

Approved  
October 25, 2011

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS ASSOCIATION  
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING  
PINE MEADOW RANCH  
SEPTEMBER 27, 2011

In Attendance: Hutch Foster, Dan Heath, Bob Burdette, Suzanne Larsen, Alan Powell (Area 3) Scot Erickson (Area 1), Jeff Hubbard (Area 2), Bruce Hutchinson (Area 5),

Amy Jackson, (Area 7) arrived later in the meeting.

Suzanne Larsen, Tom Deaver (Area 4), Mike Gonzales (Area 6) were excused.

Ex Officio: Jody Robinson

Guests: Pete Gilwold, a developer; Lou Powell, Alan Powell's father; Matt Brown, Lot SS-144A; Brett Davis, Lot 115.

Hutch Foster called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m.

### **Approval of Minutes – August 23, 2011**

MOTION: Bruce Hutchinson moved to APPROVE the minutes of August 23, 2011 as written. Bob Burdette seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed.

### **New Business**

Mr. Foster stated that in 2008 Doug McCallister submitted an application to Summit County for a 26 lot subdivision. Mr. Gilwold remarked that he was not involved with the original application, but he thought it was an eight lot subdivision. Mr. Burdette replied that it was originally submitted with more lots and over time it evolved to fewer lots. Mr. Foster stated that in 2008 Mr. McCallister was looking to apply under a Transfer of Density (TDR) proposal. Specifically a transfer of vacant lot density within Pine Meadow Ranch and on the circumference of Pine Meadow Ranch and moving that density into the Deer Meadows area. That proposal was denied by the County Council. Since that time, the existence of TDRs has become unclear, and Deer Meadows is reapplying under a Specially Planned Area (SPA) application. His interpretation of the Code is that the idea of a SPA is to give the developer an opportunity to do something valuable and interesting with a lot that may not fit into its base density. It would need to add value to the community and the developer.

Mr. Gilwold stated that an SPA application and sketch plan was submitted to the County over a year ago, at which time the County enacted a moratorium on processing SPA applications in order to rewrite the Code. The Planning Commission voted to delete the entire SPA process; however, the County Council did not favor eliminating SPAs and

remanded it back to the Planning Commission for modification. Mr. Gilwold noted that the moratorium ended early in August.

Mr. Gilwold noted that the owners met in a work session with the Planning Commission and presented their proposal. The Planning Commission is considering their proposal and has scheduled a public hearing for October 19<sup>th</sup> in Coalville. He clarified that the Planning Commission would only hear public input and no action would be taken that evening.

Mr. Gilwold stated that the problem with the first Deer Meadow application was the concept of community benefit. It was denied because the County Commission did not believe the eight lot subdivision offered enough community benefit. Mr. Gilwold stated that he was hired to begin a different process under the SPA, which is part of the Code in Eastern Summit County. The purpose of the SPA is to allow a developer to do something different than the base density.

Mr. Gilwold reviewed the proposal for a 21 lot subdivision. He indicated the existing house with the blue roof. From a land planning scenario, they would begin with one, two and three acre lots entering into the property. As it stretches to the north, it would break into four or five plus acre lots. The lots will all be on drain fields. Mr. Gilwold stated that two wells have been drilled and he identified the locations. Those two wells should serve up to fourteen residences with water. One well is pumping at 7 gallons per minute and the second well is pumping 13 gallons per minute. Each home would have a 5,000 gallon tank and the water would be pumped into those tanks. Regarding the other seven lots, they had well permits for up to three additional wells. They have also talked to the Water Company about possibly tying into their water system in the future. Mr. Gilwold noted that the existing roads would be used and only one small road section would need to be built. Mr. Gilwold pointed out that they tried to keep as many lots as possible from direct access off the main road.

Mr. Gilwold had spoken with Bryce from the Forest Service regarding wildfire prevention. Each lot would have a designated building envelope and the remainder of the lot would be put into an open space conservation easement. Therefore, each homeowner would have a building envelope of approximately 20,000 square feet, and less on the smaller lots. He noted that the General Plan calls for clustering of home sites, preservation of wildlife habitat, etc. Perimeter fencing would not be allowed. The intent is to maintain a natural setting and minimize sprawl. The proposal was designed to be as site sensitive as possible.

Mr. Burdette asked if the property in question was inside of Pine Meadow Ranch or Forest Meadow Ranch. Mr. Gilwold answered no. He used a map to orient the Board

members to the property. He understood that in 2008 the McCallister approached the Board and offered to join the HOA and pay dues. The intent was to make sure the development would not have a negative impact on roads and services. Mr. Gilwold stated that the intent was the same for this proposal. If they eventually tie into the water system, they would have to join the HOA.

Mr. Hutchinson noted that the County limited the first proposal to 12 lots and they were now proposing 21 lots. Mr. Gilwold understood that the original proposal started at 26 lots and it was reduced to 8 lots during the TDR process. The proposal went back to 21 lots because they could not generate enough community benefit with eight lots. Mr. Hutchinson asked Mr. Gilwold to identify the community benefit. Mr. Gilwold stated that they need to prove the development would not negatively impact County services. From a property tax standpoint it would generate positive income for the County. The Planning Commission looks at benefits in terms of how the development would serve Eastern Summit County, as well as the surrounding area of the project. Mr. Gilwold outlined a number of possible benefits being considered that would help the local community and at the same time provide a benefit for Eastern Summit County.

Mr. Hutchinson pointed out that if the development is ever annexed into the Association, Pine Meadow would be responsible for maintaining the roads. He thought the Board would want input on whether or not that was feasible. Mr. Foster stated that towards the end of the 2008 process, Pine Meadow Ranch had a drafted annexation agreement on the table with Deer Meadows pending that project moving forward. The agreement at the time was that Deer Meadows would annex to the Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association, that the lots would be encumbered by the CC&Rs of Pine Meadow Ranch, and that the road system would not be part of Pine Meadow Ranch. Mr. Foster pointed out that the HOA would not have to maintain the road, however, it would be a private road and not accessible to the Ranch. He offered to find the draft agreement to see how it compares with the current application.

Mr. Foster remarked that the community benefit concept of the SPA application has nothing to do with Pine Meadow. It may be something that benefits the Ranch community, but they would not have the purview to judge whether or not there was a community benefit. That would be the role of the Planning Commission and County Council. Mr. Foster noted that the Board spent a great deal of time in 2008 deciding what position to take on the project, assuming that the Planning Commission would ask for their opinion. At that time the Board took the position that with the agreement to bring all the lots under the auspices of the Ranch Owner's Association, the HOA would not oppose the project.

Mr. Gilwold believed the owner would be comfortable with the same agreement. His

objective this evening was to provide an update on the process. Mr. Gilwold welcomed any ideas the Board might have on benefits for the area, because they were struggling to find community benefits.

Mr. Hubbard asked if the project was envisioned as summer cabins or year-around development. Mr. Gilwold stated that their analysis assumes 75% second homes and 25% primary residences. He believed the project would be phased as opposed to developing all 21 lots at one time.

Mr. Hubbard commented on conversations regarding ideas of open space and conservation lands, and whether it was possible to start a non-profit that conserves land within Tollgate Canyon. He suggested that this might be an opportunity to preserve areas within the Ranch as a benefit for everyone. Mr. Burdette asked if Mr. Hubbard was suggesting that the developer purchase some of the existing lots in Pine Meadow Ranch and put them into a conservation easement. As an example, Mr. Hubbard would like the two lots across from Bobcat to remain open space rather than be built.

Mr. Foster suggested that Mr. Gilwold review the CC&Rs that govern Pine Meadow Ranch and the architectural guidelines. Mr. Burdette asked if Mr. Gilwold knew whether anyone in that area has contributed annually to the Pine Meadow Road Maintenance Fund. Mr. Gilwold was unsure. Currently, the only structures are the blue roof house and a cabin. Mr. Burdette recalled other structures further up the road. Mr. Foster thought they should ask Carol about contributions outside their gate. Mr. Burdette would follow up with Carol.

**Mr. Gilwold left the meeting.**

Mr. Foster stated that he had seen this project in the Planning Commission Staff report online. When he realized that the Pine Meadow Owners Association had not been informed of the application, he asked Mr. Gilwold to update the Board. Mr. Foster reported that the Water Company was not interested in a one-time contribution to a project. Personally, he was not interested in a one-time contribution either because development of 21 lots poses the next 100 years of impacts and not just current impacts. Mr. Foster thought the Board should look long term in their thinking.

Mr. Burdette noted that the Owners Association has an impact fee that is levied when someone wants to build on the Ranch. However, they do not have an annexation fee. Mr. Foster remarked that some people have suggested an annexation fee. He noted that the Water Company bases an annexation fee on the amount of annual dues that would have been paid into the system since the founding of the Water Company. Mr. Burdette thought the topic deserved further discussion.

## Open Forum

Mr. Davis, Lot D115, stated that he and Bob Burdette were at Windy Ridge a few weeks ago and he asked about plowing and how the two sides work. Mr. Burdette stated that he had invited Mr. Davis to attend this meeting. Mr. Davis stated that he and his family have been on the Ranch on and off for 30 years. He was trying to understand which funds pay for what plowing and why he has to pay extra money to plow the Forest Meadow side when he is already paying into an HOA.

Mr. Hubbard explained that the Homeowners dues pay for plowing Tollgate Canyon Road to the gravel pit and the connector to the Forest Meadows area. Mr. Burdette stated that many years ago the Owners Association did not plow any roads. The owners would drive up during the winter, park just off the freeway and snowmobile through the Ranch. It reached the point where the lot could no longer hold all the cars, and individuals began plowing part way up Tollgate Canyon. Cars would park on each side of the road to unload their snowmobiles and over time that became impassable and improbable. People then plowed further up to Oil Well Road, where parking was available at that time. Cars were strewn all around for a mile and a half, which created a poor situation. Mr. Burdette noted that a huge debate ensued over whether the Owners Association should plow at all. They eventually came to an agreement to plow one road to the parking lots, to allow everyone who wanted winter access the ability to driver their vehicle to these lots and snowmobile to their cabins. Mr. Burdette explained that the agreement to plow was not acceptable to everyone because some obviously get more benefits than others. After much argument and discussion regarding fees, they came to an agreement. Good or bad as the agreement might be, the landowners pay \$200 per year, part-time cabins owners pay \$250, and full-time owners pay \$350. Mr. Burdette remarked that the fees are equally distasteful to everyone.

Mr. Foster stated that when Mr. Davis comes to this side of the Ranch and sees several plowed roads, he should know that they are almost exclusively privately funded. Mr. Davis clarified that there was a similar organization on this side of the Ranch paying into a private plowing fund. Mr. Heath stated that Forest Meadows is more expensive because there are a lot of roads but fewer people to contribute.

Mr. Burdette noted that Mr. Davis had also asked him about the people who do not pay in the winter time but come up and drive on plowed roads. Mr. Burdette stated that as a part-time owner he never hears information about plowing, nor is he ever asked to contribute. Mr. Heath was under the impression that mailers were sent out. After further discussion, Mr. Foster did not believe this was a discussion for the Board. He believed there was a plowing section in the document called The Code of the New

West on the documents page of the Ranch website.

Mr. Foster received a letter from an owner in Toronto who was concerned about the County taking over the Ranch roads. He responded by saying that although the County has posed that possibility, it was not favored by the Board members and they moved away from that discussion. The Owner responded and thanked Mr. Foster and the Board for all they do. He also requested that the minutes be posted faster. Mr. Foster stated that until they find a webmaster the minutes would not be posted faster and people need to accept it. He welcomed anyone who wanted to volunteer to be the webmaster to get the minutes posted quicker. Mr. Burdette pointed out that the minutes are being made available much faster than they were two years ago.

Mr. Foster stated that at the last meeting Mr. Hutchinson reported on a problem on Pine Cone Circle, where a cabin has piled junk, stumps, and logs off the road on and on an unbuilt lot that belongs to another owner. Emails were sent to Mr. Hutchinson and forwarded to Mr. Foster suggesting that the Owners Association should deal with the issue because the pile was within the easement and the access to his property. After several emails, Mr. Foster told the owner that the Association does not maintain easements, they maintain the roads. His issue was with a neighbor who piled junk on his land and there was no recourse for the Owners Association to address that matter. Mr. Foster had asked Carol to provide the contact information so the owner could contact his neighbor.

Mr. Heath knew people who may be interested in taking the wood if it was burnable. Mr. Foster was sure the owner would be happy to have volunteer labor to remove the pile. He was willing to provide information they could contact the owner.

Mr. Hutchinson agreed with Mr. Foster's explanation. However, if there were other cabins on the cul-de-sac it would be a major issue because the pile is definitely in the right-of-way. He clarified that the Association does not remove trees and debris within the 66 foot right-of-way. They only deal with the road as constructed.

Mr. Hutchinson recalled an issue with an 8' x 4' For-Sale sign on a lot on Pine Loop. He called the lady and she said it would be removed. She has since taken down the sign, but left a large 4 x 4 post with a smaller standard realtor sign. Mr. Foster suggested that in the future, all issues or violations should be documented in writing through a letter to the owner.

Mr. Heath asked if there was any reference on the website where people to find appropriate sizes for signs. Mr. Foster pointed out that the CC&Rs say No Sign. The customary exclusion has been a single sign of standard real estate size for a real estate

advertisement. Mr. Heath thought that should be referenced on the website.

Mr. Powell reported on a call he received from an owner on Pine Meadow Circle informing him that a large animal tore apart his wood pile. Mr. Foster stated that there was a mountain lion sighting in I-Plat within the last week or two.

### **Environmental Control Committee Plan Review**

Mr. Hutchinson had received a call from Steve Treseder, Lot D58, saying that he would attend this meeting this evening. Mr. Treseder wants to build a garage for his toys. Mr. Heath noted that something was already being built in that area and asked if there was anything on record. Mr. Hutchinson answered no. Mr. Hutchinson told Mr. Treseder that the impact fee would be \$2.00 per foot, and depending on the size of his garage, he may or may not need a building permit. He would need to check with Summit County to verify their requirements. Mr. Foster asked Mr. Hutchinson to follow up to see if construction was currently occurring.

### **Water Board Update**

Mr. Foster provided an update of the Water Board meeting. He noted that the Water Board has closed on the loan to begin the new projects. Due to the timing and the State requirement for 30 day bidding on projects, the I-Plat project would be postponed until Spring. There would not be enough time to complete the project before bad weather would shut it down. Apparently the loan closing took longer than expected.

Mr. Foster stated that another component of the loan is that the Water Company was in the process of changing all meters on the Ranch to digital wireless meters. When the telemetry on the water tanks indicates that there is a probable leak, Trevor and Brody would be able to drive around the Ranch and collect data from all meters as they drive. The meters will have a built-in 24 hour alarm. If there is continuous flow over 24 hours, the alarm will send the signal and the Water Company will know rather quickly whether the leak is a metered leak or a line leak.

### **Amy Jackson joined the meeting.**

Mr. Burdette asked about Pine Meadow Drive. Mr. Foster stated that the expectation is that the I-Plat connector will allow the Water Company to reduce the PRVs on Pine Meadow Drive by approximately 100 psi. They believe that dropping the psi should eliminate the broken pipe problems that continually occur.

### **Ranch Manager's Report**

### Projects

Jody Robinson thought the work that was being done at the bottom of the canyon was evident. Mr. Foster noted that the road was radically widened and an 8 foot culvert was installed. They were able to use the fill that was dumped at the upper parking lot for the project which saved truck time and money. The County provided a dump truck and the hoe to dig the pipe, as well as other construction equipment. He estimated that the County invested approximately \$15,000+ into this project.

Mr. Burdette stated that he received invoices from Geary Construction for over 360 tons of fill. Ninety-four tons was Rotomill, and 232 tons was for cobble rock. Jody explained that the cobble rock was for the bar ditching and to repair the deeply eroded sections of Tollgate Canyon.

Mr. Hutchinson noticed that much of the cobble rock was at the same elevation as the asphalt. He asked if that would be a problem next Spring. Jody stated that he still needed to go up and down the bar ditch with the grader. He did not anticipate that it would create problems in the Spring.

Jody stated that other projects included signage repairs and road grading. The steep part of Windy Ridge was resurfaced. Mr. Foster asked about Beaver Circle. Jody replied that he still needed to do Beaver Circle. Due to imminent weather changes, he has been helping the Water Company install the digital meters. Jody also planned to do regular grading and bar ditching to get ready for the winter.

### Equipment Status

Mr. Heath reported that a few people have volunteered to help out on the Forest Meadows side. They have good equipment and Mr. Heath preferred to get authorization from the Board to coordinate through Jody Robinson rather than have these people work on their own. Jody could help supervise or identify projects that need to be done.

Mr. Burdette asked if the cutting edge on the grader was still adequate. Jody replied that it was about 70%. He thought he may need to purchase another one to get through the winter. Jody stated that he still needed to purchase tires for the dump truck. The windshield was fixed. The plow on the dump truck needs a cutting edge.

Jody asked if Mr. Heath has spoken with Mr. Foster about moving the lower building at the bottom of the Canyon. Mr. Foster noted that Jody was referring to the shed where



the signs are stored near the bottom of the Canyon. Apparently the building was moved several years ago and Mr. Heath would like to take it back up. Mr. Foster was of the opinion that if Jody has a use for the shed they should let him use it. The Board concurred. Mr. Foster stated that if the shed is moved they should consider putting in fixed signage at the bottom.

Jody commented on the propane tank. Mr. Foster asked for a volunteer to research lower costs for propane. Mr. Heath volunteered. Mr. Foster suggested that he contact Hone and Utah LP to price the lease rate of a tank and the current rate on gas. Mr. Foster stated that the company chosen should bring up an empty tank, pump off the Suburban tank into it, and then top off the tank with their propane. Mr. Foster stated that due to higher costs, they need an alternative supplier to Suburban Propane.

MOTION: Mr. Foster made a motion to authorized Dan Heath to change the propane service to another supplier for a lower cost. Bob Burdette seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Foster noted that the Board previously discussed preparing a site in case the Post Office moves the mailboxes. He suggested the area where the shed was because that would be easier to plow. The delivery person has expressed concern about the boxes in their current location because people frequently slide across and the area is jammed up with dumpsters in the winter. Mr. Foster stated that the Board had authorized Dan Heath to grade that area, and it appears that the property line is different from what they originally thought. The property line runs 15 or 20 feet into that area. Therefore, the real estate signs and the shack are not on Ranch property. Mr. Heath has been talking with the property owner, who is very amenable to allowing that project to move forward.

## **Old Business**

### Information Signs on Lower Tollgate

Mr. Burdette stated that the Board members should have received an email of with a sample sign. Tom Deaver had drafted the wording. The cost for two steel signs was approximately \$239. Mr. Powell had provided a metal post. Since there were two signs he would try to obtain another post.

Mr. Foster read the language on the sign, "Any vehicle left over one week is subject to tow", and suggested revising the language to say, "Any vehicle, trailer or equipment lever over one week is subject to tow". Mr. Powell asked if a vehicle would be towed

after one week if it had a sticker. Mr. Foster replied that it is short-term parking. If the vehicle is used during the week and comes back, that would be considered short-term parking. They are trying to target vehicles that are left for a week with no movement.

Several Board members thought the language was unclear regarding vehicles with stickers. Mr. Burdette clarified that without a sticker the vehicle would be considered abandoned and could be towed immediately. Ms. Jackson interpreted the language to mean that anyone could leave a vehicle in that lot for one week. Mr. Heath suggested stating, "short-term parking only". It was noted that the language as drafted specifically says that a sticker is required.

Mr. Burdette read the revised sign language. "Short term parking. Any vehicle, trailer or equipment left over one week is subject to tow. Pine Meadow Ranch parking sticker required. Contact [office@pinemeadowranch.org](mailto:office@pinemeadowranch.org)."

MOTION: Mr. Burdette made a motion to APPROVE the revised wording as read. Alan Powell seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

### Meeting Schedule

Mr. Hutchinson had called the Unified Fire Authority of Salt Lake and scheduled the fire station from October to April on the third Tuesday of each month. Mr. Foster understood that the Board had decided to meet on the Ranch in October. Meeting at the fire station should begin in November. The Board concurred. Mr. Hutchinson noted that the firemen would unlock the door for the meeting; however, if they are out on an emergency call, they would have to wait for them to return.

### **New Business (Continued)**

Ms. Jackson was contacted by an owner on Elk Road. His carport was demolished by the snow and he would like to build a garage. She informed the owner that he needed to bring his plans to the Board for approval and pay his fees. Because he only contacted her today, he was unable to gather the appropriate information for this meeting. In an effort to take advantage of good weather, he asked Ms. Jackson if he could begin pouring the footings and submit his plans within a few days. Mr. Hutchinson questioned how he could obtain a building permit in two days and was concerned that he may be trying to avoid the proper channels.

Ms. Jackson was unaware that a building permit was required for a garage. She would

follow up with the owner. If he had obtained a building permit, she wanted to know if it would be appropriate for two or three Boards members on the Ranch to review and approve his plans. Mr. Burdette stated that if she was comfortable that the plans were consistent with the architectural style that would be approved by the Board, the Board could authorize Ms. Jackson to approve the plans and sign the paperwork and collect the fees.

The Board discussed which impact fee should apply. Mr. Hutchinson felt the impact fee should be based on impact to the roads and not whether the structure has utilities. Mr. Foster clarified that the intent was to establish criteria for deciding the impacts created by the intensity of the construction. Mr. Hutchinson thought they should be consistent at \$2.00 per square foot. Mr. Foster remarked that different structures create different impacts and they cannot define specific criteria to address every project. He was open to considering another alternative. Mr. Burdette believed the simple idea was \$2.00 per square foot for any additions or additional building other than the first structure on the property. He noted that the CC&Rs allow a second dwelling, such as a guest house. Mr. Burdette thought that type of structure should be subject to the same impact fee as the primary home, which is \$5,000. Mr. Foster suggested that they discuss second dwellings sooner rather than later because they could be faced with it in the future.

#### Annual Meeting

Mr. Foster noted that the required noticing for the annual meeting was 30 days, which meant they needed to choose a date and tentative location. Mr. Burdette noted that keeping to the third Tuesday of the month, the annual meeting would be held on November 15<sup>th</sup>. The Board was comfortable with that date. Ms. Jackson would ask Suzanne Larson to try and reserve the same location as last year for November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011. Mr. Foster noted that the date and time would need to be finalized fairly soon to allow Carol time to send postcards and election information.

#### Replace Scot Erickson (Area 1)

Mr. Foster noted that Scot Erickson had resigned from the Board due to scheduling conflicts with his school schedule. Mr. Erickson was up for re-election this year, which only left three meetings that would be relevant. Mr. Erickson looked for an interim replacement for Area 1, and Matt Brown volunteered.

Mr. Foster remarked that the Bylaws address removing members for attendance problems or changing and replacing members if necessary, and appointing a replacement from that same area. The CC&Rs does not address how that procedure should occur. In the interest of documenting the change related to Mr. Erickson, Mr.

Foster suggested that the Board vote on adopting Matt Brown as the short-term representative for Area 1 until Mr. Erickson's term expires at the end of the year.

Mr. Brown stated that he purchased land on the Ranch five years ago. He built on his property two years ago and this will be his third winter on the Ranch. He has a wife and two children. His wife was born and raised in Park City and he is from Chicago. Mr. Brown stated that his only qualification to sit on the Board was that he was a local resident and he is quite boisterous. He volunteers in the Ranch community and helps with roadwork in the Spring.

MOTION: Bob Burdette moved to ACCEPT Matt Brown as the Area 1 representative to fulfill the remainder of Scot Erickson's term. Dan Heath seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

### **Monthly Budget Review**

Mr. Burdette reviewed the unpaid bills in the amount of \$17,600. He would also be reimbursing mileage for anyone who had their reimbursement sheet. With the submitted mileage reimbursement, the total bills were slightly under \$18,000.

MOTION: Mr. Burdette proposed to pay all the bills as outlined. Bruce Hutchinson seconded the motion.

Mr. Hutchinson asked if Brandon would finish the season with Jody. Jody replied that Brandon was only hired until Labor Day and he has left.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Burdette stated that they were still in a good financial position and there were sufficient funds to end the year. However, he was concerned about not knowing the cost of the 8 foot culvert at the bottom of Tollgate. Jody believed a ticket was signed for \$6600. Mr. Foster recalled that the expected cost was between \$6,000 and \$7,000. That price did not include custom bands. He estimated that the final cost would be in the \$7,000 to \$8,000 range.

Mr. Burdette pointed out that Jody had to use his personal credit card for fuel. The Association would reimburse him \$114. Jody clarified that he did not have the company card with him when he needed fuel.

Mr. Foster suggested that Jody buy a couple of bags of pasture mix in order to re-seed

all the disturbed areas that were created. Jody had some pasture mix that he could use. If he goes to Salt Lake he would purchase another bag. Mr. Brown stated that he is in Salt Lake all the time and offered to pick it up for Jody.

### **Assignment Review**

Amy Jackson would talk to Suzanne Larson regarding the annual meeting location. Once the location is reserved, Suzanne should confirm that information with Carol.

Scot Erickson (Area 1), Dan Heath (Vice President), and Amy Jackson (Area 7) were up for re-election.

Dan Heath would research propane. Mr. Foster wanted to confirm that Suburban Propane has a "do not fill" order.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Owners Association Board adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

---