

Hidden Creek HOA Board Meeting Minutes

Thursday, August 20, 2020 3:00 MT

GoTo Meeting

I. Call to Order. 3:02p.m. by Leanne Miller

II. Establishment of Quorum

Board Members:

Leanne Miller

Carri Moentmann

Michael Bradley

Dan Mitrovich (joined at 3:27p.m.)

Guy Rawson (not in attendance)

ASHM:

Carissa Nosack

Mike Williams

Garrick Malin

Gina Covino

Homeowners:

Lili Holland

Lisa Graveline

Paul Oberkircher

Ariel Osmond

Jim Meland

Steven McBride

Kristi Wilson

(+2 by phone without contact info)

Kevin Moentmann

III. July 2020 Meeting Minutes

Leanne asked if everyone had a chance to review. Page 2-15 of board packet.

Leanne questioned whether violations should be in minutes. It was pointed out that violations are not listed in the meeting minutes but are included in the financial reports. The financial reports are part of the Board packets not the minutes.

Motion to approve by Carri, 2nd by Michael, all in favor. Motion carries.

IV. Financials

June begin on page 16 of the packet. July begin on page 31.

June 2020 Revenues:

The total revenue budgeted for this period is \$68,369, while actual revenue earned is \$68,152. This \$217 variance in revenue is primarily attributable to interest income reserve and finance charges/late fees coming in under budget.

June 2020 Expenses:

Period actual expenses totaled \$64,447, which was more than the budgeted period expenses of \$61,210. This was 5.29% more than budget or an unfavorable variance of approximately \$3,237. Significant variances of specific line item expenses include:

- Legal and Professional Fees: The \$2,640 variance is related to the reserve study expense of Complex Solutions.
- Landscape Contractor: The \$990 variance is primarily related sprinkler repair and lawn maintenance.
- Water: The \$1,702 variance is related to fluctuation in rates and consumption, as well

as reduced consumption from the shutdown of Summit County, and the milder weather from the spring/summer season.

- After review of this report, there are two 91+ day balances listed as of June 30, 2020 totaling \$12,575. As of July 20, 2020, there are two delinquent accounts.
- Unanticipated capital expenses: During the period, no money was spent.
- Planned capital expenses: During the period, \$1,233 was used to pay for heat tape repairs.
- Summary: Year-to-date planned and unplanned capital expenses total at \$8,340.

July 2020 Revenues:

The total revenue budgeted for this period is \$68,369, while actual revenue earned is \$68,188. This \$181 variance in revenue is primarily attributable to interest income reserve coming in under budget for the period.

July 2020 Expenses:

Period actual expenses totaled \$68,189, which was more than the budgeted period expenses of \$67,457. This was 1.09% more than budget or an unfavorable variance of approximately \$732. Significant variances of specific line item expenses include:

- Maintenance: The \$3,120 variance is related to various projects taking place around the property including sprinkler repair, painting, parking patrols, and inspections.
- Water: The \$1,675 variance is related to fluctuation in rates and consumption, as well as reduced consumption from the shutdown
- After review of this report, there are two 91+ day balances listed as of July 31, 2020 totaling \$14,911. As of Aug 18, 2020, there are two delinquent accounts totaling \$8,203. These accounts are in collections.
- Unanticipated capital expenses: During the period, \$45,050 was spent on removing and replacing the retaining wall.
- Planned capital expenses: During the period, no money was spent.
- Summary: Year-to-date planned and unplanned capital expenses total at \$53,390. The current reserve balance is at \$360,804.

Leanne asked about the unanticipated capital expense of the retaining wall and why it was categorized that way. Carri responded that it was originally a 2021 capital budget item moved forward by the Board to 2020 due to the MRW project and other capital projects.

Page 48 of the Board packet:

GAAP makes sure that they are general enough to cover multiple industries, and HOA's are a niche segment. The HOA should adopt a policy based on the general guidelines.

Proposed Standard for Operating and Capital Expenditure Differentiation at Hidden Creek HOA

US GAAP provides guidelines on the appropriate situations to capitalize expenses. US GAAP does not give number thresholds or absolute rules regarding HOAs and capital expenses.

According to current information, the industry best practice is to understand the guidelines and create an HOA policy that follows them. Garrick provided the following examples differentiating:

Proposal:

Based on historical expenses:

- Operating expenses are considered those items that either (a) return previously working asset(s) to their working condition or (b) return asset(s) to preexisting conditions.
- Examples include snow removal, mowing the lawn(s), painting a common wall, and pest control.
- Capital expenses are considered those items that add value or life to assets of the HOA.
- Examples include expanding the retaining wall, installing new roofing materials, and adding new drainage pipes.
- Expenses such as utilities, management and labor fees, and insurance are regular operating expenses.

Leanne would like to set a monetary limit. Item tabled to future meeting when Guy and Dan can participate.

Carri asked if anyone had heard from Guy or Dan regarding their participation in the meeting. Leanne sent them both a text and neither had responded.

Leanne asked to revisit the last page of the financial packet, the breakdown of maintenance labor hours, and discuss if this is what the Board want in terms of how hourly costs are being accrued. Michael agreed.

Garrick reported that the last document is how the management company bills the HOA and follows the PMA. ASHM has a policy against providing HOA's with internal maintenance hour records.

V. Management/Maintenance Report

• Remodel/Modification Report

A detailed report is provided as part of the Board packet. Mike Williams reported there was nothing exceptional to call attention except that he was able to walk through 8B with the new owners and the county had passed off, but he was waiting on a copy to sign off on behalf of the HOA.

Carri brought up the fact that the rear window over the deck needed to be painted as part of the interior remodel and window addition before the final inspection can be passed. They would also like to finish the decking but it may not be possible this year as they want to submit an amended decking remodel request. Mike was going to make sure the window was included in the interior remodel final inspection.

Dan Mitrovich joined the call 3:27 PM

- Completed/In Progress/Parking Report (MRW)

A detailed report is provided as part of the Board packet. The biggest challenge this month has been irrigation water and damage to lines from construction projects. The extremely hot and dry temperatures have not helped.

Carri asked about Sunday's major valve leak and if it was under control. A homeowner (Brian Sampaio) jumped in the hole and water to shut the valve off. Altitude has almost completed the repair.

Michael asked if MikeW had talked to MRW or CVMA because of the work on Canyons Resort Drive and asked if the work was impacting.

MikeW reported that he has spoken to Marti Gee (MRW) about it and she reported that there were so many breaks up and down the lane it would be impossible to know or determine the cause but it could have been a factor.

Michael asked about the water issue by Aspen Drive.

MikeW reported that there had been four total issues and all at this time all of them have been repaired.

Leanne asked about the brown patches of grass in the community and mentioned the water bills have been higher and asked how those were being addressed.

MikeW reported that much of this is because of the hot/dry weather temperatures, the water line breaks and the timing in the season. He is constantly in communication with Altitude about the sprinklers and making adjustments for coverage. Altitude wants to remind the HOA that the system is old and many heads are in the process of needing or being replaced.

Carri suggested that the sprinkler be assessed every season and that sprinkler heads be evaluated for coverage and replacement at the beginning of the season as opposed to later when the need is apparent. Is the old system limited in the capacity to change heads to address the problem?

MikeW reported that it is a very large and old system. The fluctuations between what the system is able to deliver versus the changing needs throughout the season are part of the problem. He will continue to work with Altitude to make the adjustments as needed. Spring and Fall the system appears adequate.

Michael mentioned Jose making adjustments as needed. MikeW reported that Spencer is supervising Jose and that Mike is on the phone with him at least weekly to try and get ahead of things. Carri recommended a more comprehensive review of the irrigation system be completed in the beginning of the season. Carri suggested a record be started now to note issues so that in the Spring there would be documentation of coverage/head issues.

Leanne brought up the Pool closing date and the possible postponement because of the limited activities this year. What are the Board thoughts?

Carri would like to make a decision and would suggest that we extend it. Can we set a date and then pending weather changing, adjust it? Mid-month in September? Michael Bradley agreed. MikeW suggested that they extend one week. He did this at another property last year and at the one week mark the weather change supported the closure. The 7th is Labor Day and the 14th would be another week. The 14th would be a good tentative date.

Leanne mentioned the pool occupancy has been exceeding limits and questioned how to enforce. Michael suggested that an email with both the pool closure extension and the County Covid recommendations/Hidden Creek pools rules be sent as a reminder to homeowners.

Michael and Carri believed nightly renters appear to be the problem, not homeowners. A special reminder should be given by homeowners to their management companies to follow the rules. The community should be able to self-police and Carri encourages those who feel comfortable to do so, to speak up when they see residents breaking the rules. MikeW will add new signage, especially by the jacuzzi. All members in favor of email and signage.

Leanne asked about the recycle and garbage dumpster locations during construction. MikeW will have the recycle dumpster moved up to the Cedar Lane parking lot temporarily and email a notice about the temporary location.

Carri asked a question about the email the Board received today about the spa concerns. MikeW reported that the minimal amount of work that was necessary to get it working was completed (seals were replaced for pressure).

- Suggestions/Recommendations for buildings to be inspected by envelope study consultants are 11, 13, 17, 32, 36, 37 or 38 (optional 1, 20, 30)

Page 51 of the Board packet:

An updated Mountain Regional Water project timeline was included in the Board packet.

- Violations/Fines Report

Report is included in Board packet. Details are not shared publicly for privacy purposes. One report details the stage and type of violation and one report details the fine assessment.

ASHM has assessed a continuing violation for August.

Leanne asked about the necessity of an executive session related to the violations/fines and collections.

Carissa reported that information was exchanged with the attorney on the collection accounts and ASHM is awaiting a response. An executive session is not necessary at this point in time for any violations.

Page 53 of the Board packet:

Personal Decking – ASHM is continuing to monitor the units. Personalized emails were sent on August 7th reminding of the deadline to perform the required maintenance.

VI. Governance

- Ratify Email Action

PMA

Michael Bradley did a lot of work on the negotiation to reach mutually agreeable terms. Motion to approve by Dan, 2nd by Carri, Leanne (Y). All in favor. Motion carries. Michael Bradley temporarily dropped off the call a few minutes earlier.

34C (deck railing), 6A (A/C)

These units non-conforming issues were conditionally grandfathered. Documentation is recorded on their HOA accounts. They will be required to meet current standards if any work (repairs, replacement, etc.) is completed in the future.

Motion to approve by Carri, 2nd by Dan, Michael Bradley (Y) Leanne (Y) All in favor. Motion carries.

- Legal: Summit County

Michael Bradley gave a brief report.

First, he wants to express gratitude to Brad Graveline for a nice job in articulating the position to best represent Hidden Creek. Ultimately, we think owners gained traction with Summit County Council to consider the Canyons Resort Area as an inappropriate area for the NMU-1, given the implications on what it could impose on the community with reference to developers and things that were already established over a 2-year period of time with the SPA agreement. We are hopeful that if owners continue to put pressure on the Council that they will remove the ruling for the area and prevent multi-unit and increased density in the area with the zoning changes. Many homeowners were present as well as Carri, Leanne and Dan as Board members.

Next County Council Meeting is September 9th. Everyone is encouraged to attend as the HOA is stronger in greater numbers.

Carri mentioned that the Council members were carefully observing those who were on the Zoom Call up until the very end. The more people that participate, the more likely the Council will respond favorably to the community and homeowner input.

Homeowners can send in written comments if they cannot or do not desire to participate verbally in the meeting. Written comments and questions need to be emailed by 12PM (noon) the day of the public hearing and can be accessed via the link provided with the agenda.

- Building Envelope Consultants (53m)

Leanne commented that there has been a lot of discussion about replacing roofs and insulation with the problems with ice dams. There are multiple opinions circulating.

Kraig Clawson (Innovative Building Envelope Consultants) had previously completed work for the association, (2012 & 2016) especially where people have expanded into the limited common area, but he is no longer available to give the Board direction in terms on the correct way to restore the buildings.

The Board contacted 2 companies in the SLC area to provide proposals to perform a study of the best way to move forward on various buildings. Those companies were J2 Consultants and Morrison Hershfield. The Board received the 2 proposals and were able to talk about them briefly which raised a few additional questions. The Board received a response from J2 that provided a clarification/correction on their fee schedule on their initial proposal as well as information and professional qualifications on who would be performing the work. A response for Morrison Hershfield was not received prior to the meeting.

Carissa has experience working with J2 and reports that they are providing independent 3rd party engineering and contractor oversight, on another large project in Park City. The project is going very well and she is impressed with the quality of work and services. Carri vetted J2 as well with other people in the Park City area who were very pleased with their work and clean contract.

Both companies were given an opportunity to respond to additional Board questions.

Morrison Hershfield did not seem to address all of the HOA concerns.

Motion to hire J2 by Carri for the initial phase (\$6400), 2nd by Michael, Dan (Y), Leanne (Y). All in favor. Motion carries.

- ARC

- HVAC Standard

The Board packet includes the version that shows the edits, a “clean” version of the edits and a document with the HVAC “ARC Helpful Hints” that was removed from the proposed standard.

Leanne was concerned about liability related to recommending specific models of AC/Splits. Discussion concluded with agreement that the language being modified to state “possible” condenser units to illustrate examples of those units meeting the standard.

Dan questions what the policy is for the adjacent neighbor notification/approval. Carri comments to make neighbors’ approval a condition of approval is not legally sound. ARC proposed the policy be amended to reflect a courtesy email sent to adjacent homeowners with a 48-hr response time for comment/feedback to management (NOT approval) that will be relayed to the Board following the ARC meeting and prior to the Board meeting.

Dan does not agree on the legal grounds to the change.

Carri opposes homeowner’s having the ability to APPROVE or DENY any type of remodel/hot tub application. Further commenting that Eric Weeks, a Utah attorney and member of the ARC committee has brought up the same legal concern on several occasions.

Leanne would like to put teeth in the language similar to: A courtesy email with proposed details will be emailed to adjacent neighbors with a response deadline. Michael suggested the adjacent homeowners be given 2 weeks to respond to the notification email. Carri believed this was too much time and would slow down the application process which the Board has been trying to expedite on behalf homeowners.

Carissa said that ASHM could give adjacent neighbors the details of the request in advance of the ARC meeting and allow them to be contacted during the ARC meeting so any comments, questions and feedback can be received and the process would not be unnecessarily delayed.

Michael commented clarifying that this would be incorporated into the new process that was already created for applications. Leanne thought that this would be reasonable.

Leanne asked about condenser sizing requirements and maintenance. Is “aesthetically pleasing” enough verbiage for the Board? Carri mentions there is overlap within the document that addresses aesthetics, conduit length and ARC just tightened up the language. The standard language is a good tool for HVAC contractors and homeowners to utilize when considering an application. Dan was concerned about calling out specific brands and was this something the Board should consider related to other items such as Sherwin Williams paint? Carri stated paint colors are formulas not necessarily brand specific for example for door colors, asking would Dan be comfortable with inserting the language “comparable”. Leanne asked if the Board wanted to vote subject to the changes? Everyone was fine moving forward with the vote. Motion to approve with proposed changes to add: “equivalent/comparable” models, verify verbiage that corresponds with the Rules & Regs, and Policy details on the adjacent neighbor notification tied to the ARC timetable by Carri, 2nd by Michael, Dan (Y), Leann(Y) All in favor. Motion carries.

- 28D Plumbing, interior remodel with plumbing

Carri commented that this remodel application was brought direct to the Board, bypassing ARC, because of the transition to the new timetable/schedule. Application was complete and ASHM reviewed and recommended it go straight to the Board. The window portion of the remodel application met the standard and was already approved by ASHM. Leanne questioned why this application needed to even go to ARC or the Board for approval. Carissa explained that previously the Board had asked that any plumbing changes be reviewed by the Board. Homeowners were doing the right thing by notifying the Board and making sure that their remodel has approval. Carissa stated our standards and even our latest newsletter direct homeowners to submit any remodeling plans to the HOA. Leanne asked what in the application the Board was being asked to approve? Plumbing - Carissa stated that the homeowner was basically

remodeling the bathrooms and replacing a short length of plumbing line (possibly original piping) and the hot water heater and connections.

Leanne stated that, in her opinion this application is not in the purview of the HOA and reviewing the application is a waste of Board's time and unnecessary. "Does everyone think that every application requires Board approval and asked for others opinions?" Dan agreed with Leanne and believed many applications should be treated clerically by ASHM and not go through a formal process. Michael liked the idea of having the applications go through ARC/Board for oversight and to create a record. Carri agreed with Michael, adding that the HOA was asking a lot of the property manager to sort through this and make these determinations. The standards for windows, doors, etc. make it easy to streamline and the Board has given ASHM the "green light" for those applications but our property is so challenging (plumbing, water/sewer usage) and historically there has been so much poorly done work that has slipped by that the HOA there is a need for oversight and a record. Leanne believes there should be oversight but not use up HOA time and resources. Carissa stated the same scenario came up with 16B1 with some plumbing alterations and we went through this same exercise to get additional information from the homeowner to answer questions of the Board. ASHM is just asking for some clarification going forward, sometime we need this process and sometimes we don't? Carissa asked whether the Board wanted to vote on this application or just have ASHM move forward. Carri wanted to vote and document for the homeowner the Board approval pointing out this was a thorough application and that we now have documentation of the remodel. Dan stated he was in support of clerical approvals but believes this application is something different and is in favor of voting on this application.

Motion to approve by Carri, 2nd by Dan. Michael (Y), Leanne (abstain, because it should not have come to the Board and should be approved administratively by management). Motion carries.

- Reserve Study

Final changes postponed pending envelope study to address ice damming issues.

Carri requests that the draft be addressed soon as the community will be asked to vote on a Special Assessment at the Annual Meeting.

Leanne said it can be discussed during the Monday August 24th executive session for legal issues.

Carri asked if an email vote could be used to finalize the Reserve Study, including the projects and elements of the Special Assessment. Leanne agreed that it could be addressed.

VII. Owner Comments

Paul Oberkirker (Building 17) has been an owner for 12 years and likes what the Board is doing as they are interested in keeping the HOA fees low and plans to continue his participation in the HOA meetings.

Concerns were expressed about nightly rental occupants breaking the rules and hopes the Board can work to address those concerns.

Paul is also very concerned about the roofing issues on his building and ice damming/water damage as his unit has developed a significant smell. He is concerned that he has complained to the HOA and nothing has changed and the water running down the wall will continue this winter causing significant damage. Heat tape was used on the roof but was removed and homeowner believes this may be a solution.

Board encourages the use of Buildium to make reports to management for maintenance requests and to report violations (specifically nightly renters and violations of Rules and Regulations).

*The building envelope study will include the evaluation of his unit.

Lili Holland (25D) expressed concerns about nightly rentals, the abuse of amenities, the difference between the summer and winter clientele, occupancy limits and enforcement. Lili has looked into Utah law and suggests that a legal opinion is needed for the HOA to evaluate the potential of charging a Resort Fee to address the concerns.

Dan and Michael commented they echo the concerns about the violations by summer nightly renters and encourage possible solutions by homeowners. Winter renters do not seem to cause the same problems.

Kristi Wilson (27C) had questions about the process to submit an amendment to her previously approved remodel-modification and the new ARC schedule. Carissa addressed the concern with a request for her to submit the paperwork before Aug 26th. Kristi thanked Leanne for the response to her emails about the insulation. However, she is concerned the envelope study will not be completed in time to address her remodel and project. Her building's roof was replaced in 2019 without addressing the insulation issues. She submitted a proposal to the Board to address the insulation issue and is frustrated that a resolution has not been reached.

Michael acknowledged Kristi's comments, but until the roofing inspection is completed and recommendations are made by the engineer the Board cannot proceed. The timing is unfortunate. Michael asked her for more detail on her timing and she responded that after consulting with an insulation company and 2 contractors they reported that it is an extensive process to open ceilings for insulation and it would need to be done at the beginning of the renovation.

Leanne states the Board does not have the information to be able to reply. Kristi said that there is visible water damage in the master bedroom where the window bumps out and the vaulted ceiling merge. Kristi is concerned that the roof on her building was replaced in 2019 and she was previously advised to install insulation, inquiring what has changed?

The Board committed that her unit will be one of the first buildings inspected and apologizes that the timelines do not match up. The Board wants to get the technical review and opinion before advising further. Kristi asked if Leanne could give her an update when it was determined when J2 would begin and Leanne committed to doing so. Kristi asked if there is damage related to lack of insulation and there are ice damming issues, is information available related to who is financially responsible for the repairs, the HOA or the homeowner?

Leanne stated that she does not have that information to release and does not know when that information will be available for release.

Jim Meland (30A) would like to know the goal of the building envelope consulting study on the roofs and whether it is to determine the course of action on the remaining roofs or whether it will create an opinion about the entire development? He expressed concerns about ice dam/water damage to the first 3 feet of his garage roof that impacts the garage. Is this going to be a course of action for entire development?

Leanne said the study was intended to address ice damming throughout the entire development. The study was initially to determine how to proceed on the remaining roofs and budget for it; but acknowledges that several homeowners have now expressed ice dam concerns on newer roofs and that the whole community roofing needs to be addressed.

VIII. Hidden Creek Meetings

- Board Meeting September 17, 2020 3:00PM, MST via GoTo Meeting
- Tentatively: Town Hall Meetings to start discussion on Capital Reserve Projects and how to accomplish funding on September 17th, 6:30-7:30PM, MST and October 1st, 6:30-7:30PM, MST and they will be noticed to owners.

ASHM has a 2-3 week deadline from this meeting for the Board to give direction in order to prepare for the Town Hall meetings.

Carissa inquired about timing for notification for board elections to homeowners so applications/bios could be submitted in time for distribution to homeowners? Leanne stated that we need to have a discussion about this “off line” because in her personal opinion there are no board seats up for election this year. Carri questions why there is no board election this year? Leanne says if you want to have a discussion and talk about this now we can.

The existing bylaws have a provision which state there are people with 2-year cycles and people with 3-year cycles. Carri asks for clarity as to how this could happen and won't this result in the entire board being up for election next year? Leanne says “yes”, this why we need an amendment. The need for an amendment has been discussed at great length due to the “fallacy” that was created in 2012 when the prior management company improperly wrote and recorded the amendment which was intended to stagger terms so that the entire Board was not up for election every 2 years.

Leanne does not believe a vote of the Board or anything other than a vote of the homeowners can change this cycle. Leanne acknowledges this is incorrect and not the intent, but states if someone wants to push this issue we will have to get a legal opinion to clarify.

***Upon Review Leanne requested this edit: The intent of my statement in the second sentence is not that the first sentence was wrong, but rather that the current by-law with 2 different term lengths is not correct.*

Leanne says this 2yr/3yr cycle is what has been followed since 2012 with the exception of a “little bit of a glitch” one year when there was a change in the property management company and there wasn't an election. Carri believes this to be unfair and poor timing when we are trying

to get homeowner participation. Leanne says she has been bringing this up for years and no one has wanted to push the issue. Carri asks if this is what you are doing now, “pushing the issue”. Leanne says yes, she is doing what no one else has wanted to do and is “pushing the issue”. She believes the right thing to do is to have the Board all on 2-year staggered terms as was the intent in 2012. It has been written wrong and implemented wrong and needs to be changed.

Carri asks for other board members to comment. Dan says he believes this is correct and the way it is written and implemented does not make any sense. It all precedes him, but it probably needs to be cleaned up. Leanne says the intent was to have 2-year staggered terms and that was what was presented and voted on at the meeting in 2012. Leanne further explains that the Board in 2012 voted on one thing and another was recorded and the error was not discovered until the next time someone thought there should have been an election. Donna Van Buren, the property manager at the time said, “oh well... and she had a story and this is what we have now” ... you have some 2-yr people and some 3yr people. Leanne says so we have 3 people on the 3yr cycle up in 2021. It has been this way since 2012 and has been “pretty consistent, but not entirely consistent” for the last eight years. Carri says she will have to look into this as she understood that after the initial elections for 2 and 3-year terms in 2012 that everyone was on 2-year terms with 3 people up for re-election this year including herself.

Carri thought the proposed amendment was to clean up the error in the recorded 2012 amendment and that the intent of the 2012 vote had been followed and no one was currently serving 3yr terms. Michael Bradley stated he was not clear and honestly thought the cycle was different but that 3 people were up this year. Michael says the problem is it sounds like we need a full vote of the homeowners to correct the bylaws unless there is some record otherwise.

Carri says if the Board continued to follow the error we may be facing a vote. Carri says she will need to look into it and try and track it historically. It seems unnecessary to have an amendment and forego an election if it was simply an error. Carri was under the belief the error could be corrected without a vote, but we may need to have a legal opinion. Leanne wants everyone to know she is not stating what was done in the past was right, but it happened and it needs to be fixed. Leanne states legal funds have already been spent to draft an amendment and it just needs to be presented to the owners for a vote. Carri questions if Leanne had simply directed the attorney to draft the amendment or did she ask for his legal opinion on how best to correct the error. Leanne said no legal opinion was requested and that she explained an amendment needed to be drafted to correct an error in the bylaws. Carri said she would appreciate access to any documentation that could help her understand what occurred in 2012 and in the subsequent and prior years.

- Regular Meeting Schedule: Third Thursday of month at 3:00pm, MST

IX. Adjourn 5:16p.m. Motion by Michael, 2nd by Leanne. Motion carries.