

Approved
August 18, 2015, as corrected

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS ASSOCIATION
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING
RANCH MANAGER'S OFFICE
JULY 21, 2015

In Attendance: Tony Tyler -President; Pat Kreis, Treasurer; Honey Parker, Secretary; Matt Brown (Area 1); Jeremy Jespersen (Area 2); Alan Powell (Area 3); Tom Deaver (Area 4); Mark Hodgson (Area 5); Mike Gonzales (Area 6); Tom LeCheminant (Area 7).
Ex Officio – Jody Robinson, Ranch Manager.

Dan Heath was excused.

Guests: Kim Klopp, a realtor and concerned citizen; Andrew Burton, SS145K.

Tony Tyler called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

NOTE: The first part of the meeting was not recorded and Mr. Tyler summarized the discussions and actions that took place before the recording was started.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes were corrected to change hydraulic ramp to **hydraulic ram**.

MOTION: Tom Deaver moved to APPROVE the minutes of June 16, 2015. Tom LeCheminant seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Mike Gonzales abstained since he was absent from the June 16th meeting.

New Construction

Lot PI-E-71

Tom Deaver presented plans for a shed he was building. The Board discussed the materials and Mr. Deaver paid the impact fee. The plans were approved with one negative vote from Mike Gonzales.

Lot E-70

Bill and Cheryl Groot are building a new storage barn with no utilities and they presented site plans and building plans. Their previous contractor is doing the construction. A motion passed with an exception to the CC&R's that specifically limits a single lot to two structures. This storage barn will be the third structure on the Groot's property. The motion was passed unanimously.

From this point the minutes were taken from the actual recording.

Mr. Deaver noted that Jerel Lindley, Lot PI-E-64, had paid his fees and turned in his forms. He had sent his plans electronically. Mr. Lindley had stated that he met with Summit County and the Fire Marshall and he had approvals to move forward.

FMD-159

Jeremy Jespersen, Area 2 rep, reported that a neighbor had made him aware that a shed was delivered and the owners had not gone through the process. The owner was very apologetic and sent him plans and pictures. Mr. Jespersen stated that it is a 14 x 40 square foot structure. Mr. Deaver confirmed that the structure met the architectural guidelines. Mr. Tyler suggested that Mr. Jespersen follow through to make sure the structure was sited properly on the site plan and away from the neighbor's lot. Mr. Jespersen noted that the structure would not have power.

MOTION: Mr. Tyler made a motion to approve a 14 x 40 structure on FMD-159 contingent on receiving the site plan. The impact fee would be \$672. Alan Powell seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Ms. Parker abstained because she was uncomfortable voting without seeing the plans.

Ranch Managers Report

Jody reported that Arapahoe and Valley Vista were prepped and ready for mag water tomorrow. He had graveled Navaho, Valley Vista, Elk Road, and Beaver Circle.

Mr. Tyler added Forgotten Lane to the list because it had been significantly washed out. Jody stated that he was trying to prep the other roads for the 4th of July and the 24th of July holidays.

Jody stated that culverts were on the agenda, as well as completing the gravel.

Jody stated that he had aggregate #5 for \$4,600, and he asked if the Board had decided to put that on the Forest Meadow side. Mr. Tyler answered yes.

Jody stated that he was unable to reach the grinders, per their discussion at the last meeting, and he would try again. Mr. Tyler wanted to know the grinding cost before ordering the gravel. If the grinding was \$5,000 he thought that should be done instead of the gravel, or they may decide to do both.

The equipment was running well. Jody had to have a hose repaired on the grader. That was the only major expense. Everything else was normal equipment maintenance. Jody stated that he had to order a pinion shaft and seal for the Ranger, which was a larger expense.

Mr. Tyler reviewed the road projects that were completed. For next month he suggested that Jody do the culverts, Running Deer, and items 3, 5, and 6 on the road projects list.

Jody reported that he had the propane tank refilled because the price was down this month to 89 cents per gallon.

Water Company Report

Mr. Tyler stated that the Water Company had an interesting meeting for two reasons. One was that it was brought to the attention of the Water Board that three properties have had their water shares foreclosed by the Water Company for non-payment; however, those three properties were still receiving water. It violates the Rules and Regulations and the Bylaws of the Water Company, which states that without a water share you cannot have water service. Mr. Tyler reported that the Water Board voted to remove the water meters from the three properties that had their water shares foreclosed. He pointed out that all three homes are occupied by full-time residents and their water shares have been revoked for a significant length of time. The Water Company has been unsuccessful in collection attempts, as well as attempts to set up payment plans. Meters will be pulled on PI-D-97, PI-C-80, and FM-D-113A within the next few weeks.

Mr. Tyler explained the process for re-purchasing a water share, which includes paying back assessments plus a 10% fee. If the meter is removed the owner must also pay a meter reset fee.

Mr. Tyler stated that the Water Board also discussed another lot that has been in arrears since 2009. The lot has been a rental cabin and the owner has been making payments on the past due amount, which is why the water share was not foreclosed. However, the payment amount is not sufficient to cover the current year's water usage and the bill has continued to increase on an annual basis. The owners currently owe approximately \$26,000. Mr. Tyler stated that there is a provision in the Bylaws that allows for people to be on a payment plan, but the plan has an expiration date for paying off any amounts owed by the end of the calendar year.

Mr. Tyler stated that the Water Company contacted the owner and told him that they were far behind in arrears and they were using a significant amount of water. They also suspect that there may be a leak on the property, even though it has never shown up on the leak software. It would have to be an incredibly erratic leak for that to happen. The owner has been told that unless he pays the balance his meter would be locked.

Mr. Deaver noted that Mr. Cylvick had told him there were three properties with water bills near \$30,000 per year, and all three were weekend rentals. Mr. Tyler stated that the property he mentioned was one of the three.

Mr. Tyler reported that the third issue the Water Board discussed was that water usage on the Mountain this summer was higher than it has ever been in the past. They were using an average of 22.3 gallons per minute 24/7. Mr. Tyler explained that they start with a certain amount of water and drain it down during the day. At night it regenerates, but not fast enough to reach the level it started at, and overtime they were losing water. Mr. Tyler remarked that there is a connection to Mountain Regional through the emergency exit out to Red Hawk, and the Water Company fed them 125,000 gallons of water earlier in the year to find a leak that Mountain Regional had in their system. Therefore, Mountain Regional owed Pine Meadow Water 125,000 gallons of water, and they have already fed back 50,000 gallons as a stop gap over the Fourth of July.

Ms. Parker asked if there were more people on the Ranch to cause the extensive water use. Mr. Tyler replied that there were significantly more people on the Ranch than in the past. Mr. Tyler recalled that approximately 3.2 million gallons had been used so far in this calendar year, compared to 4.1 million gallons for all of 2014. He believed they would come close to doubling the water usage this year.

Mr. Gonzales thought that was a reason for discouraging new construction. Ms. Kreis asked if restricting construction was possible. Mr. Gonzales thought that was a reason for discouraging new construction. Mr. Tyler reminded the Board that the Water Company has an agreement with Mountain Regional as an additional water source. There is not a tolling agreement for gallons/ dollars; however, there was also no guarantee of service from Mountain Regional. Mr. Tyler reported that the Water Board was looking at a long-term service agreement with some form of tolling back and forth that would allow for the purchase of water. Mr. Tyler noted that part of the agreement with Mountain Regional was the sharing of costs for the telemetry system and piping. In exchange, Mountain Regional feeds some of their lots off of the Pine Meadow tanks. There was a lot of give and take involved in their participation with Mountain Regional and so far it has been a good partnership. Mr. Tyler stated that an agreement was already in place for emergency services, which basically says one entity will feed water to the other in the event of a fire in either place. Mr. Tyler personally believed that

eventually in the future Pine Meadow would have to be annexed by the Mountain Regional Water District, because there is not enough water for the Water Company to sustain the growth on the Mountain and the number of lots. Mr. Deaver pointed out that annexation would be an expensive outcome for Pine Meadow.

Ms. Parker asked if it would be helpful to ask the property owners to conserve water or whether it would even make a difference. Mr. Deaver noted that the owners have been asked to conserve water twice before. Mr. Tyler did not believe it would make that much difference because the primary use occurs over the holiday weekends.

On-going Business.

Community Playground

Mr. Tyler had received an email from Mandy Deuel. Ms. Deuel did not have a major update at this point and would not be at the Board meeting. They were working on the final layout and planned to send it to the Board for review and approval before they start raising funds. Mr. Tyler noted that Ms. Deuel had talked to him about potentially setting up an account for donations that would be kept separate from the operating account. Mr. Tyler told Ms. Deuel to contact Ms. Kreis.

Ms. Parker recalled a previous discussion about having a parking area and cutting in a road. She thought it would be better to make a path from the existing parking area as opposed to spending time and money and using the space for another parking lot. Mr. Tyler disagreed because people are generally lazy and they will park on the roads rather than walk the path. Ms. Parker suggested the parking area as a contingency. If people do not use the existing parking area and practice bad behavior by using other means, they could then consider adding a parking lot. Mr. Tyler explained that the playground will be used during the summer, which is also when materials and equipment is staged in the upper lot. During the summer the lot is closed to vehicles and people would be forced to park at the lower lot and walk through the operations to reach the playground. It would not be a safe walk. He understood Ms. Parker's point, but he did not believe it was practical. Mr. Jespersen thought the materials and equipment could be moved. Mr. Deaver remarked that the purpose of the playground is to have a place where people can take their children. Regardless of which parking lot is used for parking, it would be difficult to wheel strollers on the path to the playground. Mr. Tyler was not opposed to trying Ms. Parker's suggestion, but the issue is who would pay for the road and the parking lot if it was done after the fact. Mr. Gonzales thought they could set the funds earmarked for the road and parking lot aside in the event that a walking path does not work. He agreed with Ms. Parker that it was better than putting in another parking lot so close to an existing lot.

Mr. Tyler thought it was an issue worth discussing at the next meeting.

Fire Pit Regulations

Mr. Tyler stated that he did not have time to follow-up from the last meeting. Mr. Powell stated that he had followed up on some of the items discussed when he spent a day on-call for the Fire Company. He obtained the manual from Bryce that is given to the Fire Wardens. The manual specifically states, "...or a manufactured fire pit", as long as it is installed per the manufacturer's instructions. Mr. Powell noted that any manufactured pit can be approved. The remaining language is the same as Pine Meadows in terms of materials, etc. The only difference is that the Fire Wardens allow "a concrete steel ring or a manufactured pit."

Mr. Tyler stated that the Board would look at revising the language at the next meeting.

Fences

Ms. Parker read from the Guidelines, "Only natural fences and natural looking fences shall be permitted as boundary line. No barbed wire or chain link fences may be used for such purposes within the property owner's boundary line, and for a limited area only used..." Ms. Parker recalled from the last meeting that the ability to have fences was clear, but the word "natural" was open to interpretation. Ms. Parker had drafted language to read, "Only natural fences and natural looking fences shall be permitted as boundary lines. **Natural and natural looking is defined as; log or natural looking log used in its natural looking form as with a rail or split rail fence. The look should be open and of the environment. No picket fences,** or barbed wire, chain link..." She clarified that the added language was an attempt to clarify that a fence is something that looks like it belongs in the environment.

Mr. Deaver asked if there was a height restriction. Ms. Parker replied that she did not address height because she could not determine how to put a number on "natural". Mr. Deaver remarked that originally fences could not restrict wildlife. Mr. Tyler believed the Board had some latitude to define height. He thought natural looking blends with the environment. A six foot or eight foot tall fence looks man made and does not blend with the environment regardless of the material used. Ms. Kreis agreed that they needed to be very specific about height because the word "natural" can be very subjective. Mr. Tyler stated that instead of putting it in the CC&Rs, the definition of a fence would be clarified in the Rules and Regulations, which still requires a vote at the annual meeting. Mr. Gonzales pointed out that per Article 5 of the CC&Rs, even an allowed fence must be pre-approved by the Board. He noted that Article 5 talks about any structure and not just fences.

The Board discussed the fence that has caused a dispute between two owners. Mr. Gonzales thought they could use that particular fence as an example when writing the definition. Mr. Tyler remarked that the fence in this case was a process issue more than a policy issue. However, the height of the fence still needed to be checked. Ms. Parker noted that the property owners were beginning to resolve their differences and she wanted to make sure that the Board did not enflame the situation again. Mr. Tyler asked Mr. Deaver, as the area rep, to contact the property owner and look at the fence.

Mr. Tyler asked the Board for suggestions on an acceptable fence height. Mr. LeCheminant remarked that fencing a partial area for horses or livestock would require a different height than a fence down a property line. Mr. Tyler suggested a 4' limit. Any other height requests would be subject to review. Mr. Powell noted that the CC&Rs talk about two kinds of fences; a perimeter fence and a partial fence for pets or animals. He asked if the Board needed to define specific materials for partial interior fences. Ms. Parker noted that the current language allows the undesirable fencing materials, subject to Board approval. Mr. Tyler stated that he would be comfortable with allowing different materials if someone wanted to put up a temporary horse corral. If a fence is intended to be permanent it needs to be a natural looking material.

Mr. Tyler summarized that the clarification should be separated from the CC&Rs and a new subtitle would be created as an amendment to the Rules and Regulations. A fence height should be 4' or less, and all fence types must have prior Board approval prior to installation. Ms. Parker stated that she would re-draft the language and email it to the Board.

Committees

Mr. Gonzales thought the duties of the Code Committee were partially what the ECC was supposed to be doing. The area reps should be following through on enforcement as they see things or have things reported. Mr. Gonzales thought the Architectural Committee made sense, but he thought the entire Board should be part of the Code enforcement.

Mr. Tyler explained that the intent was to streamline the process because he does not have time to follow-up on every violation and send out letters, and many things are falling through the cracks. Mr. Gonzales suggested that the Area Reps could contact Carol directly if Mr. Tyler was comfortable with that approach. He believed that the follow-up process was more important than the process to notify people. He suggested keeping a community log of activity so in 30 days they would know to follow up. Mr. Tyler suggested that they ask Carol to keep a log when she sends out a violation. He

believed Carol could sign on behalf of the HOA if the Board gave her that authority. Each area rep could send the violation to Carol to be mailed out. Carol could keep a log and the Board could review the violations on a monthly basis during the Board meeting. At that point the area rep who submitted the violation would follow up.

Ms. Parker commented on a stockpile of construction materials in the road on Chipmunk. Mr. Gonzales was the Area 6 Rep. Ms. Parker had taken pictures and she would email them to the Board. Mr. Tyler clarified that grading is considered dirt work and that is not a violation. For example, an owner can grade in a driveway by simply filling out an application with Summit County and paying the \$500 driveway fee. It does not require HOA approval. It also applies to grading a building pad. Mr. Tyler stated that the HOA does not regulate grading in the Architectural Controls, but they do regulate structures. Once there is concrete and wood on site, it becomes a violation if the Board has not approved the building plans. Mr. Tyler stated that in this particular incident on Chipmunk, the owner has been before the Boards in the past on other sites and he knows the process. If he has started to build without Board approval he would be fined. Mr. Deaver asked if they no longer issue a first offense warning. Mr. Tyler replied that it would not be a first offense for this particular owner and the owner should be fined. Mr. Deaver agreed with Mr. Tyler, but he was certain that the owner would argue that it was the first offense on this site.

Mr. Tyler assumed from the comments that there was no need for a Code Committee. He informed Carol that the Board would like her to receive the Code violations from the area reps or any Board member and send out notices of non-compliance. She should also keep a log of the violations that could be attached to the back of the agenda.

Mr. Tyler noted that four Board members had signed up for the Architectural Review Committee; however, he preferred a three person committee. Dan Heath was removed from the list. Tom LeCheminant, Tom Deaver and Mark Hodgson were the Architectural Review Committee members. Mr. Tyler explained that he was looking for a committee to initially review the architectural plans. When an area rep receives a set of building plans they should send it to the three Committee members. The Committee should send Mr. Tyler an email naming the lots that should be put on the agenda under New Construction or Additions. Mr. Tyler clarified that he did not want to take the time to review all the building plans at each meeting. Instead, he would look to the Committee members to update the Board on whether or not the plans meet the guidelines.

Mr. Tyler reported on a phone call he received from a resident on Forgotten Lane complaining that they had been forgotten again for road work. Mr. Tyler had driven Forgotten Lane a few days earlier and he agreed that it was bad. Mr. Tyler asked the area reps to drive around their areas and let him know which roads need work.

Mr. Brown asked if they update the website when a project is completed. Mr. Tyler replied that it is not done currently, but he makes a list for the Annual Meeting to show which roads were done. Ms. Parker stated that she could easily update the website as projects are completed. Mr. Gonzales suggested that they maintain a spread sheet tracking the history of what has been done to maintain different sections of roads. Over the course of years they would be able to plan on where the money needs to be spent. He pointed out that they were doing the mag water experiment, but they have nothing to compare it with. Tracking the history would give them pertinent information. Jody thought it would be a difficult comparison, particularly when they have washouts. Mr. Tyler stated that Jody could make a note that he had to regrade due to a washout. Mr. Tyler favored the idea of tracking the history on road work.

Summer Road Projects

Jody had spent \$12,608 on gravel for the roads. The first application of mag water was \$2,935.

Ranch Signage

Mr. Tyler provided the sample of a sign that the Board proofed at the last meeting. At that time there was consensus that the sign was too flimsy and too small. The current signs are larger and narrower. Mr. Tyler stated that another option was a 36" length and 6" width sign with four inch letters, which was similar to the current signs. It would be an 8 mil sign as opposed to a 2 mil sign like the sample. It would be a brown color with white letters and standard reflective properties. The signs would be two-sided, which is the federal standard for public roads. The cost was \$26 per sign. Mr. Tyler recommended that Dan Heath obtain a sample of the alternative sign. He thought it was worth spending \$26 to make sure the sign was what they wanted.

MOTION: Tony Tyler made a motion to authorize Dan Heath to order a sample sign from the manufacturer of the second sign. Alan Powell seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Board discussed the thistle problem on the Ranch. Mr. Tyler stated that the HOA is responsible for everything on Ranch property, but the majority of the thistle problem is on private lots. Ms. Parker would post it on the website and encourage people to remove it from their property. Jody noted that Millstone works best to eradicate the thistle. The cost was \$100 per quart. One quart mixed is approximately 60 gallons. Mr. Tyler asked Jody to purchase two or three quarts additional quarts the next time he is in

Salt Lake. If they do not use all of it this year they could use it next year.

New Business

Trash Enclosure

Mr. Tyler stated that he has been working with Summit County and Allied/Republic Waste. They met on site four or five times over the last two weeks. Mr. Tyler also spoke with representatives of the Church Camp many times. He explained that the Church camps have historically used the trash bins. The HOA has allowed the bins to be located on Ranch property but they are for the use of Tollgate Canyon as a whole. The bins are paid for out of property taxes for that particular area. Mr. Tyler believed the current location of the bins was the right location. They have traditionally been moved down during the winter because Allied/Republic refused to go up the road to empty the bins. However, with the regrade and improvements to Forest Meadow Road, Allied/Republic was willing to go up the road during the winter to empty the bins. Therefore, the bins can remain there permanently. Mr. Tyler stated that even though the Church camps have been dumping in those trash cans, they are not allowed to use them. The Church has been notified by Summit County and Mr. Tyler and others have spoken with the Church on multiple occasions. They are considered a commercial enterprise, and as a commercial enterprise they are required to provide their own trash bins.

Mr. Tyler remarked that the problem is that the Church camps cannot get access at the far end of the Ranch. They have actively looked for places to locate dumpsters on the Mountain that could be serviced, but all of the property owners in those locations have turned them down. Mr. Tyler stated that the Church was requesting to place two dumpsters at the dumpster lot on Ranch property at their own cost for their exclusive use. Mr. Tyler personally thought it was a reasonable solution. If there is spillover on to the Tollgate dumpster the Church would be fined. Mr. Tyler had suggested that the Church lock the dumpsters that they would pay for. He noted that Ty Larsen was comfortable with that suggestion because they already do that in other locations. Mr. Tyler stated that the Church was requesting to place two dumpsters at the dumpster lot on Ranch property at their own cost for their exclusive use. Mr. Tyler personally thought it was a reasonable solution. If there is spillover on to the Tollgate dumpster the Church would be fined. Mr. Tyler had suggested that the Church lock the dumpsters that they would pay for. He noted that Ty Larsen was comfortable with that suggestion because they already do that in other locations. Mr. Tyler recommended that the Board allow them to place dumpsters on the dumpster lot that would be signed for their use only at their cost. The lids would be locked and only used by the hosts from the Church camps who would have the key to dump the trash. It would only be used during the summer

months and the bins would be completely removed during the winter.

Mr. Tyler stated that Tom LeCheminant knows someone who does commercial chain link fencing. He asked Mr. LeCheminant to obtain a quote for a 50' x 50' square with a truck access gate which would be locked. The Code would be given to Allied/Republic for access. A second gate would be for people.

The Board discussed design and concepts for the dumpster area. The suggestion was made to make the area look nicer and to enforce the rules and regulations for dumping trash. Mr. Tyler stated that the reality is that people watching the area get aggressive with the people throwing things in the dumpster and there are many confrontations on a daily basis. He was concerned about people getting hurt on Ranch property trying to enforce a code that should be enforced by Summit County. He understood that some people were handing out flyers at the dumpster with information on what can and cannot be thrown into the dumpster. He was not opposed to that type of activity, but he was opposed to having them confront someone who throws something away that does not belong in the trash bin. He was concerned about creating a liability issue for the HOA. Mr. Powell agreed that the Ranch owners should not be the enforcer. They should collect the data and let Summit County enforce the violations. If the County does not follow-up on the complaints, someone with more authority should talk to Summit County.

Ms. Parker asked if installing a camera was realistic and could be set up quickly. She thought it was worth trying to see if it was effective. If someone is caught on camera committing a violation there would be no personal confrontation and the picture could not be disputed. They could send the picture to Summit County and see what the County was willing to do. Mr. Powell thought Mr. Tyler would be the best person to communicate with Summit County because he already has a good relationship with the County. Mr. Tyler stated that he has already spoken with the County and informed them that Summit County first needed to take an interest and then the HOA would help. He wanted to be able to tell Tom Fisher at Summit County that the HOA has cleaned up their own mess and they were staffing the dumpster area; but that the evidence and complaints are useless if the County does nothing to enforce the violations.

Mr. Tyler asked for a vote on whether or not to allow the LDS Church to place trash bins on the dumpster lot.

MOTION: Tom Deaver moved to allow the LDS Church to place trash bins on the dumpster lot.

Ms. Parker was not opposed to the idea, but she was concerned about space. The

space is small with limited parking, and they were potentially talking about an enclosure that would take up more space. Mr. Tyler thought Ms. Parker raised a good point. They have allowed people to park there in the past and that should stop. Parking should be prohibited. Mr. Powell agreed that there was plenty of parking in other areas for the Ranch owners and there was more value in using it as a dumpster area. Ms. Parker understood, but she also thought having the use of that parking was more convenient for people who commute and for other reasons. She did not favor completely eliminating the parking option. Ms. Kreis pointed out that the motion was only to allow the LDS Church to place two garbage cans. Ms. Parker clarified that she was only suggesting that they look at the lot and determine where the cans would be located and how it would impact the space. She preferred that the Board look at that before giving approval. Mr. Tyler suggested that they could allow the Church to place the dumpsters for the remainder of this year, and the Board could re-evaluate it next year. Ms. Parker was comfortable with his suggestion.

Mr. Tyler asked Mr. Deaver to amend his motion to only apply to the remainder of this year, after which time the Board would discuss the remaining use for that lot.

Mr. Deaver was willing to amend his motion with an additional caveat that the LDS Church would be willing this year to add an additional dumpster if they find that two dumpsters is not sufficient to handle the amount of trash they generate. Ms. Parker thought the Church should first come to the Board to make sure there was enough room for an additional bin. Mr. Brown wanted the Board to consider whether or not to prohibit parking before giving additional space to the Church for another dumpster.

AMENDED MOTION: Mr. Deaver modified his motion to allow the LDS Church to place two trash bins on the Ranch dumpster lot for the remainder of this year and that the Church agrees to add a third can if two cans were not sufficient for their needs. Mark Hodgson seconded the motion.

Mr. Tyler summarized that the Motion was to allow the LDS Church to place two cans on the dumpster lot on Ranch property for the rest of 2015, subject to the fact that if they need to add another can for capacity that they agree to do so. Mr. Tyler stated that he would also ask the Church to submit their plans for signage to the Board for review.

VOTE: The motion passed. Matt Brown and Mike Gonzales abstained from the vote.

Monthly Budget Review

Ms. Kreis reviewed the unpaid bills detail.

MOTION: Pat Kreis moved to pay all the unpaid bills as presented. Tony Tyler

seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Brown referred to the detail regarding construction impact fees. He understood that there was some confusion about whether a particular property owner had paid the impact fee. He asked if the detail was showing that it was paid. Mr. Tyler explained that it was in accounts receivable, which means it was invoiced but payment had not yet been received. Ms. Kreis was pleased that Carol had prepared the detail because there were questions about the impact fees.

Mr. Deaver recalled that Eric Cylvick had written a check for the impact fee at the last meeting; but it was showing as an account receivable. Mr. Tyler agreed that Mr. Cylvick had paid the impact fee and he asked Carol to follow through. Mr. Deaver stated that he had received an email from Carol informing him that Jerel Lindley has paid his impact fee, but it was still showing as unpaid. Mr. Kreis noted that the profit and loss statement indicates that the impact fees were paid. She believed the confusion was with the detail Carol provided because it was only showing what she had received.

Ms. Kreis reported that the 97.4% on the annual assessments for this year was the best collection percentage the HOA has ever had for any year in the history of the Ranch.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Owners Association Board adjourned at 8:18 p.m.
