

PINE MEADOW RANCH OWNERS' ASSOCIATION
MONTHLY BOARD MEETING
IN PERSON & VIA ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE
MAY 21, 2024

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

Ex Officio – Jody Robinson

Excused: Marty Hansen (Area 2); John Pettijohn (Area 3)

George Sears called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Minutes

April 16, 2024

MOTION: George Sears moved to approve the minutes of April 16, 2024, as written. John Adams seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Ratifications

John Adams stated that the first ratification was for the electronic approval of the Sawtooth's different engine. Sawtooth recommended a larger engine that they plan to use systemwide.

MOTION: John Adams moved to ratify the electronically approved motion for the new engine. George Sears seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Adams stated that the second ratification was for an approved motion to send out the community, beaver, and burn pile survey.

MOTION: John Adams moved to ratify the electronically approved motion regarding the *beaver* and burn pile survey. George Sears seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Adams stated that the third electronic motions were for two RFPs; one for a hydrology study and the second for civil engineering. The two motions were related to the work they hope to eventually do on Tollgate.

MOTION: John Adams moved to ratify the two electronically approved motions for the hydrology study RFP and the civil engineering RFP. Pam Slaughter seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Adams stated that the final ratification was a motion electronically approved on the FEMA Grant RFP for the Hazardous Mitigation Grant Program.

MOTION: John Adams moved to ratify the previous electronically approved motion regarding the FEMA Grant RFP. Pam Slaughter seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Water Board Meeting

Mr. Sears reported that the Water Company Board meeting was primarily a review of the Financials.

Brody and Trevor found the leak they had been looking for and it was fixed. The Water Company will be looking at select units to replace the meters because it was an oldermeter that failed. The base of the meter had somehow popped off and created a leak. They will be looking at whether some of the older units can be upgraded.

Ranch Manager's Report

Jody reported that they were starting to ramp up for the summer with road repairs, sign repairs, equipment maintenance, and bar ditching. They have been working on the asphalt repairs in the lower Canyon for the last few days trying to fix a specific bad spot. They will begin laying gravel and begin their road maintenance routine for the summer.

George Sears thanked Jody for fixing a particular area on the road. It was bad when he came up last week and he noticed it was much smoother driving up today. Jody replied that it still needed to be finished and they would try to finish it tomorrow. They intend to continue working their way up the Canyon.

Jody stated that the roads are drying out enough that they should be able to start working on the upper roads. He would like to start at the bottom and lay gravel going up Forest Meadow above Glass Hill where it washed away last summer. Once that area is touched-up they will begin working on the Tollgate side.

Jody was aware of a road that was washed out on Alexander. A driveway culvert had plugged up and it caused a ditch down the middle of the road.

Pam asked if Jody had a schedule or a maintenance calendar where the board members can see where and when they can expect some of the culverts to go in. Jody replied that he did not have a schedule at this time. He and Trent have a lot on their plate, and they were trying to do the major work first before working on the minor maintenance.

Andrew Pagel asked Jody about the Reagan Company invoice for the spring mix and the spreader. Jody

replied that it was placed on the piece they did on Lower Tollgate back in November.

Mr. Pagel referred to three charges on the Home Depot credit card statement. He was able to see the itemized receipts for two but there was nothing for the third charge of \$443. Jody stated that it was for cold mix for some of the potholes. Granite did not have the material made yet and he needed to purchase bags of cold mix from Home Depot.

Mr. Pagel referred to the broken-down Ford truck that was still on the books as an asset. He understood it needed a transmission and asked if they were close to getting it fixed so the truck could be sold. Jody replied that the old plow truck was not being worked on. Mr. Pagel was aware that it was not being worked on, which is why he asked if they planned to repair it so they could sell the truck. Jody stated that they have done nothing with the old truck since they purchased the new one. Mr. Pagel suggested that they sell it as salvage or repair it and sell it. Jody requested that he and Mr. Pagel discuss it another time.

John Adams recalled talking about mag water last month and asked if they were doing mag water this year. Jody stated that he ordered the mag water from the same group they used in the past and they were scheduled to come up on Monday July 1st.

Budget Review

There were no further questions regarding the financials and the unpaid bills.

MOTION: Andrew Pagel moved to approve the unpaid bills in the amount of \$4,959.64
George Sears seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously

Fire Committee

John Adams reported that the RFP for the FEMA Grant was finished, and Summit County published it on May 14, 2024. They followed up and reached out to 15 companies and publicized the RFP. Mr. Adams stated that there was a calendar to keep them on track and the next important due date is May 24th, which is the last day the contractors can ask questions about the RFP. The Board needs to be prepared to answer the questions no later than May 29th.

Mr. Sears was aware of a few responses, which indicated that people are reading the RFP. Mr. Adams explained that the HOA cannot answer questions directly, however, they can refer them back to the process through Summit County.

Burn Pile

Mr. Adams commented on the burn pile and noted that the HOA did a survey about beavers and the

burn pile. The burn pile results were split down the middle. Everyone had the opportunity to choose at least one option. Therefore, the numbers would add up to something greater than 100%. Mr. Adams reported that 272 people provided feedback. They were not able to adjust the number for this part of the survey if two people per household responded. He pointed out that 250 households representing 309 lots provided feedback. Half of the Ranch wants some type of burn pile. Even if it is smaller, they want a burn pile that is reasonable and manageable. Based on some of the input, once the burn pile reaches a certain level, they should either close it early or not open it until the last month in the Fall. Mr. Adams did not believe they had reached the point of completely doing away with the burn pile. He thought there were many good recommendations and suggested that they go through each recommendation as a group to determine what works best.

Mr. Sears understood that the next step is for the Board to get together and finalize what they want to do. He noted that Jody had put up the fence, but people were still able to get around it. Mr. Adams asked if they should set a date this evening, or whether they wanted to have a discussion as a group to decide when to open up the burn pile. Mr. Sears thought they could have that discussion this evening.

Jody commented on the need to put out a notice to get everything out of the lower parking lot. All the vehicles need to be removed. Mr. Sears would ask Carol to put out a notice. Clearing the lower parking lot and removing the trailers up above needs to be done by June 1st.

Mr. Adams asked Jody for his opinion on when they should open the burn pile. Jody stated that once the lots are cleared, he did not have a preference on timing. However, he does not want everyone in the way while they are trying to push the trees up. Mr. Sears asked Jody if he was comfortable building the pile with only green waste after June 1st. He emphasized that they need to be clear that building materials are prohibited. Currently, the burn pile is only for the HOA. Jody understood that the burn pile should be in the middle of the parking lot this year rather than in the back. Mr. Sears replied that he was correct. Jody will close off the back end of the parking lot where the old pile was located. Mr. Adams stated that if it becomes necessary to close the gate at some point, he asked Jody how hard it would be to add another section of the gate towards the east. Jody stated that he can use the trackhoe to dig a trench and people will not be able to drive around and use the bump track to get in if the gate is closed.

Mr. Sears asked if the gate should be open 24/7 or whether they should specify certain days of the week. Mr. Pagel liked the idea of keeping it open in September or October. Mr. Sears agreed because most people do their cleanup in the Fall. Taissa asked if keeping the gate closed during regular business hours would stop the contractors from adding to the pile. Mr. Adams pointed out that it was one of the recommendations from the survey. He thought it was a good idea. Mr. Pagel was not opposed to weekends only as long as the gate can be locked during the week.

Mr. Sears stated that the Executive Committee will come back to the Board with a proposal. John Adams clarified that the burn pile will remain closed for the time being.

Roads

Mr. Sears asked if they had received any feedback on the two RFPs that went out on hydrology and civil engineering. Mr. Adams replied that Meridian Engineering, CRS Engineers, and Wall Consulting Group all plan to follow up. He spoke with Horrocks Engineers, and they submitted the proposal to their bidding team. He had not heard back from the others. Mr. Adams stated that they targeted the RFPs to eight specific companies. The deadline for both RFPs is June 14th. He anticipated hearing from the engineering firms within a few weeks.

Beavers

Mr. Adams stated that beavers at Bobcat Springs were part of the survey. He reiterated that 273 households participated, representing 309 lots. Mr. Adams stated that this particular data was very binary because most of the people either supported leaving the beavers alone or wanted them relocated. A small category of doing something else turned out to be people who wanted to euthanize the beavers or wait for an expert opinion.

Mr. Adams explained that they went through the data and weeded out people from the same households to see if it changed the data, but the data was still very much the same as the 273 who participated. Mr. Adams reported that 60% think they should relocate the beavers; 33% want to leave them alone. Some of the comments were binary. Some people indicated they were in favor of the beavers until they saw what they did to Bobcat Springs and now want them relocated. Other comments included people asking if they made the pond, and the pond is creating a problem, why it should be a burden on the entire community. A handful of people suggested getting an expert opinion. Mr. Adams noted that most respondents want some type of solution.

Mr. Adams recalled that some of the Board members were going to speak with the DWR. Someone who had attended the meeting thanked Craig for organizing it and for bringing in two intelligent DNR people who walked them through the beaver world. They asked about potential damage that could occur with flooding and what they can expect in the future. They were told that the beavers would continue to chew down the trees over the course of their tenure, but it might slow down slightly.

There have been instances of disease caused by beavers, but nothing has been reported in this area. The DWR provided good ideas on how to take care of the erosion on the banks. They called it a Beaver Deceiver and it is simple to correct. The beavers create a family colony and if they intend to remove the beaver family from the pond, it needs to be done prior to August 1st. The DWR will try to trap and relocate the entire beaver family together. August 1st allows enough time to release them locally, otherwise, they need to be released further south.

The primary damage occurs in the Fall and Spring. The beavers are fairly benign in the summer months. The HOA has some time to decide whether to keep the beavers or have them relocated.

Mr. Sears also attended the meeting and thought a lot of good information was provided. There are a lot

of beavers in the mountains aside from this area. The closest area that experienced the disease was just north of Jeremy Ranch. Beyond that, most of the areas were Park City and south. Mr. Sears stated that the DWR was not overly concerned other than if people are in the pond area they should be very conscientious and make sure they are not bitten by a bug that could carry the disease because it is transportable through ticks and deer flies. Mr. Sears remarked that there are other beavers down below. The DWR recognizes that Tollgate is privately held and owners who have a pond or beavers in their pond are the ones who determine whether or not to leave the beavers or have them removed.

Mr. Sears stated that the DWR is very willing to consult with the HOA to help modify the pond at Bobcat Springs, as well as the pond at Salt Box if those owners are interested, to change the way the water moves through the pond and out. It would deter the beavers from constantly trying to plug up the water exits. The DWR offered some solutions and explained how it works. One offered to come up to the Ranch to consult and put it in play. Jody and Trent were also at the meeting, and they did not believe it would be difficult to do as long as everyone was in agreement. There would be an associated expense and the outflow solution model would be different from what they are used to.

Mr. Sears remarked that the meeting was very constructive. The DWR left it up to the HOA to make the decision and they will support whatever is decided. If they decide to trap the beavers, they will be relocated north for a period of time to determine whether they are sick. If they are not sick, the beavers are moved to other locations based upon need and where the State wants them to populate. Mr. Sears found the information very interesting, and he explained what they were told regarding beavers and their behavior.

Mr. Sears stated that the DWR was not worried about the pond and liked how it was structured. They said that fish and beavers can co-exist, and they can continue to drop fish in the pond. The beavers make the pond deeper, which is a benefit for the long-term health of the pond. Kids can fish in the pond and the beavers will not bother them. Beavers are protective of their young and the colony will have three sets of ages. It consists of the older mating beavers, younger beavers, and the pups. The disease is bacterial and can be treated. Mr. Sears reiterated that there has been no evidence of disease in this area.

Mr. Adams asked how they balance things with what the community would like them to do. Mr. Sears suggested sending out a second survey with additional information on how it can be managed to help people make a more informed decision. The DWR gave them more options than anticipated and they need to educate the greater community population to make a determination. Mr. Sears noted that the beavers will leave the pond and the area within a few years because there will not be enough food to sustain them. If they want to minimize damage relative to building the pond higher, they will need to put in a different water flow system to allow that to happen. They were told that when beavers hear running water, they want to stop it. Mr. Sears stated that he asked multiple questions regarding this matter and the DWR said that if they do not change the water flow, they will continue to have this same issue.

Mr. Adams pointed out that the group who wants to keep the beavers had not done anything proactively to keep the beavers from further damaging the Ranch. He was unsure whether that group

would step up and help take measures. Mr. Adams noted that there is an expectation that the HOA should fix it so the beavers can live there. Mr. Sears stated that the HOA does not have the budget to manage the beavers. If that group wants to collect money and help facilitate ways to manage the beaver population, they can come to the Board with a proposal. However, if they just want the HOA to leave everything as is for the beavers, that is not acceptable. They need to do something proactively to change the way the pond is being managed if they choose to allow the beavers to stay. If they choose that option, it is important to educate the owners around the pond because the beavers will eventually cross the road to take down trees.

Mr. Sears noted that Jody, Shaun Baker, and John Klebba had attended the DWR meeting, and he was interested in hearing their perspective. He emphasized that educating the community is key.

Andrew Pagel did not have a preference for keeping the beavers or relocating them. His interest was from a financial perspective. The best cost analysis was to determine the cost associated with reverting the water versus the cost of relocation. His primary concern was whether wrapping the trees would drive the beavers to other areas. Mr. Sears stated that the DWR told them that beavers will not travel more than 500 yards.

Mr. Adams asked what message they should relay to the community. Mr. Sears replied that no decision has been made. He thought the Executive Committee could discuss it further and bring it back to the Board. Mr. Sears thought it was important to understand that it is a colony of beavers, not just two beavers. Once they run out of food beyond 500 yards they will move away naturally. Shaun Baker recalled that the DWR said that the chances of trapping the entire colony of beavers was slim.

Mr. Pagel agreed to having an Executive Committee meeting and possibly an expanded survey before making any decisions. He asked if someone who attended the DWR meeting could send a one or two paragraph email summarizing the key points and different approaches the DWR recommended. The Executive Committee can review the summary and the survey and bring suggestions back to the Board for a final decision.

It was noted that even if they relocate the beavers, they will always come back. The Board discussed possible measures to create "Beaver Deceivers" to discourage the beavers if they do come back. Mr. Pagel pointed out that if the beavers cause damage to the road and other common areas of the Ranch, that affects every owner and not just the ones who want to keep the beavers.

Mr. Sears stated that he would summarize his notes and he asked John Kleba and Shaun Baker to include their notes as well. He noted that the DWR was very responsive and very thorough. He believed DWR would support whatever solution the Board chooses. The DWR also offered to attend by zoom any of their Board meetings if requested.

Architectural Review

John Adams reported that there were no new construction projects to report on this evening.

Mr. Adams stated that the ARC met to discuss culverts and culvert size. Throughout the Ranch several culverts are only 8"-12" in diameter. Those are the culverts that typically end up causing problems. The ARC discussed whether to have a minimum size culvert. They were asking the Board to set a minimum of 15"-18" culverts for all new construction and for any replacement culverts.

Mr. Adams remarked that the ARC would work with the owners when they submit their Lot Improvement Plan and make a recommendation on the size of culverts all the way up to 30"-36", depending on the water flows in that particular area.

Mr. Adams stated that the ARC was also recommending that the Board create a \$5,000 bond associated with the new culvert. For example, someone building a new home would put up \$5,000 for their culvert. If the culvert is the right size and installed properly the \$5,000 would be refunded. If the culvert is not properly sized, the HOA would keep the \$5,000 to either do the work themselves or hire someone to do it.

Mr. Pagel pointed out that \$5,000 was a standard cost for installing a culvert. He believed that the "minimum" size would be based more on area rather than being an absolute. Mr. Sears understood that there could be variability based on location. Mr. Pagel replied that he was correct.

Mr. Pagel noted that Summit County does an evaluation of swell versus culvert. At a minimum, the HOA could say they no longer allow swells and at a minimum the culvert should be a Summit County 12" culvert. Mr. Adams replied that the 12" culverts are the ones creating problems. Mr. Pagel clarified that 12" would be a base point and the ARC can require a larger culvert if the home is in a primary location for runoff in the Canyon. He suggested that the Area Reps should identify owners building in their areas and determine whether a larger culvert is necessary.

Mr. Sears thought the Board could assess the areas and identify Elk Road, Alexander Canyon, and other primary areas where they know for sure a larger culvert is required. Mr. Pagel suggested that as part of the architectural submission they could require a culvert design, along with photo submissions of the location where the driveway will be placed as a place to begin the evaluation. Mr. Adams thought it was a great idea. Mr. Sears agreed.

Mr. Adams noted that the ARC needed to update the Lot Improvement Plan to include that requirement. Mr. Sears suggested language indicating that based on the location the culvert size will be evaluated by the ARC to determine whether the capacity is adequate. Mr. Pagel added a requirement for a culvert design and a recommendation from an engineer regarding the driveway and culvert sizing.

Mr. Adams asked if the solution needed further discussion or whether the ARC could draft language to include in the Lot Improvement Plan. Mr. Sears thought they were ready for a vote on making that adjustment.

MOTION: John Adams moved to require an engineered culvert design in the Lot Improvement Plan

going forward. George Sears seconded the motion.
VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Andi, who sits on the ARC but is not a Board member, stated that she thought the recommendation was fantastic.

Area Rep Reports

Area 1 – Pam Slaughter had nothing to report.
Area 2 - Marty Hansen was not present.
Area 3 - John Pettijohn was not present.
Area 4 – Katie Winters had nothing to report.
Area 5 – Shaun Baker had nothing to report.
Area 6 – John Kleba had nothing to report.
Area 7 – Taissa Folden had nothing to report.

Communications

Mr. Sears reported that John Pettijohn had resigned from the Board. An email was sent to the owners in Area 3 opening the position up for Area Rep. Joe Pagel had submitted his name and they were waiting to see if anyone else was interested. Responses must be in by next week. A formal approval process with the Board will take place as soon as they know if anyone else is interested.

Open Public Forum

There were no comments or questions.

The meeting of the Pine Meadow Owners Association Board adjourned at 7:58 p.m.
