

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS' ASSOCIATION  
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING  
IN PERSON & VIA ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE  
MARCH 19, 2024

In Attendance: George Sears, President; John Adams, Vice-President; Chris Moore, Secretary; Andrew Pagel, Treasurer; Pam Slaughter (Area 1); Marty Hansen (Area 2); Katie Winters (Area 4); Shaun Baker (Area 5); John Kleba (Area 6); Taissa Folden (Area 7)

George Sears called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m.

### **Minutes**

#### February 20, 2024

John Adams submitted corrections to Carol prior to the meeting.

MOTION: George Sears moved to approve the minutes of February 20, 2024, with the correction submitted. John Adams seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

### **Ratification**

The Board previously voted electronically to approve implementing a fine on Lot PI-C-84 and FM-B-37. The fines were approved in two motions and nine Board members participated.

MOTION: George Sears moved to ratify the motion the Board previously approved electronically to implement a fine on Lot PI-C-84. John Adams seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: George Sears moved to ratify the motion the Board previously approved electronically to implement a fine on Lot FM-B-37. John Adams seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

### **Water Board Meeting**

Mr. Sears reported that the Water Company had an external engineering company, Bowen Collins and Associates, do a thorough analysis of the water system as required by Mountain Regional when preparing for annexation. Bowen Collins provided an overview of the complete analysis and valuation of the water system at the Water Board meeting on March 14<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Sears explained that the analysis assumed full buildout of all 803 lots. He noted that Mountain Regional wanted the evaluation to understand the risks and demand for water if they were to merge with the Water Company at any time.

Mr. Sears stated that his takeaway from the report is that they have 15-20 years for full buildout, assuming the Water Company installs 15-20 new connections every year. He pointed out that each year is different and some years it may be more or less. Mr. Sears noted that the report delineated between full-time use and part-time use. The average use of full-time residents was obviously higher than part-time users.

The Water Company conducted its regular business with approved unpaid bills and the financials; however, the majority of the meeting focused on the engineering report.

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

Jody was not able to attend the meeting. Mr. Sears stated that Jody has primarily been slush managing the roads.

### **Budget Review**

Andrew Pagel reviewed the unpaid bills detail. He asked why they were still withholding the \$4,000 to Rykestone. Mr. Adams stated that they were still waiting for the grate installations that should be done this spring and once that work is done, they will release the check.

MOTION: Andrew Pagel moved to approve the unpaid bills as presented in the amount of \$7,401.82. John Adams seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Pagel was pleased to report that they had collected 66% of the one-time road assessment.

### **Road Committee**

John Adams remarked that the PermaZyme people were in town at the end of February and looked at the test site. They liked part of what was done; however, they had concerns about the section that is on a curve and north around the barn. There were gouges in the road and the ditch line was elevated in that section. Mr. Adams pointed out that three weeks later they were having problems in that location. The material south of that location is holding up. As they move into Spring, Mr. Adams wants to make sure that Jody lowers the ditch line as he goes back to grade that area. Mr. Adams pointed out that it was not just the PermaZyme test area. It is a broader issue that occurs anywhere on the Ranch.

Mr. Sears was anxious to see the test site the first part of May to see how the material held up.

Mr. Adams stated that regardless of what material they use, it always goes back to drainage. Drainage is important and it needs to remain at the top of the list. Mr. Sears believed it would require educating the owners because the owners have some accountability for maintaining the culverts on their property.

Mr. Adams reported that the Road Committee met. They intended to have a follow-up meeting, but everyone has been out of town. They are beginning the process of an RFP for a hydrology study. They would also like to break out a second civil engineering study for upper and lower Tollgate Canyon Road.

Mr. Adams stated that the Committee needs to understand how to go about putting out an RFP knowing exactly what funds they will be working with, and how the Board wants the Roads Committee to come back with the proposals and receive approval or denial to move forward. Mr. Adams asked if that should be within the realm of the HOA Board or whether there are some elements the Committee can do on their own to some degree.

Mr. Sears stated that whatever they do, the Board must approve financial expenses. One option is that the Board could identify a lump sum amount of money and the Committee can work within that budget. Mr. Adams stated that from the assessments, \$389,236 is allocated for repairs and engineering. From the annual dues, \$88,600 is dedicated to drainage and aggregate testing.

Mr. Pagel suggested scheduling a meeting with the Executive Committee and the Road Committee. In his opinion, the Road Committee should bring to the Executive Committee the issues and how they expect to solve them, the timeline to fix the issues, and the estimated costs. After that, the Road Committee can determine an RFP for two or three line items. Once they have the actual amounts versus the estimated amounts, they can go from there. Mr. Pagel assumed two different funds. One would be from the annual dues, which is more of a maintenance budget than a capital expense budget. The Roads Committee would have more control over that budget. Culverts are a big issue, and they need to come up with a better method of installation for the culverts. The aggregate test projects should be categorized under research and development.

Mr. Pagel stated that the funds from the one-time road assessment will require the Executive Committee to steer the RFPs and make sure everything is on track, and spending the money will be approved by the entire Board. Mr. Adams pointed out that the checks and balance system is more from the standpoint of fiduciary responsibility.

## **Signs**

Pam Slaughter proposed posting a sign at the bottom of Forest Meadow and Pine Meadow, and a sign at the top. She thought the Board should identify where they should post the one at the top.

Mr. Adams asked if they should go with the reflective signs. Mr. Sears recalled talking about the advantages of reflective signs, particularly with nighttime driving. Mr. Adams clarified that Ms. Slaughter was talking about four signs versus the 11 signs talked about at the previous meeting.

Mr. Sears remarked that whatever signs they purchase should have some level of durability. Ms. Slaughter assumed the signs would be thick plastic. Mr. Sears thought they should get prices on metal versus vinyl before making a final decision. They need signs that will withstand snow and harsh winters.

## **Rentals**

Mr. Sears understood that this year the Legislature discussed giving HOAs the latitude to prohibit rentals if it is not in their CCRs. It was still an ongoing discussion, and he did not believe it passed before the legislative session ended. Last year, the Legislature passed a bill allowing HOAs a limit of 30% of the total units to be rentals.

## **Fire Committee**

John Adams reported that the Executive Committee met a few times, and they have an RFP. The next step is to take the RFP to Jessica Kirby, which they will be doing on Thursday.

## **Open Public Forum**

Someone expressed appreciation that the S-curve was cleared yesterday. The roads were deep slush, and she could not get up Navaho. A lot of people were without the ability to get out yesterday.

## **Architectural Review**

### PI-F-62

John Adams reviewed plans for a new home on Lot PI-F-62, 2175 *Pine Loop* Road. The owner, Henri De Baritault, was proposing a 1,987-square-foot home on two acres. The design is a semi-A-frame, with a standard A-frame steep roof at a 12:12 pitch.

The owners included a wide selection of materials they were looking at using but they narrowed it down significantly. Mr. Adams stated that all the materials proposed have been approved on previous projects. From a roofing standpoint, they were looking at the Maxi Rib Metal roofing panels in either dark brown or black. They were looking at two different types of asphalt shingles in gray.

For siding, the majority of the home will have either Alura or James Hardy woodgrain cement fiber lap siding. The owners were hoping to use either Urbane Bronze, Iron Ore Gray, or Iron Gray. For accents, the owners were requesting to use some of the metal products that other people have used from Western States., either rosewood or dark wood siding. They also have several nice choices for rock work and the retaining wall on their driveway.

Mr. Adams reported that the ARC did not have any issues with the plans and the materials as proposed. He believed the project was ready to move forward.

MOTION: John Adams moved to approve the Lot Improvement Plan for PI-F-62, 2175 Pine Loop Road, for a 1,987-square-foot home on 2.0 acres. Andrew Pagel seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

### **Communications**

Pam Slaughter commented on the possibility of having a newsletter at some point.

Mr. Sears understood they were having issues with the email system. Katie Winters stated that she has had increased trouble. The HOA invites and certain things that used to go to her email will not come through anymore if she does not log into that server.

Mr. Sears stated that Dream Host is the company that hosts the website; however, there are other hosting solutions. He offered to explore other options. He noted that Google has a hosting option, but it takes away a lot of flexibility if they ever want to do other things. Mr. Sears personally liked Google, but he was not comfortable with that inflexible solution for the website.

### **Area Rep Reports**

Area 1 – Pam Slaughter commented on the rainwater barrel solution that the Utah Rivers Council has going on and the availability in Summit County. Andy Harris also shared the link on the Tollgate Canyon page on Facebook. People can also go to [rainbarrel.org](http://rainbarrel.org) and order one there. Ms. Slaughter remarked, however, that the link to purchase the rain barrels directly

from Summit County was not available. People need to click on “where to have it delivered” and pick it up at the listed Summit County location. They can add it to a “cart” and still purchase it at a significant discount that way.

Ms. Slaughter stated that she purchased a rain barrel last year. The barrels are 50 gallons, and they catch the rainwater from the eave where the water comes off the roof. People can use rainwater to water deck plants and water for their dogs. Shaun Baker had spoken with Brody Blonquist and the Water Company has no issue as long as the barrels are not connected to the water system. Most of the rules for the barrels and other solutions run through Utah State University and can be found on their website. Ms. Slaughter pointed out that this was a Statewide program for water conservancy.

Mr. Sears thought they should ask Carol to email the information out to all the owners.

Area 2 – Marty Hansen had nothing to report.

Area 3 - John Pettijohn was not present.

Area 4 – Katie Winters reported on one incident regarding the blocked road that had already been resolved and the warning was sent out.

Area 5 – Shaun Baker had nothing to report.

Area 6 – John Kleba had nothing to report.

Area 7 – Taissa Folden had nothing to report.

### **General Board Comments**

Ms. Winters referred to an issue that came up at the Annual Meeting regarding funds that were made available for roads in Utah after they were declared a State of Emergency last year due to the storms. She asked if anyone had looked into whether Pine Meadow would be eligible for some of those funds if the opportunity had not expired. Mr. Sears stated that Carol is usually familiar with that type of funding and that he would ask her about it. Mr. Sears recalled that they did a few inquiries with the State and there was pushback because Pine Meadow roads are all private. He thought they should work with Summit County to get at least the main roads reclassified as access roads. It is not only important for the HOA, but it is also a main access road beyond the Ranch. Ms. Winters was interested in learning more, and she was willing to start some conversations about possible applications for relief funds. Mr. Sears thought the LDS Church would be interested because they use the roads to reach their Church Camps.

Pine Meadow Ranch Owners Association  
Monthly Board Meeting  
March 19, 2024  
Page 7

**Open Public Forum**

There were no comments or questions.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Owners Association Board adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

---