summer road projects.

#### **New Construction and Additions**

Mr. Tyler stated that plans for construction need to be submitted one week prior to the meeting so the Board has time to review them. If they are not received a week prior, it

will not be scheduled on the agenda. He understood that Alan Powell was still receiving information from the owners of Lot PI-1, and the Board was in a situation of having a partially complete set of plans with no draft Lot Improvement Plan Agreement. Mr. Tyler understood that the construction window is limited and people want to start construction, but the Board needs time to properly review the plans to make sure it complies.

Submitting plans one week prior to the meeting was listed on the Construction Checklist, but Mr. Tyler would post it as a separate notice on the website. Ms. Parker stated that she would post it on Facebook.

Mr. Tyler was willing to review the plans submitted for this meeting.

#### Lot PI-1

Alan Powell passed around a photo. The owner, Mike Caputo, was building a garage for their off-road equipment. The colors would be the same as the house they built a few years ago on Elk. He showed a photo of the house. The roof would be steel and the siding will be standard cedar or Hardy Board painted brown. Mr. Caputo would mail the \$6,000 impact fee directly to Carol. He would bring the signed Lot Improvement Agreement to Mr. Powell this weekend. At this point no utilities were planned for the garage.

Mr. Tyler stated that the Board would have to look at the Hardy Board siding. He noted that Hardy Plank siding has to be specified in a wood grain and applied in a traditional wood siding style. Mr. Tyler asked Mr. Powell to follow up on the exterior materials.

MOTION: Tony Tyler moved to approve the garage for Mike Caputo, Lot PI-1 with the following conditions: 1) The exterior siding material and roofing are clarified to Alan Powell and that he approves and signs off on them. 2) Receipt of the signed Lot Improvement Plan Agreement. 3) Receipt of the \$6,000 impact fee, which will be sent directly to Carol. Dan Heath seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### Lot PI-E-65

Mr. Deaver had sent documents and plans to the Board. He reviewed the exterior materials. The roof will be dark gray standing seam metal. The siding is fir wood panel stained with semi-transparent cedar stain. Mr. Deaver presented the site plan and survey and noted that it meets the setback.

Mr. Tyler asked Ms. Lee for the location of the water line, the septic tank and the electric line. Ms. Lee stated that they were in the process of hiring a contractor to do the septic design. Everything has been approved by Summit County except for the septic. Based on the perc test, she was fairly certain where it would be located. Ms. Lee reviewed the site plan to show the location of the cabin and the septic. Mr. Tyler informed Ms. Lee that the Board does not approve the location, but they require that it be shown on the plan. Ms. Lee noted that there is an existing septic tank on the lot that will have to be collapsed. The new septic would be located in the same general area.

Ms. Lee had submitted the signed Lot Improvement Plan and the water letter. Mr. Tyler thanked Ms. Lee for providing a complete set of plans. Mr. Deaver noted that there was no gas line and asked if the house would be all electric. Ms. Lee answered yes. They would have a wood burning stove and electric baseboard heaters. She noted that it would not be their permanent residence. Mr. Deaver suggested that Ms. Lee talk with the plumber about installing convenient drain lines so they can drain all their lines when they leave for the winter.

MOTION: Tom Deaver moved to approve the construction plans for PI-E-65. Alan Powell seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### Lot FM-D-87-B-AM

The Board reviewed the plans for a garage. Mr. Tyler referred to the site plan and questioned the 14' dimension from the corner of the garage to the property line. The owner, Greg Pack stated that it was actually 15 feet and he already had his building permit. Mr. Tyler commented on the siding material, which is 3' high rusted metal wainscoting. He noted that the Board can regulate the percentage of metal on the siding and he asked for the overall siding area. The owner stated that he could do the calculation and make sure he did not exceed the allowed percentage. Mr. Pack asked if the Board ever allowed exceptions because his intent was to use the metal to keep the maintenance down during the winter. Mr. Deaver suggested that he count the garage doors and windows in the overall calculation.

Mr. Tyler stated that 7D in the Architectural Guidelines allows for a variance process at the discretion of the Board. Mr. Tyler remarked that the approval will be based on the calculation requirement. Mr. Tyler asked if there would be utilities. Mr. Pack stated that he may add power in the future, but nothing was planned for now. Mr. Tyler stated that based on \$1.20/square foot for a dry building, the impact fee was \$1425.60. Mr. Pack

also needed to provide a signed Lot Improvement Plan Agreement.

MOTION: Mr. Tyler moved to approve the new garage for Lot FM-D-87-B-AM as presented with the clarification that the rusted metal wainscoting cannot exceed 10% of the exterior siding material as a whole. The other materials as defined are acceptable. The impact fee calculation is based on 1296 square feet at \$1.20/square foot for a total of \$1425.60. Approval was also conditioned upon a signed Lot Improvement Agreement with the details given to Matt Brown, the area rep, as well as a check for the impact fee. Tom Deaver seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### SS-144-A

Matt Brown was the owner. The Board reviewed the plans at the last meeting and Mr. Tyler sent their questions to Mr. Brown. Mr. Brown stated that he still needed to submit the Lot Improvement Plan, colors and siding choices. The design was exactly the same. He hoped to have that information to Mr. Tyler within the week.

Mr. Tyler stated that once Mr. Brown submits the missing items the Board could vote on his plans electronically.

#### **North Summit Fire District**

Mr. Tyler had not taken the time to review the land lease agreement. However, Ted Barnes, the attorney, would be reviewing it anyway. Mr. Tyler wanted to review the terms of the agreement so the Board could provide direction to Ted Barnes so they could come up with a land lease agreement suitable for everyone. Mr. Tyler stated that the Fire District plans to build a permanent structure on the Ranch at some point. He and Ken Smith have talked about the Fire District potentially purchasing land across from the garage house by the old runway. It's a flat piece of ground in the center of the Ranch. The ground is owned by the HOA and the Fire District would be purchasing it from the HOA. However, in the interim, the Fire District wants to construct a building to enclose their equipment so they have the ability to service the District until the permanent building is constructed.

Mr. Tyler stated that the proposed building does not meet the HOA Architectural Guidelines. However, the lot, although owned by the HOA, is not actually part of the HOA and is not impacted by its covenants. Mr. Tyler noted that it was common for back of house type services that have to occur in neighborhoods, and a lot of times those buildings do not meet the architectural guidelines. The HOA has the ability to grant a

variance, but it would not be necessary because the land is not subject to the CC&Rs.

Mr. Tyler believed the initial location was intended to be the location of the guard shed. Mr. Tyler explained why he thought it was the best location for the HOA to build a long-term maintenance facility for the Ranch. The Board and Ken Smith discussed potential options for a building that would meet both the needs of the Ranch and the Fire District. Mr. Tyler stated that he would work with Ken Smith and Jody regarding a concept plan.

Mr. Tyler pointed out that the fire station would be a major benefit for the Ranch, which was why they were basically giving the land to the Fire District for \$1 per year for a three year term, with the ability for extensions by mutual agreement. He believed it was a straightforward lease agreement, but it would be reviewed by Ted Barnes.

Mr. Deaver wanted to know what would happen if the Fire District ends up not building a permanent structure. Mr. Tyler replied that the lease term would expire in three years and the Fire District would have to remove the building or the Ranch could keep it. There is no provision for reimbursement. Ken Smith explained that the terms of the lease he generated gives the homeowners the right of first refusal to pay fair market value to purchase the improvements that were put on the land. Secondly, in the event that no agreement takes places, the Fire District has 180 days to remove any improvements.

**MOTION:** Tom Deaver made a motion to approve the lease agreement electronically after it has been reviewed by Ted Barnes. Dan Heath seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed.

### **Ranch Manager's Report**

Jody reported that the grader was in good shape. The dump truck was being repaired. Mr. Tyler noted that the cost to rebuild the entire rear axle on the dump truck was \$1797.29. The tractor was scheduled to be repaired this week.

Jody reported that he was starting to grade roads. Ms. Parker would post on Facebook and the website to pull the rebar and the snow markers. The posts should also ask people to clear the upper parking lot from any trailers, snowmobiles, snow machines and cars. Parking in the upper lot is not allowed during the summer.

Jody stated that Cody had started yesterday and he would be spraying weeds per the Summit County ordinance.

## **Water Company Report**

Mr. Tyler had attended the Water Company Board Meeting. The Water Company has a set amount of funds they intend to use to improve the lower sections of Tollgate Road. There have been multiple meetings with engineers and Summit County to make sure that whatever is done on the lower section of Tollgate is acceptable to some form of Summit County standards. Mr. Tyler pointed out that neither Tollgate Canyon Road and Forest Meadow Road do not meet current County Codes, and there is no way to make them meet County Codes. The scope of the project is to widen Tollgate Canyon Road and to put up retaining walls where necessary and asphalt the lower section.

Mr. Tyler stated that Summit County has asked them to revisit the location of Forest Meadows Road where it intersects with Tollgate Canyon Road to come up with a design that minimizes the grade of the road. The County has indicated a willingness to help with some of the cost and/or labor for that particular section. Due to timing constraints, it may or may not happen this year. Improving Tollgate has to be done this summer, otherwise, the Water Company could lose the money.

Mr. Tyler presented a copy of the permanent easement agreement between the Pine Meadow Water Company and Fred Bacon, who has the very top lot in the Stagecoach Estates directly off of A-Plat. The easement provides a permanent non-exclusive evacuation route from Pine Meadows and to Pine Meadows for Tollgate or for Stagecoach. He oriented the Board to the location. He clarified that it was for evacuation purposes only. It is a major benefit to the Ranch and it should not be abused. Mr. Tyler did not want anyone from the HOA to ever be on Mr. Bacon's land unless the Mountain is on fire.

Mr. Tyler noted that the easement also includes a potential for a pipeline for water, and the connection is Mountain Regional. If an agreement is ever made with Mountain Regional, they now have the ability to connect to them. Mr. Tyler stated that no matter how many wells are drilled on the Ranch, it would never produce enough water to service all the lots on the Ranch. At some point it will be necessary to connect to a larger water system.

## **New Business**

### Street Signs/Entrance Signs

Mr. Tyler stated that when the lower section of Tollgate Canyon Road is redone, the map, and all signs at the bottom will be removed. He believed this was an opportunity for the HOA to start with a clean slate and establish a signage plan for nice looking,

logical signs. Ms. Parker volunteered to help with a signage plan. Mr. Tyler recalled budgeting to purchase two-sided road signs this year for the entire Ranch. The cost was under \$10,000 and he thought it was something to consider. Clear road signs contribute to the safety factor and it unifies their signage system. Mr. Tyler stated that the signs would be color-coded to identify specific routes.

Mr. Tyler had been approached by owners suggesting that the HOA establish requirements for uniform real estate signs. Some of the Board members were uncomfortable being too specific about private real estate signs. The signs are temporary and come down when the property sells.

A Board member suggested adding a nicer welcome sign at the bottom once the roadwork is completed, and he volunteered to help with fundraising if necessary to pay for the sign.

#### Summit County Tax Sale

Mr. Tyler reported that one lot within Pine Meadow Ranch was listed to be auctioned for sale on Thursday. He understood that the owner always pays his taxes the day before the sale to keep his lot from being auctioned. However, if the property is auctioned at the tax sale the Ranch lien is wiped out and the HOA loses their money. Mr. Tyler suggested that if the lot goes for sale, the HOA should bid on it to purchase the lot and ensure the lien. They could then sell the lot.

Mr. Heath noted that this particular owner purchased junk lots and he assumed the lot was not a buildable lot of record. Mr. Tyler remarked that the HOA has a vested interest in the homeowners themselves, and he thought most of the property owners would be interested in using community money to purchase a lot and never build on. Ms. Parker asked about the amount of the lien versus the cost to purchase the lot. Mr. Tyler recalled that the tax owed was approximately \$3400. He believed the lien amount was within the same dollar amount. He thought the cost to purchase the lot would be higher than \$3400, and if the bidding gets too high it would not be worth it.

Mr. Tyler planned to attend the tax sale regardless. If the lot was still for sale, he could bid for the property on behalf of the HOA, if the Board authorized him to do so with a set limit on the amount. The caveat is that the purchase has to be paid on the day of the sale. Mr. Gonzales wanted to know which specific lot was for sale. Mr. Deaver stated that if the HOA purchased the lot, they could potentially sell it to the adjacent property owner to replat it into their existing lot to create a larger lot.

Ms. Parker asked Mr. Heath for his opinion from a realtors point of view. Mr. Heath

stated that if the property is unbuildable they would be purchasing a worthless lot. If the lot is buildable, they would have the opportunity to sell it and recoup their money.

Mr. Tyler pulled up the lot number on the tax sale and announced that the owner had paid the taxes and the lot was not longer for sale.

#### Update on the Yurt – Lot PI-D-69

Mr. Tyler stated that when the Board last discussed the Yurt, the Board agreed that if the Yurt was not removed by this meeting on May 20<sup>th</sup>, they would set the fine structure. He noted that the Yurt was still up, but it was for sale. Mr. Gonzales recalled that the Board had already discussed the fee from the original deadline going forward.

Mr. Tyler pointed out that the fine would not become effective until the owner, Mr. Bethke, was actually out of compliance. He was given 90 days from the March meeting, which would be June. The Board was to set fines at the May meeting if the Yurt was not removed. The fine would begin in June if the Yurt was still standing.

The Board discussed the fee structure and at which point it should be retroactive. Mr. Tyler noted that the Board sent Mr. Bethke a notice of non-compliance on January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2013 by certified mail. The certified mail receipt shows that it was received on February 1, 2013. Ms. Kreis thought the retroactive date should be February 1, the date he received the letter. Mr. Tyler pointed out that the non-compliance letter was sent over a year ago in 2013.

Mr. Deaver thought the fine amount should be high enough to motivate Mr. Bethke to remove the Yurt.

Mr. Tyler read an excerpt from the minutes of the July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Board meeting, “The definition of the temporary use as of today, which is the date the Board agreed to revisit the issue from the April meeting, they would handle anything between that time and now, and have a decision ready for Mr. Bethke. A Yurt cannot be on the Mountain for more than 180 cumulative days per calendar year just like any other temporary structure on the Mountain”. Mr. Tyler thought July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2013 was the date they should begin calculating the 180 days, which would put the expiration date as January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014. Mr. Tyler believed the Board needed to be consistent with enforcement. He clarified that whatever they decide on the Yurt would set the precedent for all non-compliant temporary structures.

Ms. Parker stated that in addition to the fine, the Board was setting a precedent for giving an owner significant warning and allowing a significant grace period to come into



compliance. If Mr. Bethke had appreciated the leeway and removed the Yurt he would not have been fined.

Mr. Deaver stated that establishing a fine of \$30/day on an average of 30 days per month would result in a total of \$4,500 by June 16<sup>th</sup>. If the fine is reduced to \$25/day, the total would be 3,750. The monthly average would be \$700 at \$25/day, or \$900 at \$30/day. Mr. Tyler questioned whether \$900 per month was a high enough fee to deter people from being non-compliant. Mr. Powell assumed the Board would have the ability to establish a graduated fee structure and increase the fee after a certain time period if the temporary structure was still non-compliant. Mr. Tyler favored the idea of a graduated fee structure. He emphasized that it was important for the Board to be consistent in their enforcement for everyone in the future. Ms. Parker suggested increasing the fee every three months if there was still non-compliance. Mr. Tyler noted that under that scenario, based on the January 16<sup>th</sup> deadline, Mr. Bethke would be charged \$60/day rather than \$30/day. The Board concurred. Ms. Kreis thought it was important to make sure that whatever the Board decided was documented.

Mr. Tyler noted that the assessment and fee schedule that was listed on the website has the HOA governing documents violation on a per occurrence basis starting at \$50. He did not believe the Board had the ability to change the current fee structure without a vote by the homeowners at the Annual Meeting. Per the fee schedule, the fine for Mr. Bethke should start at \$50, but the Board needed to decide if that was a per day amount. The Board thought it should be per day. Mr. Tyler stated that if the Board thought it needed to be further defined for future issues, it could be addressed prior to the Annual Meeting.

The Board agreed to fine Mr. Bethke \$50 per day.

MOTION: Mike Gonzales made a motion to use the existing approved Fee Schedule to impose a \$50/day fine to Mr. Bethke, retroactive to January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014, for his failure to comply with the regulations that he was made aware of; and that a letter would be sent to Mr. Bethke informing him of the Board's decision. Dan Heath seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

### Architectural Guidelines

Mr. Tyler had sent a draft to the Board members. Mr. Tyler noted Mr. Deaver had made him aware that a house being constructed on Tollgate Canyon had put in an 8" plastic culvert. When he contacted Jody for his opinion, Jody said that the issue is that plastic culverts burn in a fire. Mr. Tyler believed that a fire on the Ranch would create bigger

problems than a culvert burning. Mr. Tyler commented on the number of plastic culverts the HOA has installed in various locations where galvanized culverts were not necessary. He noted that plastic culverts are less expensive and they last longer than metal culverts. Mr. Deaver had suggested writing a better regulation for driveway culverts. Mr. Tyler stated that driveway culverts are required by the Rules and Regulations do not specify the type and size.

Mr. Deaver stated that the plastic culvert was installed four days ago and it was already filled with dirt. The owners buried the culvert deeper than the ditch and everything flows into it. Mr. Tyler assumed that the culvert was installed by the contractor and the homeowner knew nothing about it. He asked Mr. Powell to contact the owner and express the concerns related to the size and depth of the culvert, and recommend that they install a larger culvert. He should also explain the drainage issues and why the culvert is important.

Reference was made to the language regarding "preferred" stain colors. Mr. Gonzales thought the language should be "required" rather than "preferred". Mr. Tyler revised the language to read, "Stain and paint colors must be earthtone shades." He made the same change to the language for "roofing". Mr. Tyler read language indicating that colors outside of earthtone may be considered by the Board through a variance process. He pointed out that for the variance process he specifically tried to make it clear that the burden of proof for approving the variance was on the owner. Mr. Heath stated that if the Board grants a variance, it should be issued in writing.

Since some of the Board members had not read the draft Architectural Guidelines, the Board was not prepared to vote. Mr. Tyler asked that all the Board members read the draft Guidelines prior to the next meeting so it could be approved. Mr. Powell suggested that comments or suggestions should be emailed to all the Board members so they could have the discussion and finalize the document.

MOTION: Matt Brown moved to discuss and finalize the Architectural Guidelines via email. Pat Kreis seconded the motion.

### Summer Road Projects

The Board discussed the best uses for the money that was budgeted for roads. Ms. Kreis noted that page 3 of the Budget had General Road Repair at \$105,000. Another \$50,000 was budgeted for aggregate purchases and hauling. Ms. Kreis stated that per the Board's request, Carol had removed the cost of sand from the Aggregates and General Road Maintenance and made it a separate category. Mr. Tyler clarified that the General Road Repair budget included asphalt. He pointed out that \$65,000 of the

\$105,000 was carried over from last year. Therefore, the budget was actually \$40,000.

Mr. Tyler stated that in addition to what the Water Company was proposing, substantial asphalt repairs were needed on Tollgate Canyon Road. They did not chip seal the road last year and it definitely needs to be done this year. Mr. Tyler noted that several sections of the side of the road have fallen off and they need to be built up and re-asphalted. Mr. Tyler asked Jody to obtain a new bid for the chip seal. Mr. Tyler anticipated that the spring asphalt patching would cost approximately \$938 for a semi-truck load of asphalt. He clarified that the cost was only for asphalt on the top. Additional costs to patch the spring include a culvert, drain rock and Jody's time.

Mr. Tyler had estimated two HOA dump truck loads of two-tons per load of three loads for asphalt patches to cost approximately \$300/load. Extra 3" minutes would be needed to fill in some of the gaps where the road was washed away before they lay the asphalt. He anticipated the bid for chip sealing to be in the range of \$10,000 to \$12,000. He estimated the drain rock for the French drain at \$500. Mr. Tyler had added a separate line item for Gabian rock, which is larger, cobble rock. The cost of the Gabian rock is \$12/ton. Road base is \$7/ton and 3" rock is \$5.75/ton. The Gabian rock is significantly more expensive, but the larger rock helps to hold the ditches together. Mr. Tyler stated that he and Jody had estimated 2,000 linear feet of Gabian rock at a 6' width. The cost of 444 tons of Gabian rock at \$313 per truckload is nearly \$10,000. Mr. Tyler suggested that they ask Jody to identify the areas that are the highest risk, and allow him use his judgment to bring in some of the Gabian rock.

Mr. Tyler clarified that he had prepared a spread sheet with all the roadwork that needed to be done at some point in time; however, it could not all be done in one year and the Board needed to set priorities. Jody would not have time to do all the projects. It is a balancing act considering the finite amount of time and money.

Mr. Gonzales suggested that they remove Aspen View from the list for this year and replace it with Windy Circle. Ms. Parker stated that at the last meeting they talked about identifying the three most dangerous portions of the road. She asked if that was included in the list of items. Mr. Tyler replied that it was a separate item as one of his long-term planning goals.

Mr. Gonzales thought \$10,000 was worth the expense to keep Tollgate from caving in. Mr. Tyler stated that \$10,000 was only an estimate and he preferred to let Jody use his judgment on how much to spend fixing it. Mr. Tyler pointed out that the Ranch does not have a backhoe, which is essential for properly building a drainage ditch. The suggestion was made to possibly rent the Water Company's backhoe. Jody offered to ask the Water Company if it was a possibility.

Mr. Tyler itemized the work on Tollgate per their discussion, and noted that the total was \$11,726, excluding the chip seal. For budget purposes, he estimated \$12,000 for chip seal.

The Board discussed mag water and specific areas. Mr. Tyler noted that \$6,000 was budgeted for mag water.

Mr. Tyler noted that the 2013 projects without a cost attached to them were the projects that were not done last year. He reviewed the list to determine which of these projects needed to be added to the 2014 projects.

Jody reported that the cost estimate he obtained last year for the slurry seal coating was \$26,000, which was considerably higher than the \$12,000 Mr. Tyler had estimated.

Mr. Tyler summarized the 2014 projects as:

- 1) Arapahoe Road from Bobcat Spring to the switchbacks at approximately \$17,600 for road base. It is a heavily traveled road and it should be a priority.
- 2) Forest Circle from lots 23-18. This project was carried from last year and it needs to be done. The owners have waited several years to have their road fixed. The cost was approximately \$6200 for road base.

Ms. Parker commented on an area above Shady Lane where the water has eroded the right-hand side going uphill. She thought that area should be added to the project list.

Mr. Tyler continued with his summary of 2014 projects:

- 3) Pine Meadow Drive from Navaho to C7. He showed the cost as \$18,000, but he did not believe they would spend that much.
- 4) Navaho from Arapaho to Uinta View, which was budgeted at \$5,200.
- 5) the first small section of Elk Road is a mud bog and it needs 3" rock rather than road base.
- 6) Modoc Loop has never been done and it was estimated to cost \$5,000.
- 7) Aspen View.
- 8) Navaho Road from Running Deer to Yellow Moon needs base rock. It was estimated at \$5600.
- 9) Heather Lane from Navaho to East 77 was budgeted at \$1,300.
- 10) Porcupine Circle has never been done before and the cost was estimated at \$4,400.
- 11) Hidden Circle has never been done and probably needs work. It was estimated at \$3,000.

Mr. Tyler clarified that his summary was only a wish list and they may not have the time or money to do it all.

Other projects included:

12) The Grandview and Forest Meadow intersection. Mr. Tyler had a request to pull the banks back to make the road safer.

13) Windy Circle was another recent request. 14) Ms. Parker reiterated her request to fix the portion above Shady Lane.

Mr. Tyler suggested that the starting point should be Tollgate Canyon and then Arapaho and Forest Meadow. He believed those three projects would take a month to complete and require a significant amount of money. The Board could revisit the issue at the next meeting so see what other projects the budget and time would allow.

Mr. Tyler suggested the HOA should hire a company to do a capital reserve study and analysis that projects out 30 years and shows how much money would need to be budgeted. They would not have to follow the recommendations but it would provide them with a better idea of scope.

MOTION: Alan Powell made a motion to Approve Tollgate Canyon asphalt and fixes for approximately \$11,800; an estimated \$30,000 chip seal budget for Tollgate Canyon; \$6,000 in mag; \$17,700 for road base on Arapaho Road, for a total of \$59,000, excluding the \$6,000 for mag water that was already approved as a separate budget item. Tom Deaver seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously

Mr. Deaver pointed out that if Jody could complete the three big projects in a month, he could use the rest of the summer to work on the remaining projects since most of them were smaller jobs.

A suggestion was made to hold a special meeting to talk about projects.

### **Monthly Budget**

Ms. Kreis noted that page 9 of the Profit and Loss/Budget Versus Actual showed that 90% of the assessments have been collected.

Ms. Kreis reviewed the unpaid bills detail. In addition to the amount shown, she added a bill from BP Auto for the dump truck repair in the amount of \$1800.

MOTION: Pat Kreis made a motion to Approve paying the unpaid bills as presented. Tom Deaver seconded the motion.

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association  
Monthly Board Meeting  
May 20, 2014  
Page 14

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Meeting of the Pine Meadow Owners Association Board adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

---