

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS ASSOCIATION
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING
BOB BURDETTE'S HOME
1750 COUNTRYSIDE DRIVE
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH
APRIL 26, 2011

In Attendance: Hutch Foster, Dan Heath, Bob Burdette, Suzanne Larsen, Tom Deaver (Area 4), Scot Erickson (Area 2), Bruce Hutchinson (Area 5), Amy Jackson (Area 7), Mike Gonzales, (Area 6)

Jeff Hubbard (Area 2), Alan Powell (Area 3) were excused.

Ex Officio: Carol Steedman

Guest: Frieda – Revenue Recovery; Evette Conley, Lot G-38

Hutch Foster called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

February 22, 2011

MOTION: Bruce Burdette moved to APPROVE the minutes of February 22, 2011. Bruce Hutchinson seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously. Sue Larsen abstained since she had not attended that meeting.

March 22, 2011

MOTION: Bob Burdette moved to APPROVE the minutes of March 22, 2011. Bruce Hutchinson seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously. Dan Heath abstained since he had not attended that meeting.

Environmental Control Committee Plan Review

Hutch Foster presented plans for a 24' x 32' pole barn that he would like to build in back of his house. It would be sided with hardy plank in a board and batt style with a small section of shingle above the door. The roof would be brown asphalt and the siding would be painted brown. If he paints the door to match his existing garage doors, the color would be wine red.

Bruce Hutchinson was concerned about snow loading in terms of the roof pitch. The roof pitch would be 4/12, which is the same pitch as his house. Mr. Foster believed that

structures on the Ranch that shed snow have more damage issues than structures that hold the snow.

Mr. Deaver clarified that Mr. Foster would follow the County Engineering Department requirements for a building permit. Mr. Foster replied that the County does not have engineering requirements for pole barns, however, he would research and follow the standards of the engineering department from the lumber yards.

Mr. Foster noted that Mike Gonzales is his area rep. If the ECC was comfortable with the color scheme, he would follow the appropriate process and complete the paperwork with Mr. Gonzales before he breaks ground. Mr. Foster did not expect to break ground until June or July.

Mr. Deaver pointed out that since he was his own area rep, he also did the paperwork on his project with Robert Burdette. Mr. Deaver stated that his project is the same color and same structure as his existing house.

Mr. Foster clarified that placement of the pole barn must be shown on a survey drawing of the lot. The setbacks for a pole barn are the same as any structure.

Evette Connely – Lot G-38

This discussion occurred later in the meeting when Ms. Connely arrived.

Ms. Connely had emailed her plans to Mike Gonzales, her area rep, and she had also brought a copy to the meeting. Ms. Connely stated that she plans to build this summer and is due to close on her loan in two weeks. Once the loan closes, they will go back to the County for final permits. Ms. Connely plans to build a log home with a grayish-brown asphalt shingle roof. The logs will be a natural stain. The metal trim will be green. The height is within the 32' requirement.

Ms. Connely stated that she already spoke with Rocky Mountain Power and they will need to run a line and install a meter box. Ms. Foster remarked that the road easement is 30 feet from center line on either side. Based on snow clearing requirements, he advised Ms. Connely to make sure that the meter pedestal is significantly back off the existing road, as well as the potential road, and away from the snow storage area on the sides of the road.

Mr. Foster stated that Mike Gonzales would finish the paperwork with Ms. Connely and collect the impact assessment. He encouraged Ms. Connely to thoroughly read the building agreement, which provides very specific details in terms of colors, materials,

and construction requirements. Once she agrees to a design and color scheme, it cannot be changed without Board approval.

Ranch Manager's Report

Mr. Foster reported that Jody Robinson was on vacation. Brody Blonquist and Trevor Townsend were handling the road work while Jody was away.

Mr. Foster noted that flooding was the primary problem on the Ranch. The rainstorm two weeks earlier melted enough snowpack to wipe out sections of Tollgate Canyon. Mr. Foster commented on several concerns. One was erosion along the canyon and the potential loss of roadway. Steeper banks along that road collapsed and slid into the road. The biggest problem was that the two culverts by the mailboxes were overwhelmed, and the lake that had formed was within 18 inches of topping the road. If the water overflowed the road it would be a matter of hours before that entire section of road would be completely gone.

Mr. Hutchinson asked if the County was involved. Mr. Foster replied that the County was aware of the situation and was willing to help out if it became an emergency. At that time there was nothing the County could do. Mr. Foster noted that the water had receded somewhat. Brody walked the trackhoe down and did some cleanup work. One culvert is flowing very well. The other culvert is either missing, damaged, or buried. Mr. Deaver stated that he and his wife check the culvert every morning and evening. Now that the water is down, his wife thought she could see the edge of the second culvert. If that is the case, the culvert is several feet back from the bank. Mr. Deaver pointed out that eight boulders were pulled out. Mr. Foster believed the culvert may have been crushed by collapsing boulders from the bank.

Mr. Deaver commented on the importance of the Tollgate Canyon Road as primary access in and out of the Ranch. Mr. Foster stated that an emergency egress plan is in place if it ever becomes necessary, but it would be unpopular with UDOT. Everyone who needs to know has been updated on what to do if that emergency arises.

Mr. Foster had received emails and phone calls regarding erosion problems on the Forest Meadows side. He and Jody visited the area and determined that they were erosion problems that could be easily fixed with a blade. They were not worthy of prioritizing.

Equipment Status

Mr. Foster reported that the radiator was replaced in the roller, which was a

maintenance issue that was discussed last year. In addition, the turntable shims needed to be replaced on the grader. Jody would be able to do both repairs. Mr. Foster reported that Jody had repaired the axle on the dump truck.

Projects Completed or In-Progress

Mr. Foster stated that the major projects had been sandbagging, blading snow and trying to keep above water.

In addition to the culvert at the bottom, Jody was concerned with the power lines that were currently exposed along the roadway, where the bar ditch had eroded out Rocky Mountain Power lines. Jody was primarily concerned with the overhead power line that crosses the road. The bank is eroding underneath the pole and substantial mudslides off the bank could cause them to lose the overhead line crossing Tollgate Canyon. That would cut power to the entire Ranch.

Projects Anticipated

Mr. Foster stated that the road has more potholes than ever before. The pot holes would need to be repaired and erosion damage would need to be assessed and repaired.

Mr. Foster stated that one item for consideration was to place heavy rebar grates over the working culverts to help with the amount of sticks and rocks that affect the performance of the culvert.

Mr. Foster reported that for the second time in three years they were at risk of losing the road at the bottom. He thought it was time to seriously discuss ways to resolve the water flow problem at the bottom of Tollgate. He noted that the UDOT culvert on the other side is a 6' or 8' round. Mr. Foster felt it was appropriate to consider a major culvert replacement on lower Tollgate. He would like to have a conversation with the County to reach a cooperative arrangement of working together to solve the problem.

Mr. Burdette asked where the UDOT land ends. Mr. Foster understood that UDOT owns an easement only. Mr. Burdette thought the freeway off-ramp coming westbound was UDOT land. Mr. Foster believed that was also just an easement. He remarked that the actual creek crossing is on land owned by Summit County. Mr. Burdette agreed with the possibility of bringing UDOT into the same discussion with the County if they find that UDOT owns the land and not just an easement.

Mr. Foster felt the Ranch was in a position to collaborate with the County on this repair.

He would like to ask the County for engineering expertise, equipment, labor and hauling capacity.

Mr. Foster complimented Brody and Trevor for taking over when Jody is unavailable. For the past few years their relationship has worked nicely. When Jody is slow, he helps Brody and Trevor, and they reciprocate by helping Jody when they have the time.

Old Business

Review Collection Policies

Frieda with Revenue Recovery requested that the Board sign a new assignment contract. She explained that when the initial contract was signed, Carol had revised the contract to reflect a greater fee than what Revenue Recovery usually charges. The agreed upon fee was 35%.

Frieda clarified that very few changes were made to the contract. She pointed out that the original agreement was that Revenue Recovery would charge 35% for the first batch of collection accounts, and then the fee would increase to 50%. Since they have never charged more than 35%, the language was changed to make 35% a permanent fee. In addition to changing the fee language to reflect what is accurate, minor word changes were made because the judge was concerned that when the account was assigned to Revenue Recovery, liens were not specified. She had added the words "lien with foreclosure rights" to the contract.

Mr. Foster stated that if the Owners Association liens a property that is in arrears, and the account is turned over to Revenue Recovery with the lien and it eventually goes to foreclosure, he wanted to know who would own the property after foreclosure. Frieda replied that the owner would be the highest bidder when it is auctioned at a sale. Mr. Foster wanted to know who would own the excess after Revenue Recovery's fee and the amount owed to the Owners Association is paid. Frieda replied that any excess would go to the original property owner. Frieda stated that Revenue Recovery always has someone attend the sale to bid their own judgment to make sure someone does not low ball the bid and cause their client to lose funds that are owed.

Frieda remarked that the recent case was the first foreclosure she had done for Pine Meadows. It did not work out as she had hoped due to several issues she intended to discuss later. Frieda stated that she met the Ranch Owners attorney, Ted Barnes, and while he is very knowledgeable in terms of HOA laws, he knows very little about collections. Mr. Barnes had done a good job giving the Board the appropriate tools in terms of what the HOA needed to do in order to enforce and collect their money.

Frieda passed around copies of the Community Association Act, as well as a current copy of all the Ranch accounts currently with Revenue Recovery. The amounts included the 100% collection fees that were added. The accounts totaled \$23,142.56. She noted that four or five of those accounts are making payments. Frieda reported that \$17,663.41 was the actual total payments, not including collection fees, that Revenue Recovery had paid to Pine Meadow Ranch since they first started collecting over two years ago.

Frieda stated that one thing she learned through the court process is that judges do not like HOA's to make a profit because they are a non-profit organization. For that reason, they frown on words such as "late penalty". Frieda noted that everything needs to be an "assessment" and that word should replace words like "fines", "penalty", etc.

Frieda stated that until she did research for the recent court case, she was unaware that there were no Pine Meadow Ranch minutes that addressed or indicated that assessments or fees were passed in a motion. The judge wanted minutes to support the fact that the fines and penalties were assessments that had been approved. She stated that it takes a majority vote from the membership to change the the CC&Rs, however, the CC&Rs state that the Board can pass assessments. Frieda suggested that the Board send a letter to all the members reminding them that they are the HOA. If they choose to sue the HOA and succeed in bankrupting the HOA, there would be no road or security services and the yearly assessment could be significantly increased.

Frieda stated that another point against them that was raised by the Judge, was the fact that they were collecting on an account older than the six year statute of limitations. Mr. Foster asked if the statute of limitations applied because the HOA had not taken legal action against that property owner prior to this time. He understood that if they had taken action in the past and it was ongoing, the statute would not apply. Frieda explained that it is six years from the time the HOA files the lawsuit.

Frieda stated that the Board must review every fee that is assessed regardless of how large or small, and rename them to be an "assessment". She reiterated that the original CC&Rs are restrictive, but they give the Board the ability to pass assessments.

Frieda presented the final judgment and noted that Revenue Recovery incurred \$25,000 to file the lawsuit, which is twice the amount Revenue Recovery had made collecting money for Pine Meadow Ranch. The late fees and collection fees were not awarded because they did not have supporting minutes showing motions and approvals. She recommended that the Board review all the fees at one meeting and "re-affirm" them as assessments through a formal motion and vote.

Bob Burdette felt it was appropriate to have that review and make the motions this evening, since they would only be reaffirming what is already in place.

Mr. Foster agreed with Mr. Burdette that the Board should review the list of assessments this evening and assign someone to record it with the County. Mr. Foster pointed out that the language for finance charges was "minimum 12%", however the Plat A CC&Rs designate 18%. He was unsure what was specified in the Forest Meadows CC&Rs. Mr. Foster suggested that they apply a flat 12% annual interest rate for everyone, since that is what they typically charge. Regarding the issue of profit or overcharging, he preferred to refund overpayments rather than apply them to the next year's dues, unless an owner specifically requests that it be credited to their dues. Mr. Foster suggested adding language stating that if an account is turned over for collection, a 100% collection fee would be added and they would refund whatever of that amount is not spent to the debtor to recover the debt.

Mr. Foster clarified that the intent this evening was to review the collection policies that have been in place since 2008 when they started with Revenue Recovery, as well as collection policies that were in existence prior to 2008.

Tom Deaver suggested changing the titles to eliminate words such as fines and penalties. For example, Annual Road Assessment HOA Dues could be changed to Annual Road and HOA assessment. The Board discussed language changes.

MOTION: Hutch Foster made a motion to reaffirm that a Full Time Resident Annual Road Assessment is \$350; Part Time Resident is \$250; and Land only is \$200. Under Building Assessments, to reaffirm that the Construction Impact Fee is \$5,000; Additions to Existing Structures is \$2.00 per square foot. Under Additional Assessments, to reaffirm that the Delinquent Assessment Fee is an annual \$25.00 on past due accounts; the Finance Charge assessed on overdue balances is 12% annual interest; a Re-billing Assessment Fee is \$5 per month; A Returned Check Fee Assessment is \$25; a Lien and Collection Assessment is 35%, up to a 100% Foreclosure Assessment. To reaffirm that a CC&R violation is \$50; that fire violations are \$100 to \$1,000 as specified in the Rules and Regulations. To reaffirm that a Resumption of Service Assessment is charged to the Title Company for \$50; parking decals are \$1.00 each to a maximum of 5 per lot.

Mr. Foster clarified that the motion includes minor language changes but the fee structure remains the same.

Mr. Foster amended his motion to reaffirm the Road Damage Assessment at the cost to

repair, to be included under Building and Impact Assessments.

Bob Burdette seconded the motion.

Mr. Deaver expressed concern with the method of what they were doing. He thought there should be a motion to establish and to set these in the minutes, separate from a motion to reaffirm. He thought it would be easy for someone to dispute that the Board reaffirmed something that was never established. Frieda remarked that they were only reaffirming assessments that were established in the past. She cautioned the Board about giving the impression that these assessments are new. Mr. Foster pointed out that there was historical precedence for the assessment schedule, which has been in place for a long time. Mr. Gonzales noted that the Assessment Schedule was adopted in 2006 and the Board was only reaffirming their previous decision.

Mr. Foster left his motion on the table as stated.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Foster requested that Carol draft a clean copy of the Assessment Schedule and send it to the executive committee for review, prior to recording it with Summit County.

Frieda stated that if any of the Board members wanted to read the lawsuit, they should email her and she would forward a copy with the 17 page ruling. Amy Jackson requested a copy. Mr. Foster asked Amy to read the case and provide a synopsis at the next Board meeting.

Mr. Foster signed the new contract with Revenue Recovery.

Frieda left the meeting.

Mag Chloride Map

Mr. Foster recalled a request at the last meeting for the area reps to create a map identifying which roads would be appropriate for mag chloride this year. Unless the Board has a map and could make an intentional decision to change what is normally done, he would authorize Jody to move forward with what was done in the past. However, the area reps would have to answer to the people in their area as to why their roads were not done.

Mr. Deaver remarked that Navaho Road, Valley Vista, and Uintah View are major areas that feed through that one section of road. He suggested that they take the mag

chloride up to that large intersection. Mr. Foster thought that was a reasonable suggestion. He assumed there were other locations that would not require a lot of mag chloride that would be worthwhile to do, but they need to be identified on paper in order to make a realistic plan.

Signs for lower parking lots to initiate cleanup

Mr. Foster commented a previous discussion about signage for the lower parking lot. Mr. Heath stated that he could get laminated signs for approximately \$10 each. They would not last forever and possibly only one season, but he did not think that would be a problem considering the low cost. Metal signs would be substantially more expensive. They would also need to purchase stands. Mr. Heath suggested that they purchase three laminated signs; one at the mouth of each parking lot and one at the bottom of the Forest Meadow Road. With the history of signage in that location, the signs may not last very long, which is why he preferred not to spend money on metal signs. Once they establish that the parking lot is there, they could eventually purchase signs that would last longer. Mr. Heath estimated the total budget, including stands, to be \$70 to \$80 for laminated signs.

Mr. Foster read the content of the sign, "Notice – these parking lots are privately owned. No parking is permitted without express written permission from the Pine Meadow Ranch HOA. Beginning June 15, 2011 we will begin towing vehicles from this area." He suggested two additions to the language. One would be to identify the written permission as the Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association parking decal visible on a window. The Board concurred.

Mr. Hutchinson suggested that they issue a memo on the website stating that the vehicles are to be parked only for a certain period of time. The sign could then refer to the website for information regarding parking in that area. Mr. Foster agreed that the bottom of the sign should direct everyone to the website.

Mr. Foster reminded the Board that this was only the first step towards cleaning up the parking lots. The next step would be to decide which lots should be long-term, which ones are short-term, and the difference between the lots.

Mr. Foster was comfortable authorizing the purchase of three signs with the suggested changes. He would also post a notice on the front page of the website.

Summer Meeting Schedule

Mr. Foster clarified that the May through October meetings would be held on the Ranch

at the Ranch Manager's Office. He was considering asking Eric Cylvick for use of the larger meeting room in the Water Company building.

Mr. Foster stated that he would not be able to attend the next meeting.

New Business

Mr. Foster noted that the Assessment Schedule also has additions to existing structures, which implies residential space. The impact fee is \$2.00 per square foot. He noted that at \$2.00 per square foot, the impact assessment is similar to the \$5,000 new construction assessment, depending on the size of the addition. However, in planning to build his own barn, he realized that the impact assessment would be 10% of his entire construction cost. At 10% of the project cost, the assessment seemed fairly large for two loads of lumber and one concrete truck.

Mr. Foster asked the Board to consider the idea of an outbuilding impact assessment. An outbuilding would be defined as a detached structure, but other considerations would include whether or not it has utilities, living space, and other amenities. Mr. Foster stated that he sees a number of small buildings go up around the Ranch every year, and he wanted to start controlling that in some way. People tend to believe that a small detached building is not subject to the rules and regulations of the Owners Association. He thought a smaller impact assessment may encourage people to bring their plan to the Board.

Mr. Burdette wanted to know what happens when someone builds new construction and builds a Tuff Shed with it. Mr. Foster stated that he had a shed on his lot that was built years before he had new construction or was aware that there was a policy.

Mr. Deaver remarked that if the building has residential living space, it should be subject to the residential impact assessment. Mr. Foster agreed that a detached building with living space should be considered residential. Mr. Deaver stated that a Tuff Shed typically has a floor and requires no construction. Mr. Erickson believed that structures without utilities or living space should be assessed at a much lower rate because the impacts are minimal. Mr. Deaver pointed out that even if the structure does not require County permits, they need to make sure it comes to the Board for color and materials.

Ms. Jackson asked if the intent was to collect assessments or to approve the plans. Mr. Foster remarked that the primary intent is to give the Board the opportunity to look at the architecture before the building is constructed. Mr. Gonzales understood that the purpose of the impact assessment is to protect the roads and to make sure there is

money for repairs if necessary.

Mr. Burdette felt it was important to institute an appropriate fee and apply it equally to everyone who does the same type of construction. Mr. Deaver suggested an impact assessment of \$1.00 per square foot. Mr. Erickson agreed. It is a minimal amount, but it would make people aware that an outbuilding needs to come before the Board.

MOTION: Scot Erickson made a motion to assess a \$1.00 per square foot impact assessment for outbuildings.

Mr. Foster clarified that the motion was for an outbuilding with no living space.

Mr. Erickson amended his motion to assess a \$1.00 per square foot impact assessment for outbuildings with no habitable space.

Mr. Foster commented on four projects that have had very little impact on the Ranch in their construction and use. For that reason, he was not opposed to refunding a \$1.00 per square foot to those owners. Mr. Deaver wanted to know how far back they would go retroactive. Mr. Foster stated that the \$2.00 per square foot rule was created during his time on the Board. Mr. Heath recalled that prior to that time the impact assessment was \$1.00 per square foot for additions. Mr. Burdette provided a brief history of the impact assessment prior to the \$2.00 per square foot, and noted that outbuildings were not specifically identified.

Mr. Erickson replied that the new impact fee for outbuildings would begin now and go back retroactively. He agreed with Mr. Foster that people who paid in good faith should receive a refund.

Mr. Hutchinson had concerns because an outbuilding could consist of a number of categories. In his opinion, allowing an outbuilding to have power and water puts it in a completely different category than a horse barn. He agreed that there should be an impact assessment, and asked if the \$1.00 per square foot applied to any outbuilding situation. Mr. Foster replied that since 2006, five people followed the rules and made their plan known to the Board and paid a high assessment. However, at least six others never came before the Board and paid no assessment. Mr. Foster hoped the new impact assessment would create a middle ground that relieves those who build low impact structures from paying the higher rate and also bring in people who may otherwise avoid the Board because of the \$2.00 per square feet rate. Mr. Hutchinson believed that some people would still build without coming to the Board. Mr. Foster agreed that the Board would have to pursue some owners regardless.

Mr. Burdette asked if they would retroactively bill the owners they could identify who built outbuildings without paying an impact assessment fee. Mr. Jackson pointed out that there is nothing in writing that identifies an outbuilding. Mr. Erickson agreed that it would be unfair to charge someone for something that did not exist at the time. Mr. Foster remarked that based on the current guidelines, those who paid did not need to and those who want to build could do so without paying. However, they still needed to have their plans approved. Mr. Burdette felt it would be difficult to retroactively assess payments.

Ms. Jackson seconded the motion with the amendment to make the \$1.00 per square foot effective as of May 1st. The majority of the Board thought the impact assessment should be effective immediately.

Mr. Foster summarized that the motion was for a \$1.00 per square foot assessment for detached outbuildings with no human habitation space. He called for a vote on the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Bruce Hutchinson abstained.

Mr. Foster preferred to research the ones they know of and open it to any they might have missed since the original assessment was instituted. He strongly felt those people were over charged and he was not opposed to offering a rebate to the current rate for those owners. The County refunded when their plan review fees were high, and he actually received a rebate from the County when they realized they were overcharging. Mr. Foster remarked that due to the small number of owners involved, it would not be a financial burden on the Owners Association. He clarified that the refund would be \$1.00 per square foot.

Mr. Hutchinson asked if the Board would automatically issue the refund or whether it would be requested by the owner. Mr. Foster stated that the Board should post the refund decision on the website, and the owner would have to request it.

MOTION: Tom Deaver made a motion to offer a rebate to the current rate of \$1.00 per square foot to the owners who previously paid \$2.00 per square foot to construct their outbuildings.

Mr. Burdette noted that all building fees are deposited in a special account and it would be easy to track that account over the past three to five years.

Scot Erickson seconded the motion.

After further discussion, Mr. Burdette proposed that the Board send a letter to the eligible owners and let the owners request the refund in writing.

Mr. Deaver amended his motion to include Mr. Burdette's proposal.

VOTE: The motion passed. Hutch Foster and Dan Heath abstained.

Monthly Budget Review

Mr. Burdette reviewed the unpaid bills in the amount of \$15,282. He assumed the bill from Park City Towing was for towing someone from the Ranch. Mr. Foster reported that he had made the call to Park City Towing. Mr. Burdette explained that because the towing company cannot assess against the owner, the Owners Association agrees to pay the portion that cannot be assessed to the owner. Mr. Foster had no idea where the vehicle came from. It was parked in the middle of the road during a storm on Arapahoe in front of Bobcat Springs. He clarified that he rarely calls for a tow unless it is a hazard situation.

Mr. Burdette continued reviewing the bills. Mr. Foster explained the \$73 charge from William Peugh. A vehicle had been abandoned in the lower parking lot for a long time. During a large storm Jody needed the space to push snow and ended up blocking the vehicle out of frustration. It was a winter track vehicle and should have been in the upper lot. When the owner came up, he was extremely angry that the vehicle was blocked in by snow. He tried to move it and broke the track. After several contentious conversations, Jody called the gentleman and apologized and Mr. Foster negotiated an agreement with Mr. Peugh that the Owners Association would pay the actual hard cost to repair his machine. He noted that Mr. Peugh lives outside the Ranch, is an annual contributor who pays his dues and he is a good neighbor.

Mr. Burdette noted that the total amount of \$15,282 included two payroll checks for Jody, the payroll taxes, and \$1891 on the Capital One account for the axle, boot and ABS sensor.

MOTION: Mr. Burdette proposed to pay all the bills as presented and outlined. Dan Heath seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Assignment Review

Dan Heath would continue to work on signage for the parking lots. Mr. Foster would

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association
Monthly Board Meeting
April 26, 2011
Page 14

post an appropriate notice on the website.

Amy Jackson noted that her assignment was to read the court case and provide an update. However, she was unable to attend the next meeting and offered to write a short opinion for their review.

Carol reported that to date they were at 84% of potential of what was invoiced.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Owners Association Board adjourned at 9:09 p.m.
