

PINE MEADOW RANCH HOME OWNERS ASSOCIATION
ANNUAL BOARD MEETING
IN PERSON
SONS OF UTAH PIONEERS BUILDING
SALT LAKE COUNTY

DRAFT

NOVEMBER 12, 2024

In Attendance: George Sears, President; John Adams, Vice-President; Andrew Pagel, Treasurer; Justin Call, Secretary; Marty Hansen (Area 2); Joe Pagel (Area 3); Katie Winters (Area 4); Shaun Baker (Area 5); Taissa Folden (Area 7)

Carol Steedman (Admin/office manager) KGC Associates Inc
Excused: Jody Robinson, Ranch Manager; Pam Slaughter (Area 1)

Guest: Michael Teranes, Candidate for Area 6 Representative

Mr. Sears called the meeting of the Pine Meadow Ranch Home Owners Association Annual Board Meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

Mr. Sears welcomed attendees, emphasized the importance of participation, and outlined the agenda for the evening.

Agenda Introduction and HOA Overview

Mr. Sears ensured that both in-person and online attendees could view the agenda, addressing an earlier technical oversight in enabling the equipment. He confirmed that attendees who had registered with Carol received voter cards for participation in decision making at the end of the meeting. Online participants would receive the cards via email after the meeting.

Mr. Sears expressed gratitude for the annual gathering, noting its importance for providing an overview of HOA activities over the past year and plans for the upcoming year. He emphasized the value of shared insights into HOA trends and operations.

Mr. Sears presented data derived from both HOA and Summit County databases:

- **Property Ownership:**
 - Total owners: 800 (down from 803 the previous year due to lot combinations).
 - Landowners: 304.
 - Part-time residents: 300.
 - Full-time residents: 196.
 - Rentals: 30 units (which may include accessory dwelling units).
- **New Developments:**
 - Five new homes were built, averaging 2,760 square feet each, totaling 13,800 square feet.

- Seven additional structures, such as garages or sheds, averaging 537 square feet.

Ownership and Property Values:

Mr. Sears highlighted shifting trends from 2022 to 2024, showing a reduction in land-only ownership from 335 to 304, part-time was 317 down to 300 and an increase in full-time residents from 153 to 196, reflecting community growth and changing demographics.

Property value insights included:

- **2022 Property Values:**
 - Landowners: \$40M.
 - Part-time owners: \$182M.
 - Full-time owners: \$57M
- **2023 Property Values:**
 - Landowners: \$61M.
 - Part-time owners: \$230M.
 - Full-time owners: \$88M.
- **2024 Property Values:**
 - Landowners: \$60M.
 - Part-time owners: \$203M.
 - Full-time owners: \$90M.

He noted the overall ranch property value stood at \$354M. Mr. Sears urged attendees to review property tax assessments and consider contesting valuations if necessary, highlighting the potential property tax impact.

Approval of Previous Minutes:

Mr. Sears introduced the prior year's 2023 meeting minutes, urging participants to review and approve them through the voting process. Physical copies and a QR code link were made available. He stressed the importance of maintaining an accurate legal history for the HOA.

Upcoming Elections and Volunteer Opportunities:

Mr. Sears noted changes in the board, with Michael Teranes joining as Area 6 representative for a one-year remaining term. He encouraged broader participation, either by running for

office or joining committees such as the Road or Fire committees. He acknowledged the challenges and scope of managing nearly 40 miles of roads within the HOA.

Tollgate Canyon Road Updates and Strategy

Mr. Adams outlined the status and challenges of Tollgate Canyon Road following the extensive damage caused by the 2023 snowmelt, which necessitated \$100,000 in reinforced concrete culverts. He highlighted the success of these culverts in managing water flow and mitigating further damage.

2024 Strategy - Hydrology and Civil Engineering

Mr. Adams explained that 2024 focused on hydrology and civil engineering to analyze water flow and design durable solutions to prevent recurring road damage.

- **Request for Proposals (RFPs):**
 - The HOA issued two RFPs for hydrology and civil engineering.
 - They contacted eight firms, receiving responses from three:
 - CRS Engineers (complete bid at \$145,000, exceeding the \$124,000 budget).
 - Wall Consultant Group (partial bid on Upper Tollgate Canyon Road).
 - Sunrise Engineering (only bid on hydrology).
- **Negotiations with CRS Engineers:**
 - To address the budget shortfall, CRS removed redundant manpower and unnecessary meetings, lowering their bid to \$129,000.
 - The HOA signed the contract in July 2024, funded by the prior one-time assessment.

Hydrology and Road Segment Identification

- **Hydrology Mapping:**

CRS Engineers assessed historical and current water flow patterns. Dark and light blue lines on the maps indicated critical water flow areas.
- **Segmented Focus Areas:**

CRS identified 20 segments, each 300 feet, with 16 prioritized for immediate work. Key areas identified included:

1. **End of Pavement at Hairpin Turn:** Water cascading into the road created erosion hazards.
2. **Catch Ponds to Hillcrest Intersection:** Significant hydraulic activity requiring drainage enhancements.
3. **Lower Tollgate S Curve:** A dangerous curve prone to accidents due to poor visibility.
4. **South of Rocky Point:** Addressing collapsing sections with proper drainage.

Tentative Additional Areas

The remaining four segments were flagged for potential work:

- **Map Area 5:** Tollgate Canyon Road by Pump House has a persistent spring water runoff affecting road stability.
- **Map Area 6:** Mudslide area-prone zone with heavy hydraulic activity.
- **Map Area 7:** Frequent flooding near a key driveway, requiring sandbagging.
- **Map Area 8:** Washed-out section from 2023 that needs permanent reinforcement.

Expected Deliverables and Future Plans

- **Design Solutions:** CRS will provide phased recommendations over 5 plus years, construction-ready documents, and project schedules for submission to Summit County.
- **Available Funds:** Approximately \$265,000 remains from the one-time assessment, reserved for 2025 roadwork.
- **Sample Designs:** Preliminary profiles showcased potential solutions, including retaining walls 6 feet to 12 feet high by S Curve for stabilization.

Other Road Maintenance Plans (2025–2027):

Mr. Adams presented a multi-year schedule prepared by Jody Robinson, Ranch Manager, focusing on Forest Meadow and Pine Meadow roads, with approximately \$300,000 in planned work. This effort aligns with typical annual expenditures on aggregate materials, estimated to take 2.5 to 3 years.

Experimental Road Techniques:

- **Perma-Zyme Test Results:**
Applied on Forest Meadow Road, the material showed average performance, failing in areas with poor drainage. Future use would require a chip seal layer to prevent water infiltration, increasing costs.
-

Snowblower Update:

- **Purchase Details:**
The HOA ordered a \$238,000 snowblower from Sawtooth in September 2023. A 25% deposit (\$60,000) was made, with \$179,000 remaining due upon delivery, pending hydraulic equipment to be received, in December 2024.
-

FEMA Grant - Hazardous Fuels Reduction:

- **Project Execution:**
Summit Forest completed a 25-day hazardous fuels reduction project in July and August 2024. Future maintenance will be scheduled every 1–3 years to sustain safety and effectiveness.
- **Prioritization Scheme:**
Legend: High-priority (red), medium (yellow), and low-priority (green) areas guided project sequencing.

Questions: Regarding Roadwork and CRS Engineering Project

Mr. Adams concluded his presentation, prompting Mr. Sears to invite questions from attendees. He reassured attendees they could ask questions now or during the open session following the financial review. **The owner of lot PI-F-26** raised a question regarding the timeline and process for CRS Engineering's work.

- **CRS Engineering Deliverables and Timeline**
Mr. Adams explained that CRS Engineering's deliverables include detailed recommendations and project documents, enabling the HOA to issue bids for road repair projects. The timeline anticipated receipt of final documentation in Q1 2025, with bid requests issued in Q2. He estimated that the bids would be reviewed by May, aiming to start roadwork in June 2025.
- **Specifics on Road Segmentation and Budget**
CRS segmented Tollgate Canyon Road into 20 sections, each 300 feet in length, for hydrology and civil engineering analysis. While the overall contract cost for CRS was \$129,000, the precise cost of repairs for each section would only be determined after

obtaining bids. Mr. Sears emphasized that prioritization would occur based on the specifications and funding availability.

- **Weather and Timing Considerations**

Andrew Pagel highlighted the narrow window for effective roadwork, given the impact of snowmelt and soil conditions. The target timeline aimed at work in June to take advantage of optimal conditions for structural and hydrological improvements.

- **Flexibility Based on Bid Results**

Mr. Adams noted the need for flexibility, explaining that if bids exceeded expectations, the board might defer some projects to accumulate funds over subsequent years. The goal was to address as many priority areas as possible within budget constraints.

- **Snow Blower Utilization and Subcontracting**

A question arose about whether the newly purchased snow blower would replace subcontracted snow plowing services. Mr. Sears confirmed the intent was to bring snow removal fully in-house after gaining operational experience with the equipment during the current season. The subcontract for the connector route would expire at the end of the year, aligning with this plan.

Budget Overview and Assessment Proposal

Andrew Pagel, as Treasurer, began his presentation by reviewing the 2025 budget. He highlighted yellow-marked areas indicating significant changes. He noted that total annual assessments were projected for 2025 to reach **\$632,688**, based on a proposed increase of **\$100 in annual dues**. This increase would raise dues from **\$700 to \$800 per year**, equating to a **\$8 per month increase**.

Mr. Pagel emphasized the stability of the **\$42,000 in variable income** from ¼% reinvestment fees and construction assessments, which historically outperformed projections but remained conservatively budgeted. Last year marked a milestone, as the HOA did not rely on variable income to pay bills for the first time, signifying stability and creating a financial foundation for future capital projects.

The owner of lot PI-F-26 raised a question regarding financial contributions from properties behind the orange gate on Pine Meadow Drive, specifically referencing areas like Mountain Lewis. In response, Mr. Pagel explained that while contributions from these areas are requested, they remain voluntary. Historically, 50 to 70% of the SS lots contributed, but this number has significantly declined, with only about a dozen lots currently contributing on average. Mr. Sears confirmed this downward trend over time.

Mr. Pagel noted that the LDS Church has been a consistent and generous contributor. He highlighted that last year, the Church even increased its contribution, which was greatly

appreciated. However, Mr. Pagel emphasized the inherent challenge of relying on voluntary contributions, as the HOA has no enforcement mechanism for non-HOA SS lots that fall outside its jurisdiction.

Fixed Expenses Overview

Mr. Pagel detailed fixed expenses, with total payroll expenses at **\$187,000**, comprising 25% of the budget. Liability insurance and property taxes saw moderate increases, bringing fixed expenses to **\$271,576**, or 36% of overall income.

Variable Expenses and Equipment Costs

Mr. Pagel addressed variable expenses, with notable increases in **equipment rental costs**, rising to **\$35,000**, largely due to winter snowblower rentals and extended roller equipment usage for summer road maintenance. The **large equipment repair budget** increased to **\$15,000** to accommodate maintenance for new heavy machinery.

Fire safety expenses remained steady at **\$70,000**, ensuring upkeep of infrastructure funded by a prior **FEMA grant**. Building repairs and maintenance increased to **\$5,000** to cover the newly acquired **\$25,000 purchase of a barn** from the North Summit Fire District, requiring a new building maintenance line item. This acquisition resolved a long-standing issue over ownership.

Road Maintenance and Infrastructure Improvements

Mr. Pagel outlined the HOA's financial strategy, focusing on how fixed and variable income has supported road maintenance and improvements. Over the past five years, the HOA has maintained an annual aggregate budget of \$55,000 for road maintenance. Last year marked a milestone as it was the first year the HOA was able to cover all fixed costs solely with fixed income, creating an opportunity for more impactful projects. Historically, variable income, particularly from construction assessment impact fees, exceeded projections, ranging from \$60,000 to \$80,000 annually, compared to the \$42,000 budgeted.

To align with past expenditures, the budget for road maintenance increased to \$95,000 for the upcoming year, reflecting the amount utilized in recent years. Mr. Pagel noted that this figure represents the threshold where manpower, equipment, and supply are effectively maximized. For winter preparedness, the sand-winter budget increased slightly, from \$15,000 to \$17,000, contributing to an overall increased road maintenance budget of \$132,000.

Mr. Pagel announced a new budget of \$12,500 for culvert installation and maintenance, aimed at transitioning from reactive repairs to proactive upkeep. The HOA plans to stockpile smooth-lined, corrugated culverts, which balance durability and functionality, and engage external companies to clean and clear existing culverts. This approach is intended to prevent water erosion and road damage, with a goal of addressing 5 to 10 culverts annually.

The owner of lot of PI-63 raised a question about the use of corrugated culverts, expressing concerns over their tendency to trap debris. Mr. Pagel clarified that the selected culverts would

feature a smooth interior to mitigate clogging, representing an upgrade from older corrugated metal designs. Concrete culverts, though ideal, were deemed cost-prohibitive for widespread use.

Further, the HOA implemented a requirement for new builds to engineer driveway culverts, ensuring proper sizing and placement to reduce hydrology issues. These combined efforts raised the total road maintenance budget to \$213,000, comprising 28% of the overall HOA budget.

At an \$800 annual fee per owner, the budget projects a surplus of \$103,237 for the next year. Mr. Pagel emphasized that this surplus would enable the HOA to tackle additional road projects and fund the capital reserves, demonstrating progress toward long-term infrastructure goals.

Reserve Accounts

The owner of lot FM-D-109 inquired about the \$70,000 budgeted for fire mitigation in the upcoming year, asking if it was intended for cleanup after the FEMA-funded work or for addressing new high-risk areas. Mr. Pagel explained that the \$70,000 allocation originated from a Fire Safety Committee initiative, which negotiated this amount as a manageable budget to secure funding for fire mitigation. The allocation also set the baseline for the FEMA grant, as the grant amount was a multiplier of available funds. A portion of this money is now strictly obligated to maintain the FEMA and county-approved fire mitigation work. Any surplus will be directed toward priority projects, with Mr. Pagel encouraging participation in the Fire Safety Committee to help decide future projects.

Regarding grant compliance, **Shaun Baker, Area 5 Rep** asked about the duration of the compliance period for the FEMA grant. **Mr. Adams** clarified that there is no definitive end date, and Mr. Sears suggested reviewing the grant's contract for specific terms.

The owner of lot PI-E-61 questioned why the accounts were earning only 0.25–0.3% interest when market rates for CDs and other instruments were much higher. Mr. Pagel acknowledged the lower interest, explaining that the HOA's investments were constrained by obligations and liquidity requirements, which limited their ability to secure higher yields. He added that funds needed to remain accessible, especially with anticipated snow blower expenses, though noted that portfolio 3-to-6-month CDs were a potential option.

Further, the topic of liquidity management was addressed, as the HOA is approaching FDIC insurance limits on its savings accounts. The need to diversify funds into new accounts next year was noted. Suggestions for alternative savings options, such as high-yield accounts, were encouraged to maximize returns while ensuring compliance and liquidity.

The owner of lot FM-D-114 sought clarification on the \$35,000 budget for snow plowing and its relation to the connector loop contract. Mr. Pagel confirmed that the amount corresponds to a fixed three-year contract for snow removal, now in its final year. Payments for winter services span two fiscal years, requiring their inclusion in next year's budget.

Mr. Adams invited the **owner of lot PI-I-37** who raised a key question regarding the rationale and timeline for HOA's reserve fund target of \$2 million over ten years. The owner expressed concern about the rising costs leading to the \$1,200 annual fee and sought clarification on how the reserve fund target and timeline were established.

Mr. Pagel clarified that the reserve plan is split into two phases: \$1 million over five years and \$2 million over ten years. He emphasized that the \$2 million target was not arbitrarily set by the HOA but derived from a mandatory, state-mandated reserve analysis conducted every three years by an independent third party. This analysis evaluates the HOA's assets, including equipment such as graders, loaders, and trucks, assessing their current conditions, expected lifespans, and projected replacement costs. The analysis recommended the \$2 million figure to ensure future sustainability and avoid emergency assessments.

Mr. Pagel further explained that while the HOA could technically impose a one-time assessment to meet the reserve target, this approach was deemed unfair and financially burdensome for current residents. Instead, the HOA opted for a gradual, iterative increase in reserves, aligning costs more equitably between current and future owners. He reiterated that the reserve fund is not just a financial goal but a safeguard against unexpected expenses, like the failure of essential equipment such as the grader, which would cost over \$200,000 to replace.

Mr. Sears added further clarification, explaining the reserve analysis requirements and how it firms the HOA's planning. He noted that while the reserve analysis recommends a \$2 million fund, HOA members retain the authority to adjust the target through collective decisions. Mr. Sears highlighted the importance of reserves to avoid sudden financial burdens, referencing the aging grader as a concrete example of why reserves are critical.

Mr. Sears also informed members that the reserve analysis, available on the HOA website, includes detailed information on all HOA assets, their lifespans, and replacement costs. He encouraged members to review these reports and actively participate in discussions about the reserve strategy.

Mr. Sears underscored the need to balance long-term planning with current realities, acknowledging that while \$2 million might not be necessary today, inflation and increasing costs make it a prudent goal for the future. He emphasized that reserves enable the HOA to handle large expenses without imposing one-time assessments, which are often unpopular and difficult to collect.

Mr. Pagel further explained that the reserve strategy is designed to minimize financial shocks and ensure sustainable planning. He highlighted the importance of maintaining transparency and accountability, pointing out that funds, like the \$265,000 allocated last year, were carefully preserved until an orchestrated plan could be implemented.

The owner of lot FM-D-114 asked for clarification on past and proposed dues increases, expressing confusion about whether a \$50 increase from the previous year was included in the current \$100 proposal. Mr. Pagel explained that the HOA cannot set dues retroactively or far in advance. Instead, the board evaluates current needs and circumstances each year to propose a budget and dues for the upcoming year.

Mr. Pagel confirmed that last year's \$100 increase brought annual dues to \$700. He explained that the prior increases, including a one-time \$60 allocation for fire safety measures, contributed to specific budget items but did not carry forward. The proposed \$100 increase for the upcoming year reflects the HOAs efforts to incrementally build reserves and address ongoing expenses.

An owner of Lot PI-F-52 raised concerns about the flat HOA fee, questioning the fairness of land owners and full-time residents paying identical amounts. Mr. Pagel explained that the HOAs CCRs stipulated a uniform fee structure to ensure equity. He detailed that the majority of HOA funds are allocated to payroll and road maintenance, which consume over 60% of the total budget. This fee structure provides consistent benefits to all property owners, including access and property upkeep, regardless of residency type.

Mr. Pagel also clarified the importance of the HOA fees in maintaining services, such as road access during winter months, which are equally critical for lot owners and full-time residents. He reiterated the need for thoughtful use of the funds to address rising operational costs and maintain essential services.

The owner of Lot Pi-F-26 asked about projected reserves if the proposed budget was not implemented. Andrew Pagel responded, outlining that without the increase, reserves would stagnate at \$490,000. This amount would support the planned road projects and other improvements. Without the fee adjustment, reserves would stagnate, and ongoing projects like engineering and infrastructure maintenance would face significant decrease in funding causing ultimate delays and the roads would stay as they are. Mr. Pagel emphasized the necessity of healthy reserves for unforeseen emergencies, upgrading equipment and improving or maintaining roads.

The owner of lot PI-G-91, a retired investment banker with expertise in municipal bonds and public entities, emphasized the importance of maintaining a healthy fund balance to achieve a favorable rating from rating agencies. This insight highlighted the critical role of financial reserves in securing the HOA's financial stability.

Mr. Sears recounted a time when the fund balance was so low that the HOA struggled to secure basic financial tools, like credit cards, and board members had to use personal credit cards for essential purchases. Over the years, significant improvements were made, transitioning from financial instability to a more self-sustaining model. He noted that the community now has a larger number of full-time residents and a growing sense of permanence, emphasizing the need to plan for future sustainability rather than focusing solely on immediate concerns.

Mr. Sears praised the progress made in raising reserves and investing in critical infrastructure, including new equipment and facilities. He stressed that the current budget, while conservative, was thoughtfully designed to provide long-term opportunities for growth and stability. He encouraged attendees to consider the future implications of their financial decisions, especially as the HOA faces rising costs and changing demographics.

When Mr. Pagel became treasurer in 2017, the HOA faced significant financial challenges, with only \$100,000 in the bank and insufficient income to cover basic fixed expenses. At that time, the HOA relied heavily on variable income sources, such as construction assessment impact fees, to make payroll and continue operations. This dependence on unpredictable income created uncertainty, with operational continuity hinging on the hope of consistent new builds and associated revenue.

Mr. Pagel highlighted the improvements achieved through incremental changes in dues and effective financial management. He discussed the long-term projection to increase HOA fees to \$1,200 per year, equivalent to \$100 per month, over the next five years. This gradual increase reflects a strategic approach to ensuring financial stability while minimizing the burden on homeowners.

Over the years, the HOA adopted a deliberate strategy of slowly raising dues to reduce reliance on variable income. This methodical approach allowed the HOA to increase its reserves while simultaneously investing in critical infrastructure. Andrew noted that the HOA's savings grew from \$130,000 to \$500,000 while achieving substantial improvements in equipment and facilities. This included the acquisition of new machinery like a truck, a blower, and loader, as well as the development of new facilities and parking to better maintain equipment.

Additionally, the HOA expanded its scope of projects, moving from a limited focus on Tollgate Canyon to also addressing Forest Meadow Road, reflecting a broader commitment to community-wide improvements. The ability to balance infrastructure upgrades, operational

needs, and financial growth without compromising our reserves underscored the HOA's effective financial stewardship.

Mr. Sears commented positively on the financial trajectory and the elimination of a dependency on new builds for financial stability. He emphasized the importance of strategic planning and praised the HOA for achieving a self-sustaining financial model while avoiding scenarios where the community would need to "beg" for resources. His remarks reinforced the value of the progress made and the need for the owners to support the proposed budget as a step toward continued growth and stability.

The owner of lot PI-G-36 referenced a soil study conducted several years ago, which revealed that the HOA had been using unsuitable road materials for over two decades. The study recommended transitioning to high-clay-content materials to improve road longevity and reduce costs. Despite this recommendation, the owner noted no changes in material use. Mr. Adams acknowledged the validity of the concern, explained that the proper materials are scarce and expensive. However, a section of Forest Meadow constructed with these materials has held up well, supporting the need for broader implementation. The board agreed to escalate the issue to the Road Committee.

The owner of lot PI-G-36 asked a second question which highlighted a critical safety issue related to an unfinished culvert project. He shared that ambulances and other emergency vehicles had been unable to reach certain areas due to road conditions, necessitating helicopter evacuations on at least two occasions. Mr. Adams admitted that the HOA had deprioritized the culvert project due to competing priorities and a lack of resources. He pledged to revisit the project to ensure its completion, noting the importance of addressing road access issues promptly.

Rental Properties and Rules

Mr. Sears stated that approximately 30 rentals are within the community, and the HOA requires these rentals to be registered annually. Carol manages the administrative tasks related to this process. The registration fee of \$200 is legislatively designed to address the impact of renters on the community.

Mr. Sears highlighted issues caused by renters, including occasional mishaps like getting vehicles stuck or failing to follow community guidelines. He encouraged property owners with unregistered rentals to contact Carol to ensure compliance.

In response to a question from the **owner of lot PI-F-26**, Mr. Sears confirmed that the \$200 rental registration fee is mandatory. He explained that while the HOA cannot prohibit rentals, it can manage their impact as per county and state guidelines.

Mr. Sears clarified that the \$200 HOA fee is separate from any county-imposed fees. He emphasized that the HOA uses this fee to address renter-specific issues, such as increased complaints and non-compliance with HOA rules.

Mr. Sears acknowledged that some renters disregard community standards, such as Dark Sky lighting requirements. He emphasized the importance of property owners reporting issues and providing photo documentation, as this greatly aids the HOA in enforcing compliance and resolving complaints efficiently. Dark Sky compliance became a Summit County requirement in January 2024. Mr. Sears explained that while the HOA cannot directly enforce this regulation, it reports violations to the county for action. He encouraged community members to maintain compliance and report issues.

The owner of lot PI-63 raised concerns about enforcing a \$500 fine for violations, citing a specific incident involving a contractor. Carol clarified that the property in question was outside the HOA's jurisdiction. Mr. Sears reiterated that the HOA could only hold property owners accountable for violations, not contractors.

Mr. Sears emphasized the importance of homeowners documenting violations with photos and reporting them to Carol or area representatives. This process enables the HOA to pursue and assess fines against non-compliant property owners.

Andrew Pagel and Mr. Sears elaborated on the HOA's operations. The HOA functions without a management company, relying instead on eleven volunteer board members and Carol's administrative work, which is significantly less than what a management company would charge, yet Carol efficiently manages a substantial workload.

Mr. Sears explained that the HOA's role is to provide information and assist in ensuring compliance. For violations such as non-compliance with Dark Sky regulations or issues with barking dogs, the HOA escalates cases to Summit County for code violation enforcement.

The owner of lot PI-F-52 questioned the specifics of the Dark Sky regulations, particularly whether lights must be turned off by 11 PM. Andrew Pagel clarified that county rules require lights must be fully shielded and motion-activated to prevent them from being left on all night. This ensures minimal disruption while allowing for functionality during gatherings or for safety purposes.

The owner of lot PI-D-59, who identified themselves as relatively new to the community, pointed out the presence of an "Events and News" page on the HOA website that had been well-maintained in 2023. The member mentioned that during the September HOA meeting,

there was a discussion about regularly updating residents, particularly on road-related updates. They questioned why updates appeared to have stopped recently and inquired if anything could be done to restart them.

Mr. Sears acknowledged the concern and agreed that communication could always be improved. He emphasized the importance of maintaining consistent updates and the challenges of communication, explaining that Facebook posts only reach a subset of property owners. To ensure broader reach, the HOA continues to rely on email communication, which has a higher engagement rate, with approximately 65% of members opening their emails. He assured owners that the issue of improving communication and ensuring website accuracy had been discussed previously and remains a priority.

Mr. Sears presented the voting process for the HOA attendees. He outlined the four items that members were being asked to approve during the meeting:

1. Minutes from the previous year's meeting.
2. The HOA dues assessment.
3. The proposed 2025 budget for the coming year.
4. The fee assessment schedule.

Mr. Sears explained the voting process for members attending in person and virtually. In-person attendees would fill out and submit voter cards at the meeting. Virtual attendees would receive an email with a voter form for voting.

Carol added that virtual attendees must register their names and lot numbers in the Zoom chat to be eligible for voting. Mr. Sears reiterated this point, urging members to ensure their registration.

Mr. Sears noted that the results of the voting would be posted on the HOA website for all members to access.

An owner of lot PI-E-66 asked for clarification on whether the budget could be approved without also approving the new assessment.

Mr. Sears confirmed that the budget and assessment are interconnected. The proposed budget is based on the new assessment, so rejecting the assessment would result in rejecting the budget. He clarified that if the assessment is not approved, the HOA would revert to the previous budget, which would not support the financial needs outlined in the proposed budget.

An owner of Lot PI-E-55-56 asked why Summit County did not assist with Lower Tollgate Canyon Road maintenance despite significant tax revenue generated by the community. Mr. Sears explained that the county classified all these roads as private, absolving itself of maintenance responsibilities. He acknowledged the owner's frustration and shared that the HOA had considered lobbying the county for financial support or grants.

Mr. Sears mentioned previous discussions with the LDS Church, whose representatives expressed willingness to support efforts to secure county funding. Attendees agreed that a concerted community effort might be necessary to advocate for county involvement.

Marty Hansen, Area 2 Rep raised a concern about the voting rights of part-time vs. full-time residents, noting that part-time residents do not have voting rights. He pointed out that full-time residents or landowners in Summit County who pay taxes should contact the county about funding for Tollgate Canyon Road.

Mr. Sears acknowledged the comment, referring to the situation as a "taxation without representation" issue. He suggested that this was a broader topic for discussion, hinting at the complexities of voting rights in the community.

Mr. Sears clarified that while full-time residents and landowners in Summit County can vote, part-time owners generally do not have voting rights, impacting approximately 300 individuals.

The owner of lot PI-E-66 inquired whether the proposed annual assessment would apply for just one year or extend until 2035. Mr. Sears stated that the assessment is approved on a yearly basis. He explained that each year, members have the opportunity to approve the budget and any related assessments, ensuring a consistent process of community oversight and participation.

Mr. Sears emphasized the board's responsibility to provide transparency about how the funds are utilized. He assured members that this process of disclosure would occur annually, allowing the community to make informed decisions regarding their financial contributions.

Katie Winters, Area 4 Rep commented by apologizing for not attending in person. She emphasized the importance of community vigilance in monitoring activities like construction and suggested reporting concerns to Carol to assist the HOA's efforts. She also addressed taxation and Lower Tollgate Canyon, noting they don't contribute directly to road maintenance, and encouraged community members with relevant knowledge or resources to work with the county on this issue.

Elections 2024

Mr. Sears mentioned that Joe Pagel, who had volunteered to fill an Area 3 vacancy after losing an election the previous year, was up for official approval during this election.

Joe Pagel humorously introduced himself as someone “voted off the island” the previous year. He highlighted his long-standing involvement with the community, including managing an HOA in Park City, and expressed his commitment to addressing community issues and improving conditions for Area 3.

Michael Teranes introduced himself as a candidate for Area 6. Michael shared his enthusiasm for the community, emphasizing his active involvement in various committees, including the Architectural and Road Committees. He expressed a desire to help manage changes and maintain the community’s character.

Justin Call described his technical background in tech and cybersecurity and shared his motivation for volunteering as the HOA’s secretary. He recounted his own challenging experience completing his property and his commitment to enhancing community collaboration through his role.

The owner of lot PI-D-66 bought his land in 1994 and commended the Board and the current meeting's atmosphere, describing it as the most pleasant in years.

With no further items for discussion, Mr. Sears thanked everyone for their participation.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association Annual Board Meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.
