

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS' ASSOCIATION
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING
IN PERSON & VIA ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE
JUNE 21, 2022

In Attendance: George Sears, President; John Adams, Vice-President; Michelle Sutor, Secretary; Andrew Pagel, Treasurer; Marty Hansen (Area 2); Sam Vincent (Area 3); Shaun Baker (Area 5); Paul Sutor (Area 6); Scott Boyle (Area 7)

Ex Officio: Jody Robinson, Ranch Manager; Nolan Mitchell, Fire Safety Coordinator, Robert Rosing, HOA Counsel

Excused: Dwaine Anderson (Area 1); Katie Winters (Area 4)

Guests: Rob and Marianne Hodson, Lot PI-F-42; Casey Hahn, Lot PI-C-26; Chris Bell, Lot PI-D-35; Ed Deffner, Lot PI-I-37; Peter Kemp, Lot PI-C-27; Aja Martin, Lot PI-D-43; Lynn Kerr, PI-D-88 Lisa Hubbard, Lot PI-C-78; John Labrum, Lot FM-D-96-A.

George Sears called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m.

Minutes

May 16, 2022

John Adams referred to the Architectural Review Committee portion of the Minutes related to PI-F-37, third paragraph, and corrected Pine Course color to correctly read Pine Tree color. The second paragraph, he corrected PVR metal to correctly read PBR metal.

Mr. Adams referred to FM-B-37 and corrected wood grain fiber snap lap siding to correctly read ship lap siding.

Mr. Adams referred to FM-A-8-2AM and corrected selected Balstar Darkest Night in gray to correctly read Valstar Darkest Night in gray.

Nolan Mitchell thought the paragraph in the Minutes reflecting comments by Robert Rosing was confusing and did not make sense. He asked if the paragraph should be better clarified in the Minutes.

Michelle Sutor stated that it made sense to her and the language in the Minutes was how it was stated in the meeting. She recalled that Mr. Rosing was clarifying how the language with the State of Utah law has changed. Mr. Mitchell clarified that he was not in attendance for that part of the meeting, and just from reading it in the Minutes was very confusing. He was comfortable if it made sense to everyone else.

Mr. Rosing pointed out that the meeting Minutes are a transcript of what people say. He did not have the Minutes in front of him, but he remembered that he was explaining that the State

adopted new requirements that associations must adopt rules regarding water efficient landscaping, and that it was the first time that the State has ever mandated that associations adopt a certain kind of rule.

MOTION: George Sears moved to approve the Minutes of May 16, 2022, as corrected. John Adams seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Ranch Manager Report

Jody reported that the *mag water* was completed for now.

They were starting to work on all the roads to get everything graded before the Fourth of July. They were doing weed spraying per the Summit County requirement.

Jody stated that the equipment was running well.

Andrew Pagel asked Jody about the \$533 line item on the White's Auto Parts invoice. Jody stated that the charges were oil and filters for an oil change on the grader and mini trackhoe. Mr. Pagel asked if the mini trackhoe they purchased a few years ago has been useful. Jody replied that it has been very useful.

Mr. Pagel assumed the invoice from Summit Ops was for aggregate. He asked Jody how much had been used from the total amount purchased. Jody replied that everything showing on the invoice had been used. Mr. Pagel clarified that all \$18,000 was used. Jody answered yes. Mr. Pagel asked whether Jody intended to have more aggregate delivered next month. Jody answered yes. He would like to continue with the list from last year and planned to order the same amount or possibly a little more.

Mr. Pagel asked Jody about the \$947 line item on the invoice from Morris Tire and Service. Jody stated that the charges were tires for the 2500 gray Chevy flatbed truck.

Mr. Suitor asked if there were additional issues with the dump truck. Jody replied that he had not had the chance to work on it because they had been doing mag water all week.

Water Company Report

Mr. Sears had attended the Water Board Meeting. He reported that the contract with Mountain Regional was finalized, and Mountain Regional has a five-year commitment to supply water to Pine

Meadow Mutual Water Co.

Mr. Sears stated that during the last Water Board meeting Brody reported that the leak in Forest Meadow that was recently fixed was a ten-gallon per minute leak. Since the leak has been fixed, the Water Company has not had to access any water from Mountain Regional to supplement the needs on the Ranch. Mr. Sears pointed out that the biggest windows for water usage would be the 4th of July, 24th of July, and Labor Day. He was interested to see how they will get through those holidays now that the leak has been fixed.

Mr. Sears noted that the Water Company will be doing some work on Forgotten Lane to extend one of the water lines. That work was scheduled to occur towards the end of the summer.

Mr. Baker noted that the Ranch also went through Memorial Day weekend without needing to access water from Mountain Regional. Mr. Sears stated that the leak was identified as a potential leak a couple of years ago, but the line finally failed and they discovered that the leak had been going on for some time.

Monthly Budget Review

Andrew Pagel reviewed the unpaid bills detail. Jody had answered all of his questions during the manager report.

Mr. Pagel stated that Carol had released a quarterly report, which he would be reviewing this week.

Michelle Suitor had a question on the Profit and Loss, which showed receipt of \$20,000 in a sale. Mr. Sears explained that the \$20,000 was a recovery of liens against a particular piece of property that was sold.

Ms. Suitor noted that that neither the playground money nor the PPP loan was called out. Also, the Fire Safety budget was in the normal budget, and she asked if Carol could break out those line items on the Balance Sheet. Mr. Pagel explained that the Fire Safety Assessment was a line item on the income portion, and it was tracking well. Everyone who paid their HOA dues had also paid the fire assessment. He will think about how to break it out and talk to Carol. Mr. Pagel remarked that currently the fire portion was vague because how those funds are being allocated was vague. Eventually they will have a conceptual understanding of how much money is being donated and the lines items of where it is being used. Mr. Pagel stated that the Fire Safety Committee was doing a good job of trying to understand where the money goes and how it is being used.

John Adams suggested that from a fiduciary standpoint they should think about having the Fire

Assessment broken out as a separate line item, so it is clearly segregated. Ms. Suitor agreed. It would help if they could track against it rather than having a lump sum that could potentially get lost. Mr. Sears thought it was an appropriate step for a variety of reasons. It was a specific assessment this year, and the Board needs to have a good understanding as they determine whether to fold it back in or continue with this model. Having a separate line item would provide better clarity.

Mr. Pagel asked if they were asking to see it as a separate line item on the actual assets of the balance sheet, or whether they wanted to see it on the budget. Mr. Adams and Ms. Suitor thought it should be included on both the balance sheet and the budget. Mr. Pagel asked how they would like to see the fire assessment displayed on the balance sheet because right now it goes into the same checking account. Mr. Adams thought it should be segregated into its own account, particularly since they have applied for a federal grant. It is important to clearly differentiate between basic HOA funds and fire related funds.

The Board agreed with opening a separate fire fund account for current and future fire assessments and donations allocated towards fire mitigation. Mr. Sears noted that the Board had allocated \$15,000 in the budget in addition to the fire mitigation assessment, and that money should also be integrated. Mr. Pagel stated that after the Annual Meeting, they can start the next year by transferring funds from the HOA side.

MOTION: Mr. Pagel moved to approve paying the unpaid bills as presented in the amount of \$34,885.52. Marty Hansen seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Michelle Suitor abstained since she had not reviewed the unpaid bills.

Rules and Regulations

Fire Safety Rule Update

Mr. Sears noted that the Board had not formally approved the Fire Safety Rule. He recalled previous discussions as to whether the Board should re-review the rule to see if input from the owners requires the rule to be adjusted. Mr. Sears asked someone to take charge and coordinate a time when the Board could meet to determine whether they will apply any feedback to the rule, or if they should keep the rule as currently written.

Mr. Adams reported that the Fire Safety Committee had met a couple of times to go through the public input. The Committee had started reworking the document to simplify it, and to make it more cohesive and easier to understand. As stated in the last meeting, they were also trying to

include educational material. Mr. Adams presented a slide showing examples of what the Committee has done. He had personally seen some of the edits. Mr. Sears asked if it was better to let the Committee continue with their work. Mr. Adams stated that he tries to be on every call with the Committee and recommended that they let the Committee continue. When the Committee completes their rewrite, it will come back to the Board.

Nolan Mitchell thought it would be beneficial to involve other people with a different perspective

Building Rule Changes to Architectural Guidelines 4.1 and 4.2

John Adams stated that after the last meeting the Board decided to vote electronically on whether to move forward with the two proposed changes in Guidelines 4.1 and 4.2. The Board reviewed the wording and voted to proceed with the minimum 15-day period for the two proposed rules.

Mr. Adams reported that eight Board members voted and both motions passed unanimously.

MOTION: John Adams moved to RATIFY the two Architectural Guideline motions presented on May 24, 2022, to proceed with comment periods for Guidelines 4.1 - siding and 4.2 - roof. George Sears seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Adams stated that after the vote they moved forward with the 15-day minimum comment period. The draft rules were distributed via email and Facebook on May 27, 2022. Those who were not on email received the draft via regular mail. Mr. Adams remarked that they received 57 responses for the two proposals. However, even with a smaller turnout, the message was the same and in line with the original survey that was done a month ago. Mr. Adams stated that 48 people or 84% of the 57 responses were in favor of the siding guideline as presented. The roof proposal was similar in that 47 people, or 82.5% of the 57 responses favored the roof proposal as presented. Mr. Adams pointed out that the results of the initial survey showed 80-87% of the respondents were in favor. Mr. Adams noted that there was no significant written opposition. He thought most people were very accepting of this proposal.

Mr. Adams thought the comments were very constructive. Some offered suggestions, some were excited about the updates, and others thought the Guidelines should be updated more often. Mr. Adams agreed with a comment regarding the board formed concrete. The suggestion was to make sure that any woodgrain finish they approve is a pronounced woodgrain rather than a shallow woodgrain finish. He thought that suggestion should be considered as they move forward.

Mr. Adams stated that the written comment period officially ended last weekend. However, they were still open to comments. If anyone had questions or concerns regarding the two Architectural Rules pertaining to siding and roofs this was the time to voice their thoughts.

Mr. Pagel thought it was reassuring that the statistics from the smaller sample size were in line with the larger sample size.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve an update to Architectural Guideline 4.1 - siding, as presented to the Pine Meadow Ranch community for comment on May 27, 2022. George Sears seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve an update to Architectural Guideline 4.2- Roof, as presented to the Pine Meadow Ranch community for comment on May 27, 2022. George Sears seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Adams stated that at the last meeting the Board decided to do more work on Architectural Guideline 4.4 regarding size of structures and amount of square footage on any given piece of property. After considerable discussion, the Board ended up settling on a scaled model that started at 3,000 square feet of total structure on a quarter of an acre, and it scaled up to 8500 square feet for the larger lots. Mr. Adams reported that the Board decided to put that model before the community for a 15-day comment period. The Board held an electronic vote on whether to proceed with the minimum 15-day comment period for the revised Architectural Guideline 4.4 proposal. Eight Board members voted; seven members voted in favor and one was against the motion.

Paul Suitor stated that at the last meeting the Board talked specifically about the size having to do with footprint. Mr. Suitor recalled from the discussion that the entire Board agreed that footprint was important. He noted that when Mr. Adams sent it out for a vote, footprint was eliminated. Mr. Adams replied that footprint was in the vote and people voted on that change. Michelle Suitor remarked that footprint was included now, but it was not included when the motion was initially sent to the Board.

Mr. Pagel explained that there were internal Executive Committee discussions, and they created a more tabulated list as a function of land area, which gives more options. The Executive Committee thought it was overly constraining to also add the additional function of footprint. Having the more

elaborate table function basically covers both functions, which is the footprint as land area and also the square footage. Mr. Pagel stated that after sending it to the Board and getting feedback, Mr. Adams made the revisions and added footprint to the motion.

Mr. Adams noted that the Executive Committee discussions drilled into what is most relevant and what is understandable, as well as a good balance between what people want and do not want the Board to be regulating. Mr. Suitor stated that the feedback from people in his area is that footprint is important, and he was concerned when it was removed. He was left out of the decision when it went out for a vote and the motion passed without footprint in the language. Mr. Suitor believed that other Board members voted without fully understanding that the footprint was removed. He pointed out that the goal is to limit people from clearing the entire forest. Mr. Suitor thought the new numbers made the potential footprint larger than what was originally discussed. Mr. Adams did not believe that was correct.

Mr. Adams stated that the biggest problem is with the smaller lots. The proposal Mr. Suitor was focused on had a maximum square footage of 4500 square feet on zero to two acres. He commented on a potential scenario which led the Executive Committee to think about a scaling model. The scaling model ensures that the maximum square footage on a quarter acre lot is 3,000 square feet. Mr. Adams believed the model does a better job of protecting nature on a smaller lot. Mr. Pagel agreed with Mr. Adams.

Mr. Adams pointed out that the proposal distributed to the community includes the option of adding the one sentence of including the foundation size.

Mr. Baker believed that anything over 3500 square feet will be two-story or better. Due to cost factors, no one will pour a 5,000 square foot rambler.

Mr. Suitor was frustrated that he had spent time talking to owners and getting feedback, only to have the Executive Committee make a different decision than what the rest of the Board had talked about. Mr. Pagel pointed out that the Executive Committee sent it to all the Board members for feedback before asking for a vote.

MOTION: John Adams moved to ratify the Architectural Guidelines motion to proceed with the 15-day comment period on Architectural Guideline 4.4 - size. George Sears seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Short-Term Rental Rules

Mr. Sears stated that he would be sending out a revised copy of the rental rules for the Board to review. Robert Rosing had provided good insight and Mr. Sears made a few tweaks based on his advice. Mr. Sears did not believe the Board was prepared to discuss rentals until they had the opportunity to read the revised proposal.

Area Rep Reports

- Area 1 - Dwaine Anderson was not present and no report was given.
- Area 2 - Marty Hansen had nothing to report.
- Area 3 - Sam Vincent reported on a request for a propane fire pit approval. He wanted to be clear on whether a permit was needed for a propane fire pit. He was unable to find any criteria for a propane fire pit. He was told that propane fire pits do not require a permit. However, if the propane fire pit catches anything on fire the owner is still liable. Mr. Sears stated that they still encourage people to inform the Board if they have a propane fire pit. Mr. Vincent asked if the no burn sign at the bottom includes propane fire pits. Mr. Suitor answered no; however, Summit County may put in a restriction for no propane, which would also include barbeque grills. The County has come close to making that restriction, but it has not been done yet.

Mr. Vincent asked if the HOA should have a *similar* guideline for propane. Mr. Sears stated that they can always add common sense guidelines, but people need to understand that if they have fire, they need to be very careful. At a minimum, Mr. Vincent thought people should be required to have a hose next to it and possibly have the fire pit on a stone platform.

Mr. Mitchell asked if Summit County had reached the point of restricting non-combustible material fires such as propane, whether the HOA would have put an additional sign at the bottom stating "including propane". Mr. Sears stated that if Summit County ever puts that restriction in place, it would be smart for the HOA to post a sign to that effect. Any no fire scenario, whether it comes from the County or the State, strictly means no fire. Mr. Mitchell thought better education was necessary. For example, a property owner might understand that "no fires" posted means no permitted fire pits; however, if they sell their property, the next property owner might not be aware and think because the fire pit is approved that they are allowed to use it. He suggested that the Area Reps or the Fire Safety Committee have the responsibility of educating new owners. Mr. Vincent stated that the Fire Committee will have that discussion and draft a rule for propane.

- Area 4 - Katie Winters was not present and no report was given.
- Area 5 - Shaun Baker had nothing to report.
- Area 6 - Paul Suitor noted that Lot PI-G-44 was supposed to put in a culvert as soon as weather permitted; however, it was not done. He asked Mr. Adams to follow up on that issue. Mr. Pagel asked if there was an opinion from the County Engineer on swale vs.

culvert for that property. Mr. Sears replied that the engineer said it needed to be a culvert.

- Area 7 - Scott Boyle reported on a request for a metal, above-ground fire pit in his area. He asked if fire pits needed to be below ground level. Mr. Sears did not believe that was a requirement. Mr. Sears emphasized that when no fires are allowed, it also applies to approved fire pits. Mr. Sutor pointed out that only the Area Rep or an Executive Committee member can approve a fire pit.

Mr. Boyle stated that when he was approving a previous fire pit, the information he saw said that the fire pit needed to be below ground and have a screen over it. His fire pit was above ground and when he read that, he thought his pit needed to be changed even though it met all the other requirements. Mr. Vincent noted that the form states, "Buried 12"-15" below ground level". Ms. Sutor pointed out that the form was from 2006. Mr. Sears believed that requirement had been changed. Mr. Mitchell recalled that Alan Powell had presented recommended changes to the Board and fire pits were included. The winter burning policy was another recommended change. Mr. Mitchell did not believe the recommendations were incorporated or changed in the Rules on any documentation.

Ms. Sutor remarked that the information posted on the website was from 2006. She has an above-ground portable wood fire pit they can move around on the gravel driveway, and she believed that was probably the last fire pit Alan Powell had approved.

It was noted that information on the website states that a pre-manufactured fire pit can be above-ground. Ms. Sutor read from the website under Fire and Safety. Under Regulating All Fires, under Firepits it pulls up a word document. She read from the summer fire policy, "For the purposes of Pine Meadow Ranch regulations, a manufactured fire pit, such as a pan or chimenea, shall be the equivalent of a buried steel ring. It must meet all other criteria such as gravel, need to have water, need to have a fire extinguisher, a shovel, cannot be under branches. The fire pit cannot have a fire in it when "no fires" is posted".

Mr. Sears noted that Ms. Sutor had to dig deep to find the pertinent information. He thought they needed to make the things more accessible on the website, particularly requirements related to fire.

Mr. Boyle stated that based on the discussion, he would approve the fire pit for *Lot PI-I-37*.

Paul Sutor asked Mr. Boyle to upload to the drop box a picture of the signed form.

Real Estate board

John Adams asked how the Board felt about having designated sections for the real estate board at the bottom, and actually charge realtors for putting a box with their name on the Board. The HOA could do a better job of maintaining the board and making it look more presentable than it does currently. Mr. Adams remarked that he was raising the issue after having conversation with a few people. One is a realtor who told him that when the realtors put material in the box and tape their card onto the plastic box, the next day they find that everything has been removed. Mr. Adams thought it was a problem because it sends the message that not everyone who lives on the Mountain receives fair and equal treatment by the realtor the owner decides to hire.

Michelle Suitor thought this was a bigger discussion than they can have in the time allotted. If the HOA starts charging the realtors, she was concerned that the realtors would assume that the HOA would maintain it and keep their flyers from being stolen, which would be impossible.

Mr. Adams asked if the Board was willing to have him continue to look at options and possibly come up with a proposal. They can talk about it at the Executive Committee level and present any proposals to the full Board to determine whether they should move forward. The Board was comfortable with Mr. Adams looking into options. Mr. Suitor stated that if the HOA intends to charge the realtors, it needs to be done in a way that the corporation pays for it and not the individual realtor. He asked Mr. Adams to work with each realtor to make sure that happens. Otherwise, he did not believe it was fair to charge the realtors for various reasons. Mr. Sears thought Mr. Suitor raised a good point. In terms of the realtors being prohibited from putting up real estate signs, Mr. Sears suggested that the HOA look into the law as it was amended in the last Legislative Session, which allows some signs to occur. The Board needs to understand the ramifications as it applies to Pine Meadow.

Open Public Forum

There were no comments or questions.

Committee Reports

- Roads and Parking – Scott Boyle had nothing new to report.

Mr. Sears stated that he came up to the Ranch a couple of times in the last month and he noticed people parking right below the signs that say “no parking” by the mailboxes. He questioned whether they needed to make it more prominent that there is no parking in certain areas.

Mr. Boyle noted that he saw one person get out of one car and get into another car to go up the

Mountain. He followed and car and it went into the Church property. Mr. Boyle thought that might be part of why they were seeing cars parked on the road.

Mr. Pagel asked if the Board had any option other than posting more signs. Mr. Sears suggested that they could start putting the green stickers on the vehicles which says they are not allowed to park there. The Board members were given green stickers for that purpose two years ago and Jody has used them a few times. Mr. Sears stated that it always gets worse in the winter, but people should at least be more conscientious about where they park.

Mr. Sears noted that some owners have approached him about allowing guests to park in the parking lot during the summer when they have family gatherings. Typically, that is not allowed unless Jody gives someone special permission to do it. Mr. Sears thought they needed guidelines that everyone can understand and so everyone is on the same page.

Mr. Vincent stated that after talking with Dave Telian earlier in the day, he thought the Board should start thinking about whether the community has outgrown the idea of having any parking in the lower lot where the burn piles are located. The piles are growing fast, and people will continue to bring more and more vegetation to the piles. He questioned whether it was still practical to have people bring vehicles on and off that lot. Mr. Vincent wondered if there was a point in the future when they have to say the lot is for burn materials only. Mr. Sears stated that Dave Telian spoke with him about the same subject a few weeks ago. He thought it was a broader subject that needed to be addressed in the near future.

- Fire Committee - Nolan Mitchell agreed that they should be watching the cars in the lower lot to make sure they avoid the same problem as last year where the burn pile needed to be relocated because they were unable to remove all the vehicles from the lot. Mr. Mitchell believed it was a Board issue and not a burden to put on the owners.

Mr. Mitchell asked Aja to talk about the cleanup. Aja stated that it was a great event and she thanked everyone for showing up. She was pleased that the Area Reps came because it shows that they care. Aja stated that they worked from Pine Loop up to Forest Meadow and up Alexander, and they got a lot done. They basically created a fire break and made the road wider. Aja reported that they raised \$700 in donations, which they used to provide lunch and drinks for everyone.

Mr. Mitchell stated that approximately 50 people volunteered which equates to 300 hours. He believed there was possibly another sign in sheet, which would give them more hours. Mr. Mitchell thanked Michelle Sutor, John Adams, Paul Sutor, and Shaun Baker for coming and working alongside everyone. He noted that property owners who do not live on the Mountain came to help as well because the cleanup is a community neighbor activity.

Mr. Mitchell announced that the next cleanup is on July 16th, and they will be sending out information very soon. He believed the next cleanup was scheduled for August 21st. Aja thought the cleanup was very successful, however, they can always use more trailers, bush cutters, and chain saws. She asked the Area Reps to email the owners in their areas in addition to the emails that go out from the Fire Committee to help spread the word about the cleanups and show their support.

Mr. Mitchell stated that this was his last day as the Fire Safety Coordinator. They have awesome people who are stepping up and getting involved. They are building great momentum and it is time for them and others to take the reins and be in charge moving forward. Mr. Mitchell noted that he would still be acting as an advisor to the Fire Committee. He encouraged everyone to keep looking at fire mitigation purpose as saving peoples' lives.

Mr. Sutor reported that the Fire Committee submitted the CWPP but they had not yet heard back. Also, the evacuation plan was sent to Summit County and they were waiting to hear back from Bryce.

Mr. Vincent noted that Alpine had submitted a bid for the summer project. Since the last Board meeting, he and Paul did a site visit with representatives from five forestry companies. They got feedback from companies that did not submit bids.

Mr. Vincent wanted to review the bid from Alpine with the Board and suggested that it might be more appropriate in a closed session. He pointed out the need to accept and formalize the bid in writing so Alpine can get started. Mr. Pagel stated that in addition to a financial discussion, it could also involve personnel issues and he preferred to discuss the bid in a closed session. Mr. Rosing confirmed that it should be an Executive Session discussion.

Michelle Sutor left the meeting.

Architectural Review Committee

Lot PI-C-78

Mr. Adams reviewed plans for a home addition on Lot PI-C-78. The owners, Kent and Lisa Hubbard, were proposing to add a 1,166 square foot addition to their existing 1,201 square foot cabin on .78 acres. The materials proposed are the same as the materials on the existing cabin, including a 1x6 cedar tongue and groove exterior material. They would like to use a custom blue/gray color, which has been on the cabin for 40 years. The blue/gray is their first choice, however, they provided backup colors in green or khaki. The roof will be a flat iron PBR metal roof panels in dark brown.

The roof pitches were not applicable.

Mr. Adams believed a variance request would be required for the blue/gray color that is on the existing cabin.

The ARC did not find any issues with the plans as proposed. The committee members were mixed on the blue/gray color because it is on the existing cabin and the area is a deep forested location; however, the bluish color is not allowed under the Architectural Guidelines. Mr. Pagel remarked that there was a good case for the variance because it was a fairly neutral color and the owners have had the same color on their cabin for a long time.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the Lot Improvement Plan for Lot PI-C-78 for a new 1,166 square foot addition on the .78 acres property as presented. George Sears seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve a variance for Lot PI-C-78 to use the existing color that has been on the home for approximately 40 years in a blue/gray known as PC130895. George Sears seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Lot PI-C-27

Mr. Adams reviewed plans for a new home on Lot PI-C-27. The owner, Peter Kemp, was proposing to build a 3,292 square foot new home on 2.74 acres. The materials were standard and included a Montana Timber products vertical shiplap in Prairie, which is a very dark brown. Also, Montana Timber Aquifer in Cascade Smooth which is a brownish gray. The owner also planned to use Horizon standing seam metal in brown, or Tri-State standing seam metal in coco brown. The roof pitches were not an issue.

Mr. Adams noted that Mr. Kemp had his bank mail a check and Mr. Adams had verification from the bank that it was in the mail. The Lot Improvement Plan will not be signed until the check has been received.

The ARC has no issues with the plans as proposed.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the Lot Improvement Plan for Lot PI-C-27 on 2.74 acres as presented. Shaun Baker seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

FM-D-96-A

Mr. Adams presented plans for a new home on Lot FM-D-96-A. The owner, John Labrum, was proposing a 3,738 square foot new home on 1.61 acres. He has selected Hardie Plank woodgrain lap siding in dark brown or iron gray. The owner also selected Tamko Fiberglass shingles in either a weathered wood color or rustic black. Mr. Labrum plans to put in retaining walls in either traditional boulders with four-foot step backs, or his preference would be to use Gabion Baskets. The roof pitch was not an issue.

The ARC had no issues with the proposal. Mr. Adams asked for discussion on the retaining wall. He believed it would be the first Gabion Cage on the mountain. The question is whether it fits the mountain vernacular.

The Board had no objection to the Gabion Baskets. Mr. Adams asked if it would be the same 4-foot step backed process. Mr. Labrum replied that it would be the same. There would be 4-foot-high basket filled with stone, a step back, and then another 4-foot-high basket. It works the same as a boulder and water passes through it. The cage would be a metal 4x4 basket in a natural rust color.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the Lot Improvement Plan for Lot FM-D-96-A for a 3,738 square foot new house on 1.61 acres as presented. George Sears seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Open Public Forum on issues discussed later in the meeting.

There were no comments or questions.

The Board adjourned the regular meeting and moved into Closed Session.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Owners Association Board adjourned at 8:05 p.m.
