

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS ASSOCIATION  
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING  
RANCH MANAGER'S OFFICE  
PMROA WINTER PARKING LOT  
ARAPAHO DRIVE  
AUGUST 20, 2013

In Attendance: Tony Tyler, President; Dan Heath, Vice-President; Bob Burdette, Treasurer; Alan Powell (Area 3); Mark Hodgson, (Area 5); Tom Deaver (Area 4).

Ex-Officio – Jody Robinson, Ranch Manager

Guests: Renae DuBray, 77-A; Ken Smith, A-59; Aaron Dwell, A-65; Kirby Wilson, G-24A; Rick Rouse; Margaret Metz, 1496 Navaho Road; Stephen Jones, Lot E-58; Ted Bonnitt, Lot E-56.

Tony Tyler called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

### **Approval of Minutes**

#### July 16, 2013

Mr. Tyler referred to page 12, first paragraph, last line, and added the word **same**, to read, "...since it was coming out of the **same** pocketbook as the HOA."

Mr. Tyler referred to page 21, and corrected the spelling of Witts to correctly read **Whits**. The spelling correction applies throughout the discussion wherever the name is referenced.

Mr. Tyler referred to page 28, last paragraph, and changed the sentence "...previously approved project for the lower project" ... to correctly read, "...previously approved project for the lower **parking lot**..."

Alan Powell referred to the bottom of page 8 and beginning of page 9 and the comment regarding the lot with the home on it. He noted that the minutes reflected that the owner was Dick Thompson, and clarified that Mr. Thompson actually owns the lot next door that was surveyed. The owner of the lot with the house is Bob Kendall. Mr. Powell noted that Dick Thompson should be replaced to read **Bob Kendall** throughout the discussion where the lot with the house is referenced.

Mr. Deaver was unsure of the page number but referred to the discussion about why the change if they worked out the \$3,000 on Bull Moose. He noted that the sentence begins, "Someone asked why the change after it was already approved." Mr. Deaver clarified that Matt Brown had asked the question and he corrected Someone to read, **Matt Brown**, to give Mr. Brown credit for the question.

MOTION: Alan Powell moved to APPROVE the minutes of July 16, 2013 as corrected. Tom Deaver seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously. Mark Hodgson abstained since he was absent from the July meeting.

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

Stephen Jones, Lot E-58, commented on the paving of lower Tollgate. He noted that 99% of the road is in good condition but the lower section is in disrepair. Mr. Tyler stated that the Board discussed the lower section on Tollgate at the last meeting and there was some division among the Board between those who wanted to improve the road to a much higher level versus those who wanted Jody to fix the road as he has done in the past. Mr. Tyler noted that the Board had not made any decisions on when or if lower Tollgate would be repaired. However, at the last meeting the Board voted to withhold \$35,000 from the road budget this year to budget for roads next year in an effort to make a decision on the level of maintenance for the road by the beginning of the next construction season. Mr. Tyler stated that the Board would have that discussion over the next several meetings. He explained that funding was the primary issue. The estimate for paving from the interstate to the edge of the good pavement was approximately \$160,000 for basic machine laid asphalt. Anything extra would be an additional charge. The cost to lay the asphalt and roll it with Ranch equipment was approximately \$60,000.

Mr. Jones pointed out that everyone on the Ranch uses that section of road and he would like to find a way to raise money to have it done right. Mr. Tyler agreed. His opinion is to do it once and do it right, but the cost would be significantly higher than the funds they have available. The \$160,000 estimate was from a few years ago and the cost would be higher now. Mr. Tyler remarked that if they spend that money on one project it can mushroom into other issues and decisions such as widening the road, installing culverts, digging ditches, etc.

Mr. Powell stated that if they spent that much money they should also consider having a legal easement because it is not an HOA road. It is a private road that everyone uses.

Mr. Jones stated that he was contacted by Eric Cylvick with the Water Company who was trying to get everyone to sign over an easement. Mr. Tyler clarified that the Water Company was trying to create legal access specifically for the Water Company to use the access for the well houses and pump houses through private property on the lower section. He noted that the Water Company already has access through the Ranch because the entities are separate but similar. Mr. Tyler remarked that Mr. Cylvick was

trying to consolidate the easements now before the State mandates it in the future.

Mr. Tyler reiterated that everyone recognizes that the road needs to be fixed but the question is to what level and funding. He noted that the annual budget is not \$250,000 annually so to spend that amount of money is not feasible. If they decide to fix the road at the higher level they need to find a way to bridge the funding gap. The Board has discussed several options which included the idea of a special assessment that would be presented to the Homeowners for a decision at the annual meeting. Another option would be to sell real estate that the HOA owns. A third option would be to allocate a consistent amount of money annually and continue doing a small section each year until the roadwork is completed.

Mr. Tyler stated that funding is the primary issue because it includes funding the maintenance as well as the initial project. It cannot be resolved in one meeting and the Board spends time at each meeting discussing the roads. He intends to have the discussion over the winter and encouraged input from the owners.

Mr. Powell pointed out that the Ranch only represents a portion of the people who use the road. The Lewis Peak Ranches subdivision and four Church camps use the same road and they have no way of collecting funds from those groups. Mr. Tyler noted that they contribute to the PMROA Association and that money is used for roads, but they also cross a significant portion of Ranch land as well. Approximately 1,000+ lots access off of that same exit, and approximately 830 are within the PMROA. Therefore, 200+ lots use the road but do not contribute to any kind of road maintenance assessment. Mr. Tyler stated that the Church contributes \$9,000 each year and a few others voluntarily contribute. He reported that the PMROA collects approximately \$18,000 per year from lots that are not within the Owners Association, and that number includes the \$9,000 from the Church.

Mr. Jones thought it would be worth the fundraising effort through the winter by advertising and contacting the homeowners. Mr. Tyler noted that several people have offered to contribute funds for asphalt, but they do not want to commit until they know for sure that the work would actually occur. It is a catch-22 for the Board, which is why they were trying to define the scope of work.

Mr. Burdette noted that the Ranch owns the equipment and it has the manpower and the skill to lay out asphalt. He commented on the asphalt that was laid going up Forest Meadow Road beyond the two parking lots. One piece was laid three years ago and a second piece was laid last year and it was done with Ranch equipment and manpower. He asked if Mr. Jones was opposed to doing the same type of asphalt work in the lower section of Tollgate. Mr. Jones was not opposed because it would be better than what

they have now. Mr. Burdette pointed out that by using Ranch equipment and manpower, they are able to lay asphalt thicker and further with the limited funds they have. He noted that the asphalt that is laid and rolled with Ranch equipment results in a different type of surface than the smooth machine laid surface. Mr. Tyler encouraged Mr. Jones to drive up Forest Meadows and check out the asphalt that Jody had laid.

Ted Bonnitt, Lot E-56, suggested that they launch an aggressive fundraising effort by creating a focus and goal structure and using their outreach abilities, and by allowing a deadline beyond the tax refund time. They should also make a sincere effort to get the Church and the Lewis Peak Owners to contribute a little more as well. Mr. Tyler thought fundraising was a great suggestion but they would need someone to spearhead it.

Mr. Burdette asked if they were talking about a voluntary request for donations or if it was about voting at the annual meeting for a one-time assessment for all lot owners. Mr. Tyler believed it would have to be a combination of the two to raise enough money. He preferred to raise the money voluntarily, but he did not believe it was possible. Mr. Burdette pointed out that they recently tried a volunteer effort to raise money to improve the pond at Bobcat Spring. Mailings were sent out to all lot owners and they raised \$4500. Mr. Jones stated that the pond was a different type of project and they could not be compared.

Mr. Burdette asked if they could put \$40,000 into asphalt today and have it laid before the end of this season, if Mr. Rouse would be willing to help fund it. Mr. Rouse replied that he would contribute \$20,000 to lay asphalt from the mailboxes up. Mr. Burdette stated that at that point they could tell the owners that with the help of Mr. Rouse the Association would be able to lay asphalt to cover part of the road, and ask if the owners would contribute so they could do another piece next Spring.

The Board discussed whether it was better to put \$60,000 in asphalt this season and have Jody do the work, or whether it was better to hold the \$60,000 until next year and try to match it. The suggestion was made to use the winter to raise additional money so by March or April they would know exactly what could be done. Mr. Heath stated that regardless of their decision, they would not want to lay new asphalt where they would eventually widen the road. Widening the road is an important aspect and it should be done first. He would like to see that portion done right because that is where a bottleneck would occur in the event of an emergency.

Mr. Tyler personally thought they should stay with their original plan and do the asphalt work in the Spring. He thought it was foolish to spend the money now and have to do the work quickly before the end of the season. Mr. Tyler suggested that the Board

make a concerted effort to begin asphalt work in the Spring of 2014 and identify someone who could raise money. He would contact Carol to see if they could run contributions through the HOA and set up a separate account. They could contact the owners by mail, facebook, email, and any other method they have. Mr. Tyler suggested a fundraising goal of \$250,000 and work with what they get. He noted that it would be the discretion of the Board to decide whether Jody would lay the asphalt or if it would be commercially laid. He believed they would have a good idea by December. Mr. Tyler felt it was best to have a Board member spearhead the fundraiser and work with the owners who have volunteered to help.

After seeing the fire threaten Tollgate, Ted Bonnitt recalled a request for crash gates years ago but nothing was done. Mr. Powell noted that they were prohibited from putting in a crash gate. Mr. Tyler remarked that it was on the agenda for discussion. Mr. Bonnitt stated that even before the fire he was thinking it was time for another fire awareness day. He recognized that it was too late to do this year, but it should be done next summer and he was willing to help organize it.

## **Ranch Manager Report**

### Equipment Status

Jody reported that the grader had a 50% cutting edge. He would need to purchase a cutting edge for the grader and one for the plow truck. All the equipment was running fine.

### Projects Completed or In Progress

Jody stated that he was working on Bull Moose and putting Rotomill on Tollgate Canyon. The crack seal was started and they were half the way down, but it was rained out twice. The crack seal project should be finished tomorrow.

Jody had been working on signs and cleaning culverts. He needed to install a couple of culverts on Pine Meadow Drive once the Water Company puts in the new line. The cost of the culverts was approximately \$1500 and the Board had already approved the purchase. He needed two 40' sections and one 45' section. The culverts are metal. Jody reported that the propane tank needed to be filled while the cost was low at \$1.42 per gallon. He would continue to repair the signs and clean the culverts.

Mr. Tyler asked if the area reps had heard any complaints on individual roads that needed to be re-graded and rolled. Mr. Deaver stated that he had complaints from two people who did not want their road graded. Mr. Tyler asked the area reps to send him

or Jody an email if they see a road that needs to be graded to reduce the washboard.

Mr. Deaver recalled that the Board had talked about Navaho Drive on the Pine Meadow end to the first curve. It is rutted now and would get more deeply rutted with the runoff. The Board approved that road last month. Mr. Tyler remarked that the Water Company was working on the water line in that area. Jody had graded Heather as discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Deaver had driven by Navaho Drive and noticed that the Water Company had left that area and were further down the hill. Jody would re-grade it when he has the grader out.

Mr. Deaver also heard a comment about the washboard going up Navaho Road from Arapaho to the intersection of Alta Vista and Uinta View. Mr. Deaver recalled that the Board had also talked about grading Forest Circle. Jody still needed to grade Forest Circle. Mr. Deaver commented on an area up and around on Navaho Drive that bogs when it gets wet. The owners requested that he ask the Board to fix the problem to eliminate the bog. Mr. Tyler suggested that maybe it could be crowned.

Mr. Heath stated that money was contributed to repair the south slope of Bull Moose if Jody still had time to do it.

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

#### FM-A-7-AM Garage Addition

Mr. Tyler had forwarded to the Board members copies of the site plan and the lot improvement plan. He noted that 988 square feet is enclosed garage/storage space, which requires a \$2.00 per square foot impact fee. However, the owner also has an open sided covered "carport" that extends beyond that. He asked whether the Association should also charge an impact fee on the carport portion. Mr. Burdette stated that the Association has charged impact fees for pole barns in the past. If it has no utilities the cost would be \$1.00 per square foot. Mr. Burdette noted that a pole barn is nothing more than a roof supported by *poles*. Mr. Tyler believed the Board should remain consistent and charge for the unenclosed portion. He would recalculate the impact fee. Mr. Heath asked about concrete. Mr. Tyler did not believe the carport had a concrete floor. It was ground with poles and a roof.

Mr. Tyler thought the materials matched the architectural guidelines and he had no other issues. He would recalculate the impact fee and send it to Matt Brown, the area rep.

MOTION: Tony Tyler moved to APPROVE the garage addition plans for FM-A-7-AM as

presented. Dan Heath seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

### **Water Company Report**

The Water Company had started digging the pump houses at Oil Well Road and at Bobcat Springs. They anticipated pouring the foundations later this week. Mr. Tyler noted that the water line replacement was expected to take two weeks. The plan was to have it completed the following Monday or Tuesday. The water line project was moving slower than anticipated because they were trying to accommodate access to individual driveways.

The Water Company plans to repair the road once Jody installs the culverts and the contractor has bid to put new road base on that section as well. Mr. Deaver asked if the Board could be a stickler on the road base and refinishing of the road. He stated that the last time the road was torn up by the Water Company had the same stipulation to be restored to its original condition, but it was not. Mr. Tyler stated that he would follow through to make sure it was done right.

Mr. Deaver asked if the architectural committee had done anything on the pump houses. He was willing to make a motion to approve the same standards as the pump house at Tollgate. Mr. Tyler stated that the pump houses would look like the one at Tollgate. Mr. Deaver thought it needed to be stated in the minutes and in a letter to the Water Company.

MOTION: Tom Deaver made a motion to APPROVE the pump house architecture to match the architecture of the pump house at Tollgate. Mark Hodgson seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

### **Ongoing Business**

#### All West Communications Easement Agreement

Mr. Tyler had reached out to both Century Link and Comcast and he was trying to work his way through their red tape to speak with the right person. Alan Powell had forwarded to the Board information he received from a resident in his area. Beyond that there was nothing new to report on the easement agreement.

Mr. Deaver stated that he had spoken with friends in the business and he could not remember which one, but either Century Link or Comcast were not interested in working with Summit County. He assumed they would be even less interested in doing an RFP for the purpose of comparing prices. He thought Mr. Tyler could be wasting his time just to be told no. Mr. Tyler stated that if Century Link or Comcast do not respond within the next month or two the Board could revisit the issue.

#### Removal of vehicles from the upper parking lot at Winter Parking

Mr. Tyler reported on phone calls he received from individuals who had their vehicles towed. In both cases they did not have a Ranch sticker which is specifically required and stated on the yellow sign in front. Mr. Tyler suggested that parking on the upper lot should be eliminated entirely. He noted that there was plenty of parking on the lower parking lot and there was no need to have both parking lots available for homeowner parking.

Mr. Burdette asked if Mr. Tyler was only talking about eliminating summer parking. Mr. Tyler thought it could be summer and winter. Mr. Burdette questioned why they would prohibit snowmobile parking in the winter. Mr. Tyler replied that Jody had suggested that they eliminate the parking entirely rather than worry about the towing issue. The upper parking lot would be left for the HOA and the Water Company.

Mr. Deaver remarked that there was not enough room in the lower parking lot to accommodate all the vehicles. Mr. Burdette agreed. Mr. Tyler understood their concern. Mr. Deaver was not opposed to prohibiting summertime parking of any kind in the upper lot. Mr. Tyler thought the sign should say winter parking only, giving specific dates, and no summer parking whatsoever.

#### Summer Fire Mitigation; discussion of NSFD Annexation

Mr. Tyler reported that he had been in contact with the County on his own behalf to compile a list of registered voters, since that is the basis for the petitioning process to become part of the fire district; and he also identified with the GIS the area it would extend to. Mr. Tyler stated that he has put in several requests for language for an annexation petition, but he had not heard back.

Ken Smith stated that he had spoken with the GIS person the day before who admitted that it was on the back burner. After talking with him, he sent Mr. Smith a map of the area to be annexed. Mr. Smith understood that turning the map into legal language for a petition was something new, and the GIS person was working with the Summit

County Recorder. Mr. Smith stated that he is the North Summit Fire Chief as well as a Park City professional firefighter. He noted that given the current fire situation, Summit County is very focused on the fire emergency response in general, ingress, egress, etc. He would mention it to the County Council members, who highly praised the effort of North Summit during the fire, and ask them to do whatever they could to make the petition process and the annexation to move forward quickly. Mr. Smith stated that if the annexation passes, there would be justification for a fire station in Tollgate because they are much larger than Rockport Estates. Rockport Estates is part of North Summit Fire District and they are serviced out of Wanship.

Someone asked if a fire station in Tollgate would also provide medical response. Mr. Smith stated that medical is already in place. He was working the entire fire district and last Fall they trained at the medical first responder level last. Several people from Tollgate attended that class. The original plan was to do something in conjunction with the ambulance, but they ran into hurdles due to part-time volunteers mixing with full-time paid people since Park City manages the ambulance. The solution was to integrate the emergency medical response into the fire district. Mr. Smith stated that there was plenty to do for those who wanted to volunteer medically but not fight fires.

Mr. Tyler thanked those in the room who were involved with fighting the fire. He watched the flames every night and was thankful it was not on their side of the Mountain. He appreciated the quick response and he was willing to do whatever he could do personally to help the annexation process move forward. Mr. Tyler noted that the Board has option as to whether or not to take on any kind of responsibility or any type of petition on the annexation. However, he wanted to review the annexation agreement and give it to the Board before asking for a vote.

An owner asked Mr. Heath if the fire had affected real estate and the ability to obtain homeowners insurance. Mr. Heath believed it would have some affect but it was too early to know. He noted that the loan underwriters were already asking the appraisers to go back and look at the homes to determine whether or not they are in imminent danger of fire. Mr. Smith stated that he frequently gets calls from insurance agents asking about fire hydrants and how close they are to a fire station. The owner noted that he was told by his insurance company that there is a move to completely revamp the way they assign risk to properties, particularly in urban interface areas. They would be under scrutiny by the entire insurance industry. He believed that if they get their annexation and have a fire station planned, they would fare better in keeping their insurance rates manageable.

Mr. Burdette remarked that better service and better fire protection is not free. The owners would pay for it and they would not see an equitable offset in their insurance

premium.

Mr. Deaver stated that even before the fire his insurance company tried to increase his premium from \$480 to \$1600. He fought it and they reduced the cost to \$680. The increase was primarily due to the fire station location.

An owner asked if there was a system in place for inspection and certification on a house where the owner created a defensible space around their home, which could be given to the insurance company. Mr. Smith stated that there was nothing in place at this point. However, he understood from casual discussions that Summit County was looking at possibly creating ordinances to mandate defensible space. Mr. Smith assumed that if insurance companies start to look at urban interface differently than in the past, defensible space could be the same as getting a rate decrease for having a fire extinguisher in your kitchen. Mr. Smith noted that as recent as today, Summit County was inspecting every lot in Tollgate with a home within all the areas of North Summit and South Summit, to identify the condition of each property in terms of building construction type and defensible space.

Mr. Deaver heard from a source at Summit County that the hydrants in Lake Rockport Estates were dry. Mr. Smith replied that their system failed. They are completely dependent on relay pumps and when the power went out there was no water in the system. Mr. Deaver pointed out that Pine Meadow was told the same thing; that the power would be shut off in the event of a fire. He noted that all of the new pump houses would have external generator connections built-in and the Water Company has made arrangement for three generators to be brought in and plugged into the three pump houses in the event of an emergency. Pine Meadow still has a ways to go, but he believed they were a lot further along than Lake Rockport Estates.

Mr. Smith stated that they were a lot further along in a lot of ways. His five year plan for the Fire District is written with having a station in Tollgate. Mr. Powell believed one of the reasons the Fire District wanted to annex Pine Meadow is because they have fire hydrants, a water supply and active volunteers. They would be an asset rather than a liability.

Mr. Tyler assumed they were ready to move forward with the annexation and he would work with Mr. Smith on the appropriate language. When there is something to vote on, the Board would take a vote and begin collecting signatures. He noted that the Ranch has been getting fire protection service for free for a very long time. They deserve better service and they need to pay for it. Mr. Smith stated that by his time schedule, the petition would be completed and signed by the next Board meeting. He noted that the wording was already drafted. They just needed to insert the legal description of

what they wanted annexed.

Mr. Tyler asked Mr. Smith to send him the agreement when it was ready and he would circulate it to all the Board members for their review. Mr. Deaver recalled from the last meeting that the annexation could be approached in three ways. One was by approval by 30% of all the property owners; the second was that the County Council could make the decision to annex; and the third was for the Board to approve it and make a recommendation to the County Commission that the Board supports the annexation. Mr. Tyler explained that he was waiting for clarification from the Summit County Attorney on what actually needed to be on the petition, because the annexation could occur in multiple ways. He was told by the County Recorder's office that a valid annexation petition requires 10% of the registered voters of the affected area. Mr. Tyler stated that there were 209 voters. Mr. Deaver pointed out that part-time residents are not allowed to vote. Mr. Tyler stated that once they get the benchmark from the County Attorney they would begin the annexation process.

#### Signage, Map Replacement & Dumpster Area

Mr. Tyler had received a call from Mike Gonzales stating that he had witnessed a girl's camp church trailer fill up two full dumpsters. Mr. Tyler was unsure whether that was allowed and he asked the Board for their thoughts. He noted that they are not Owner Association members, which is technically the requirement to use the dumpster. Mr. Tyler was not opposed to the church camps using the dumpsters.

Mr. Tyler noted that the dumpster overflow every weekend during the summer. He asked if he should contact Allied to bring in more dumpsters or if the Board members had another solution. An owner stated that he sees construction workers driving up to use the dumpsters all the time. Mr. Deaver informed the owners that when this occurs they should take a picture of the license plate and send it to Summit County. Construction materials are prohibited in the dumpsters and the County would fine them. Any action taken by PMROA would be costly and time consuming.

Mr. Powell thought they needed additional dumpsters in the summer and the dumpsters should be emptied more often. Mr. Tyler noted that Allied had agreed to empty the recycle bin as often as necessary to avoid bringing in a second bin. He suggested that whenever someone finds that the bin is full, they should call the number on the side of the bin and request that it be emptied.

Mr. Heath remarked that in the past the Church has told the camp people to take the garbage home rather than dumping it in Tollgate; and they have always been good about it. Every once in a while they have a problem but not usually. Mr. Burdette

pointed out that it is a different group each week and sometimes the word does not filter down. Mr. Deaver noted that the caretaker of the Church property could make sure each group knows not to use the dumpsters.

Mr. Tyler stated that he would contact Allied and request additional dumpsters for the summer.

#### Long Term Planning Discussion.

Mr. Tyler believed this topic was addressed with the Tollgate Canyon discussion.

### **New Business**

#### Truck/construction traffic routing

Mr. Tyler had received a communication from Matt Brown asking about truck and construction traffic routing. He noted that heavy equipment is prohibited from using Forest Meadow Road. Heavy trucks and equipment should be using Tollgate Canyon to Oil Well if it is mid-mountain construction, or all the way up if it is not mid-mountain construction. They need to make sure that the contractors and everyone else is aware of that. Mr. Tyler pointed out that PMROA has no recourse to enforce it because they do not own the road. However, Item 8 of the construction agreement states that Forest Meadow Road is off limits to heavy truck traffic. Heavy trucks must use Tollgate Canyon Road. Mr. Tyler asked the Board members to talk to the drivers or contractors if they see heavy equipment on Forest Meadow Road. They could also contact the property owner who hired the contractor; or if the company is identified on the truck, they could email the company directly and request that they tell their contractors to use Tollgate Canyon Road.

#### Lot Improvement Plan and Agreement

Mr. Tyler could not recall whether the Board had formally approved the Lot Improvement Plan and Agreement that was discussed in May. He found where they had approved the Construction Checklist but he could not find an approval for the Lot Improvement Plan and Agreement. Mr. Tyler had re-sent the document to everyone with the revision from May 14<sup>th</sup>. He requested a quick review and a vote to make it official.

Mr. Deaver noted that homeowners have agreed to sign the document, but without agreement to Section 14 regarding short-term cabin rentals. Mr. Heath recalled that the Board had voted to eliminate that Section. Mr. Powell concurred. Mr. Tyler stated that

if the Board took that position he would remove it. Mr. Burdette recalled that the Board removed it because they do not have the legal right to stop an owner from doing what he wants with his property if it is not restricted by the CC&Rs. Mr. Powell stated that the Board could not enforce short-term rentals but they could enforce associated impacts such as noise, parking on the road, trespassing, etc.

Mr. Tyler stated that he would remove Section #14, Short Term Rental. He asked if there were other revisions to the document. His intent was to clean up the language and make it consistent with the Construction Checklist. Mr. Tyler thought they should revisit the documents every few years.

Mr. Tyler clarified that the Lot Improvement Plan and Agreement was a construction contract for any new construction for an undeveloped lot, or any addition to a developed lot.

Mr. Deaver pointed out that the wording in Section #8 does not tell people to use Tollgate Canyon Road. Mr. Tyler remarked that the language says, "Heavy trucks must use Tollgate Canyon Road." Mr. Deaver noted that most people only know the shortest route to their lots. He thought they should clarify which roads to use to reach a specific area because people are more willing to comply if they understand that there is an alternate route. Mr. Tyler revised Item 8 to state, "Forest Meadow Road from I-80 to Oil Well Road is off limits to heavy truck traffic. Heavy trucks must use Tollgate Canyon."

MOTION: Tony Tyler made a motion to APPROVE the Lot Improvement Plan and Agreement as revised. Tom Deaver seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

### Deer Meadows

Mr. Deaver asked for an update on Deer Meadows. Mr. Tyler had received a text message from Doug McAllister prior to this meeting and Mr. McAllister was still working with Dave Nichols to get him to agree to be annexed into the homeowners association.

### **Budget Review**

Mr. Burdette reviewed the unpaid bills detail report in the amount of \$22,033.00. He added a bill for Dirt World in the amount of \$3,970, bringing the total to \$26,003. Mr. Burdette noted that the \$150 bill from Clyde, Snow and Sessions were legal fees for the

claim against the Owner Association for damage done to a culvert. He expected to see more claims in the future. Mr. Burdette noted that the bill from KGC Associates was double the normal charges and he was unable to explain the additional charge.

MOTION: Mr. Burdette proposed to pay all the bills as outlined in the amount of \$26,003.09. Tony Tyler seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Tyler reported that Pam Davis had paid her balance in full prior to the last meeting and she had still not had a lien release on her property. He had asked Carol to follow up to make sure the lien is released.

Mr. Deaver understood that when the land on Arapaho across from Navajo was sold at auction, the new owner sent out certified letters to lien holders and the lien holder only had a certain number of days to respond. The PMROA did not respond and they lost their lien of \$2700. He noted that Carol had sent her office assistant to pick up the mail. That person filed the letter believing that Revenue Recovery also had received the notice and it was not discovered in time to collect on the lien by placing a bid on the property.

Mr. Burdette suggested that it was more appropriate for the Board to address this issue outside of an open meeting.

The Board adjourned the meeting and moved into Closed Session.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Owners Association Board adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

---