

Approved Minutes of October 27, 2012 Board of Directors Meeting

The Directors of the Stagecoach Property Owners Association (SPOA) met on Saturday, October 27, 2012, at the Stagecoach Fire Station for their regularly scheduled quarterly meeting.

Directors Present: President Tom Watts, Skip Moyer, Arthur Fine, Robert Skorkowsky, Secretary Ann Holmes, Mike Koponen, David Hackett, Tonja Elkins and Treasurer Ken Jones.

Staff Present: General Manager Ken Burgess

Also Present: Hans Hochreiter, Tony Stitch (ARC), Theresa Hackett, Corky Fisher, Matt Carry, Don Alpertie

Tom Watts called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Introductory Comments

Ratification of July 28 BOD minutes e-mail approval

MOTION: Ann made a motion to approve the July 28, 2012, minutes. Tonja seconded and the motion passed.

Approval of new ARC members

Ken Burgess noted that 4 members have expressed interest in joining the ARC: Greg Spenser, Melorine Jules, Dan Kuechenmeister, and Pam Kuechenmeister. Frank Murphy, head of the ARC, has asked for ratification of these members.

MOTION: Tonja made a motion to accept the 4 new members to the ARC. Ann seconded. The motion carried.

Ratification of funds paid on Jim Ficke contract

Ken Burgess reported on the history of the dispute with consultant Jim Ficke. Jim submitted a bill, which Ken refused to pay. Jim pursued a small claim through the court system for \$863.00 based on the claim that Jim brought value to the process. A judge required SPOA to pay Jim.

MOTION: Mike made a motion to ratify the expense. Skip seconded. Dave recused himself from the vote. The motion passed.

Ratification of funds paid for building permit and PUD amendment approval for South Shore mailbox enclosure

Tom distributed a handout on the bus turnaround/mailbox project. South Shore has no centrally located flat location to construct a safe mailbox pick-up area. Currently, mailboxes for residents sit on a 2 X 4 frame erected by residents in the County road right of way. Last year, a snowplow damaged the mailboxes. A previous board member started a negotiation with Upper Yampa Water Conservancy District to lease property adjacent to the "South Shore" sign for a gateway project containing a school bus turn-around, bus shelter, cluster mailbox enclosure and recycling dumpster enclosure. Ultimately a lease for \$100/yr for a 17,000 sq ft parcel was entered into in May 2011. Landmark Engineering was hired to prepare plans for the site preparation and Native Excavating was hired to do the grading and filling. Site preparation was completed in early 2012. The cost was just under \$35,000. Robert noted that at that time, the subdivision account reserves maintained by SPOA included money contributed in the past by South Shore residents in an amount sufficient to cover the expense. Tom continued that a South Shore resident architect, Erika Swissler-Hewitt, then prepared plans for the mail box and dumpster enclosures. However, problems developed with respect to the design of the dumpster enclosure, and, simultaneously, the SPOA board began to question whether a recycling center for all of Stagecoach should be considered, so Erica was asked to submit plans for only the mailbox enclosure. In June of this year Erica was notified that SPOA would be required to apply for a PUD amendment to get the building permit. Simultaneously, an application for building approval was submitted. The costs included \$200 for PUD and \$132 for the permit. In September the PUD amendment and building permit were approved by the County and the plans put out for bid. Tom has received only one bid for construction but it was quite high due to the timing (building in the winter). Tom is asking for approval for the \$332 already spent and an opportunity to rebid the construction in the spring. Approximate cost for construction is \$20,000. Corky asked if there is space for mailboxes for every South Shore resident if every lot gets a house. Tom reported that it would be sufficient for the foreseeable future. Tom commented that this project was always considered to be a gateway project for South Shore. He noted that there is opportunity for a bus shelter. Tom noted that Erika has only been paid \$500 thus far, which is well below cost. Don noted that a bus shelter might be moot based on his experience with the bus shelter in Eagles Watch. Tom noted that the hope is to continue a design throughout Stagecoach. David asked to be included in any design review.

Tony noted that he had proposed, in the past, for residents to pay for the boxes (and include heating) as opposed to SPOA covering the expense. Ken Burgess noted that the ARC might want to look into common design. Skip noted that

as an overall project, it is about \$57,000, which is a lot of money.

MOTION: David made a motion to ratify the \$332 expense. Tonja seconded and the motion carried.

Discussion and Approval of 2013 Budget

Discussion of Proposed Operating Budget

Ken Jones distributed budget documents (A and B). Budget A is the budget that does not include Ken Burgess' request to cut back on his time and hiring a second employee. Ken then reported that Budget A is the status quo.

Robert asked that additional bids be obtained for the following items: Office/administrative expenses & accounting services – Robert asked to have a discussion on how SPOA can lower these expenses. The Project Manager position should also be bid out.

Tonja asked about having an annual financial review. Ken B. reported that a review costs about \$2,500. She questioned if CCIOA requires such a review to be in compliance.

David noted that there might be an opportunity to look at the whole operation especially considering Ken Burgess' request to reduce involvement. Ken B. commented that he couldn't agree more. The history of SPOA administration has been pieced together inexpensively.

Ken Jones then reported on Budget B. The income is the same. He made an assumption that accounting would increase due to a request for an additional employee. Ken J. also added legal expenses due to an increase in enforcement. Rent was reduced. Ken noted that the manager wages would be split between two employees—Office Manager and Project Manager.

Art asked about bank fees. Ken noted that business accounts have additional fraud fees associated with commercial accounts (historically those fees were covered by earnings credits, but with interest rates so low, those have gone away).

David asked if SPOA could talk to the bank to possibly lower the costs for the current protections.

Request to change management structure for SPOA

Ken Burgess noted that he has become worn down by the job. He would like to hand off some of the responsibilities to Corky or someone else. He noted that much of the job is volunteer work. Specifically, in the proposal, Ken would keep the routine items (phone, e-mail, document coordination, board meetings, etc.) and his wife, Renata, would keep up the support services. The Project Manager would handle covenant violation management, coordination with ARC, some record keeping, maintenance/coordination of equipment, coordination of the annual meeting, management of existing maintenance contracts, and administration of new contracts.

A general discussion then followed: Corky spoke about his background in management. He has wanted to get involved in SPOA and make a positive impact. Mike noted that Corky has experience with construction people in town. Robert noted that it is the responsibility of an organization like SPOA to spell out the job description and put any position out there so that the public has an opportunity to apply for the job. Ken J asked about the time allocation... specifically time on covenant issues. Ken B reported that he hasn't been able to spend as much time as necessary on covenant issues. Robert noted that it is hard to evaluate a position if SPOA doesn't spell out the responsibilities. Tonja noted that it is SPOA's fiduciary responsibility to follow-up with covenant compliance. Corky noted that a phone call or face-to-face meeting with violators could help with legal expenses. Tom then noted that SPOA must enforce covenants. The question is whether SPOA hire someone to replace both the administrative as well as covenant enforcement or if SPOA split the responsibilities per Ken's request.

David also put forth a 3rd option, to redesign the whole administrative/covenant enforcement responsibilities. Robert also offered up the acknowledgement that there could be some transitional motion forward without having to do everything all in one step. Tom noted that if SPOA does not successfully address covenant enforcement, SPOA could lose its right to enforce the covenants. Mike liked the idea of a transition year.

Discussion of Proposed Capital Improvements Budget

Request for additional logging funds (Skorkowsky) – Robert referred to an accounting report distributed earlier that shows the current status. The first contract was to Rogue Resources for 26 acres that is complete, paid for and reimbursed by the state. The second was to HDR Logging for 30 acres, which has been complete, paid for with reimbursement pending. The next one is for Blackhorse II for 22 acres, which is complete, paid for but not yet submitted for reimbursement. The next is for Blackhorse I for 27 acres, which is also complete, paid for but not yet submitted for reimbursement. Currently contractors are working on Morningside for 11 acres and Skyhitch. The logger for Skyhitch defaulted on the contract so there is additional administration occurring. Thus, they are almost done with the 155-acre goal and therefore on track. The forest service has been reimbursing approximately \$470 for the \$900 per

acre cost for the logging (SPOA is paying the difference). To do the next 24 acres it would cost approximately \$24,600 of which \$13,300 would be SPOA expense with the remainder reimbursed. That would conclude the grant cycle and Phase I, but there is still the Horseback area (14 acres). Also, there are still other issues: Phase 1 addressed most lots with homes but it hasn't addressed lots without a home that are near a lot with a home. There is more to be done. Robert is hopeful for more matching grants.

Robert then went on to report on the fire department's grant. Because the fire danger was so high this summer many of the piles were not burned. Robert asked SPOA to consider funding \$5,400 for Oak Creek Fire Department personnel for slash pile burning this winter.

Eagles Watch request for bus shelter renovation funds (Alperti)—Don spoke about the bus shelter that SPOA funded in Eagles Watch. The shelter is on school property yet the Eagles Watch members want the shelter removed because it is not being used. Don is asking SPOA for paint money (about \$350) if needed to improve the shelter for the school district. It would be seen as a donation to the school district. Don then made a comment that covenants are critical to SPOA and covenants are the responsibility of board members.

Request for funds to purchase and construct mailboxes for Morningside and Cole Hill (Burgess)— Ken Burgess reported that the postmaster has requested 3 more box units (16 boxes per unit). The boxes are approximately \$1,400 each. SPOA charges \$250 for non-SPOA members who want to use them. SPOA also charges \$250 to new home builders for mailboxes. Ann said that she does not believe it should be a SPOA expense.

Request for funds to construct fencing at Wagon Wheel (Burgess)—Ken Burgess reported that \$10,000 is required to re-fence the RV area at Wagon Wheel. In the past SPOA has helped fund this however, Wagon Wheel does have its own HOA fees. Corky asked if the project has been bid. Tom indicated that the board is being asked to consider this request with the information given, which is minimal. The ARC has reviewed the request. Mike said that the board could request conditions for allocating funds like requiring three bids, etc.

Request for funds to repair Filly Trail (Fisher/Burgess)—Corky reported that 3 contractors reviewed the request for drainage ditch creation, culvert repair and installation, and road base for Filly Trail (1,648 feet). Two bids came in at approximately \$17,000 and \$10,000. Corky believes the bid could be reduced because of the new gravel pit. Currently the county has not accepted this road.

Request for funds to repair Stampede Way (Burgess)—Stampede is in Blackhorse II. Ken reported that it is approximately \$4,500 to repair this road based on one bid.

Request for funds to construct sign at Meadow Green (Burgess)—Ken reported that a new resident has asked for a \$1,500 sign to be built identify Meadow Green.

Request for funds for road design in Skyhitch II (Skorkowsky)—Robert spoke about the Skyhitch II road package. He reported a request for road development design of 2,200 feet of Halter Trail for \$16,700 (based on a bid from Landmark). Soil tests have already been done. Then SPOA could put it out for bid. 24 lots would be directly affected. There is support by lot-owners based on returned proxies. Tonja reported that most people she spoke to don't pay much attention to SPOA, so proxy votes may underestimate the people who would actually be interested in road development. Ann noted that amending the covenants should come first. Tom noted that the property owners could agree to assess themselves. Tom recommends moving on parallel tracks—landowners could talk among themselves to build up enough funds with the first step finding out how much it would cost while SPOA works on amending the Covenants. Mike clarified that this road was picked because it showed interest by property owners, especially those in South Station I (disclaimer: board members Robert and Art own lots in South Station I), the soil samples have already been done, and geographically, it appears that it would be a relatively simple road to build. Robert noted that ultimately it would go out to bid, Landmark was simply asked to give an estimate so SPOA could have a rough idea of cost. Corky offered that a certified road builder could give a not-to-exceed estimate simply based on core soil samples. Tom noted that that kind of process has not worked in the past. A design with a set of plans is required for a contract. Robert made the point that the other lot owners, farther down Halter Trail, should also participate. Robert offered to negotiate strongly with Landmark or to talk with other companies for plans.

Votes on Proposed Operating Budget

Since it appeared that the Directors favor dividing the GM position into two parts, at least temporarily, Tom stated that we would work from Budget B and asked whether any Directors wanted amendments to Budget B.

Robert asked that SPOA not spend 23% of the operating budget on administration. He asked that SPOA review the job duties and then have bids. Tom noted that by approving a proposed budget it does not mean that SPOA will spend the money specified in the budget. By approving a budget, it allows Ken Burgess to spend up to the dollar amount in the budget, without seeking further Board approval. Ken J agreed that the exercise of reviewing the GM job is important

but that it shouldn't stop the board for approving a budget. Tom then requested specific amendments to Budget B.

MOTION: Robert moved to reduce the annual meeting expense line item in Budget B to \$1,500. Ann seconded and the motion passed.

MOTION: Ann moved to reduce legal fees line item to \$2,500. Robert seconded the motion. Ken B noted that this motion indicates that once Ken reaches \$2,500 he needs to stop spending and then come back to the board. The motion passed.

MOTION: Ken J made a motion to allocate \$2,400 for the office rent line item. Skip seconded the motion. The motion passed with six approvals two opposed and a recusal by David.

Ken J noted that with the above changes, Budget B now stands at \$93,880 for budgeted operating expenses.

MOTION: Robert made a motion to accept operating Budget B at \$93,880. Skip seconded and the motion passed.

Votes on Capital Expenditure requests

MOTION: Robert made a motion to advance not more than \$24,600 for logging expenses for 24 acres given that SPOA will be reimbursed by the Colorado Forest service for \$11,280 resulting in a net of \$13,300. Tonja seconded and the motion passed.

MOTION: Robert made a motion to make a contribution of up to \$5,400 to the Oak Creek Fire Protection District for help with slash burning. David seconded. A discussion followed that this is a choice of burning now, in the snow, or not at all. The motion passed.

MOTION: Tom made a motion to spend general funds of not more than \$4,200 to purchase and install two additional cluster mailboxes at Morningside and one at Cole Hill. Tonja seconded and the motion passed with Mike opposing the motion.

MOTION: Tom made a motion to pay \$2,500 to Wagon Wheel toward construction of a new fence for their RV storage area. Payment to be made upon presentation of an invoice from the contractor marked paid. Skip seconded and the motion passed with David opposing the motion.

MOTION: Tom moved that SPOA pay not more than \$5,225 or 50% of cost of construction, whichever is less, for the repair of First Filly Trail upon presentation of an invoice and verification from the General Manager that the work has been completed. Tonja seconded.

Discussion: Robert noted that it was apparent from the annual meeting that constituents want those who benefit to pay for their road improvements and not paid for from SPOA funds. Mike noted the benefit to everyone when SPOA makes it more attractive for people to build in Stagecoach. Ken B noted that boards have focused on road maintenance on the front side because they are so visible. Ken B recommends setting up some kind of fund for each subdivision to use for road improvements. There was a comment about the problems with the vote to increase dues. David reported that his conversations have indicated that people were upset with the process not necessarily the increase in dues.

Robert noted that the board has voted down road repair in the past because SPOA stated that it is not in the business of road repair. Ken B noted that the image of Stagecoach is at stake with the front area roads. Ann noted that these non-operating funds came from the subdivision funds. David noted that these funds are not being replenished. Corky asked about Routt County's responsibilities. Tom said that the short answer is that SPOA cannot rely on any help from the county. Discussion continued about construction verses repair. Robert noted that SPOA has been hoping to amend the covenant to address this very issue (the covenant would allow property owners affected to assess themselves to cover road expenses).

A vote on the motion was taken and the motion was approved with 5 approvals and 4 opposed, namely, Ken J, David, Ann, and Robert.

MOTION: Tom made a motion to pay not more than \$2,250 or 50% of the cost of improving Stampede Way upon presentation of an invoice by the contractor and verification by the General Manager that the work has been completed. Skip seconded the motion. Ken B noted that there are two homes on Stampede Way. Corky noted that this is the worst road he has seen. Art abstained from the vote. A vote was taken and the motion was approved with 5 approval and 3 opposition votes (David, Ken J, Ann).

The request for Meadowgreen signage was reposed for lack of a motion. Ann said that sign saying "Meadowgreen" does not make sense because there are three sections of Meadowgreen.

MOTION: David made a motion to cover the cost of the paint of up to \$350 for the Eagles Watch bus shelter as a contribution to the school district. Mike seconded and the motion passed. Ken J noted that this item should fall under the "contribution" line on the budget.

MOTION: Robert made a motion to pay not more than \$16,700 for engineering designs for the first 2,200 feet of Halter Way for the purpose of future road construction. David seconded.

Discussion: Ken Jones noted that this does not build an actual road and there is a possibility that this money would not make a difference. Robert noted that is not possible to get a bid without plans. He also noted that this road would be an access to many more lots. David noted this proposal is one that gives people a place to start. Robert noted that he believes this will come in significantly lower than estimated. Tom noted that in keeping with our proposal to amend the covenants to establish assessment groups, it would be appropriate to expend this money to give people a more accurate view of actual costs.

The motion passed with 6 approvals and 3 opposed (Mike, Ken J and Ann).

Covenant Amendment Regarding Special Assessments

Tom distributed a handout titled, "Proposed Covenant Amendment." He noted that this document integrates comments submitted to him in the brackets. Tom would like to arrive at the exact language for the proposed covenant amendment. The board then went through each item and made changes.

MOTION: Tom moved to publish the Proposed Covenant Amendment with the changes agreed upon and publicize it through the newsletter and a mailing to ask for feedback from SPOA membership. The idea is to make a formal covenant change during the January Board of Director's Meeting. The proposal would be sent out with a ballot after the January Board of Director's meeting. Ann suggested sending out the proposal with the ballot for a vote with the dues mailing in February. Robert seconded and the motion carried.

Horseback Road Fund Policy

Discussion of Proposed Horseback Road Fund Policy. Tom noted that Ken J and Ken B distributed a proposed distribution of Horseback funds. The proposed policy is that upon proper application, SPOA will fund up to 70% of the cost to build a new road, up to 60% of the cost to widen the original road, and up to 50% of the cost of addition widening of the road, to meet County standards. SPOA will deal with applications for payment on a first come/first serve basis.

Tony has an issue with the county on these roads. He believes that the county should have accepted these roads and SPOA should be focusing on going after the county. The county is currently not giving building permits without roads meeting their standards. Ken B brought up an instance where this is happening: Kim Wright is paying for road widening to meet county standards before she can finalize her home. David clarified that Tony is saying that the roads were originally built to county standards and because they chose not to maintain those roads even though it states in the settlement agreement that it is the county's responsibility, that now the roads are no longer meeting county standards. Robert said that on one hand SPOA could go to the county and say it is the county's fault. On the other hand, the county could just come back and say, well the road no longer meets standards and it is up to residents to bring the road up to standard. Tom reported that the county has indicated that there was never any documentation that the roads were originally brought up to county specifications. SPOA would have to dig into subdivision funds to legally fight this fight—it would be an expensive fight. Meanwhile, some SPOA residents are taking their own money to improve their roads. Robert and Mike asked about precedence. The facts are that there are 5 miles of road in Horseback. The county is currently plowing about half of those roads. Skip asked about the first come/first serve provision as opposed to a proportional distribution. Ken B mentioned that there are a couple options: a pro-rata share is more challenging to determine (due to when different people along the road want to build) so first come/first serve was the default option. It is up for discussion. By Kim building her road, it allows 40 other people to build houses (in other words, their lot values have increased because of Kim's road). Tony noted that there have been other examples of pioneers, including him, who were not compensated for the infrastructure they funded. Tom noted the difference between electricity and roads. YVEA requires reimbursement from anyone who taps into an electric line within 5 years to the person who put in the line originally. Tom clarified that SPOA has approximately \$97,000 that must be used for infrastructure. Tom noted that the whole roads fund proposal as well as the percentages are up for discussion. David suggested that the percentages be 50%, 40%, 30%. Tom believes in a proposal that rewards the pioneers and encourages road building. Skip wondered about other infrastructure improvements—electric, sewer, etc.

MOTION: David made a motion to use the proposal but change the percentages to 50%, 40%, and 30%. Art seconded. Mike made an amendment to change the percentages to 60%, 50%, and 40%. Robert seconded. The amended motion passed with 6 approvals and 2 opposed (Dave and Art). A vote was taken on the motion with the amendment and the motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Skip made a motion to reimburse to Tony for 50% of the approximately \$5,000 that Tony reported spending for infrastructure work he did in the past, or approximately \$2,500. Robert seconded. David moved to amend to 60% , which would total approximately \$3,000, pending submission of invoices by Tony. Tonja seconded the

amendment. The amendment passed with one opposition (Ann).

Discussion: Tom noted that SPOA would need to send out a notice to everyone in Horseback of these payments. Robert asked about the exposure this motion presents. How much infrastructure has been paid for in the past by homeowners or developers? Ann spoke up that she has a problem with the fact that Tony was a developer.

A vote on the motion with the amendment was taken and approved with 6 approvals and 2 oppositions (Tom and Ann).

MOTION: Tom made a motion to reimburse Kim Wright 60% of the \$19,706 she has requested pursuant to the previously approved motion. Tonja seconded. The motion passed with one opposed (Ann)

Status Report on pending ARC violations (Burgess)

Ken B reported on 4 violations and noted that letters have been sent via certified mail. He will be working with the attorney for those who have not yet responded to their notices. Tonja asked about foreclosing on the properties that have not responded. Ken said it is possible especially with the property that is in health violations. David asked for some rules about what SPOA pursues. Ken reported that there is a hierarchy based on what types of issues have the highest negative impact on the largest number of owners. Tom noted that there are the covenants then the governance and then the ARC guidelines to help.

Water and Sanitation District Mil Levy Increase

Art reported on his frustration on the mil levy proposal on behalf of Morrison Creek. Now that the lot values have decreased the mil levy has not decreased. He proposes not belonging to the Morrison Creek district. Ken B sits on the Morrison Creek board and spoke about the IGA. The issue is not the mil levy increase as much as a need to preserve the income—they need sufficient funds to operate. Splitting off the southern subdivisions would prohibit them from getting building permits. Ken is not sure about the other legal ramifications of removing the southern subdivision. Morningside is the only area in danger of running out of vaults. Tom asked for clarification about what Art is upset about--that SPOA did not advise members of the mil levy proposal? Tom is questioning that that this is a SPOA issue. Art is asking people to vote against the mill levy. Tom suggested that the newsletter article should have had both a pro and a con argument on the issue, rather than only an article from a Water Board member. Robert noted that there are Tabor violations regarding notifications so the issue will probably be discussed for a while.

Covenant Issues – Trailers. Tony reported that trailers are not allowed on vacant land. He has a problem with the fact that trailers are allowed on a lot with a structure but not on property without a structure. Tom asked that according to policy the ARC should handle these kinds of complaints. Ken also noted the 30-day policy that allows people to camp on their lot for a maximum of 30 days with approval. Tom feels that the ARC needs to act on this and then approach the board if there is a dispute.

Updating the Community Plan-

Dave reported that he and Skip have spoken with Chad Phillips and one member of the planning commission. The 2009 effort listed improvements to the plan but then they lost funding to implement the improvements. What needs to be changed in the community plan to accomplish what SPOA wants to be accomplished during the next 5-10 years could be very expensive. David noted, however, that it is SPOA board members who need to be clear on what SPOA wants to accomplish through the community plan. David and Skip have identified a few things but they would like a couple hours to go through the plan with the board members to identify changes. There is also an issue of SPOA funds. There is already an approval to spend \$10,000 to improve the plan. Robert added that there was always intended to be a cost sharing with the planning commission. Tom said that a figure of close to \$90,000 total is well above what was originally discussed. Skip said that unless SPOA agrees that it is worth it (financially and time effort) to update the plan document, it might be worth scrapping the update of the plan. Tom said that SPOA boards come and go but a contract is a contract. If you want to make a difference, make a strategic plan that puts together a plan that is rock solid. An example is that commissioners will not approve zoning changes unless they approve a variance to the community plan. Tony also mentioned the proposed reservoir changes included in the community master plan. Tonja noted that there is a list of priorities that have already been identified that will help SPOA by changing the community plan (commercial, flexibility on lot consolidations, etc.). Skip noted that SPOA might have some time on most of these issue. Skip then talked about the need for a Stagecoach action plan. Skip said there is a credibility issue for the board. Through an action plan the board could get buy-in from members. Some thoughts he and David have tossed around for an action plan include adding funds by giving accounts back to the subdivisions and by changing the covenants. Presenting a comprehensive action plan might help rebuild credibility to SPOA. David is asking that the board think about adding a

dedicated period of time during the next meeting to put out a list of priorities for an action plan. And, at the same time to put the Community Plan document on hold. Art thinks it is time to bring in outside people into discussions. Tonja noted that the board was set up to be a homeowners association yet what SPOA has is a lot owner's association whose members choose not to be involved. Tom spoke about the recommendation to put the Community Plan document on hold and the recommendation to have a facilitated discussion about action plan items. Tom appreciates the work Skip and David are doing and noted that it is important to understand the history so we don't reinvent the wheel. David clarified that the action plan would specify projects on the frontend. Robert pointed out the proposed covenant amendment would cover this issue. Mike added that both the amendment and an action plan specifying goals and objectives. Robert noted that it may be beyond the board's ability to handle this size of a project. He recommended hiring a consultant.

Tom clarified that Skip and David have asked to defer rewriting the community plan. The second decision is whether to conduct a facilitated discussion to develop an action plan (5, 10, 15 year plan). The third is to survey the membership on goals for SPOA. The fourth is to continue a relationship with the county. By consensus, the request to defer changes to the community plan was accepted. Tom recommended planning to conduct a facilitated discussion during the next quarterly meeting. Tom also recommended sending out a survey to board members before the meeting in an effort to make the meeting efficient. With respect to a survey, Tom would like a proposal for a sending out a survey to the membership. David spoke to the fact that a professional survey developer might be required. Tom recommended doing a test on a subdivision to test response and the design of questions. Ann reported that Omega Way is the only subdivision that has all the e-mail addresses for a program like Survey monkey. Tonja thought it would also be interesting to know why people do not purchase property/homes in Stagecoach. There is time between now and January.

Project Manager – Robert noted that framing for the Project Manager position was not discussed. Robert would like specifics so SPOA has clear expectations. Skip asked that Ken send out an e-mail with a list of duties. Robert also asked that there be a process of posting a position with a list of duties to the membership. Robert asked that the duties and expectations be clear and written down. Tom and Robert discussed the details of this new position. Tom made a suggestion that since Corky has already assumed many of the responsibilities, that he continue in that capacity during the approved transition year. Then by spring, there could be an official structure proposed, a job description and an official positing and job search or a management company search conducted. Mike suggested that both Ken and Cory develop a metric on what is being done. Tom asked David and Robert and whoever else has an interest assume responsibility for this. Robert may be stretched too thin at this point. Tom recommended putting this on the January agenda. Ken commented that SPOA would be surprised to see what full blown management will cost and that he has been “plugging the hole in the dam.” Ken asked that the board remember that SPOA represents a community not special interests. Theresa said that her big question is “who is SPOA and what are they doing for me?” It is important to participate.

Next Board Meeting – Tom suggested January 12, 2013, for the next SPOA board meeting.

MOTION: Tom made a motion to approve a \$300 fee for clerk services for today's meeting. Skip seconded and the motion passed.

MOTION: Robert moved to adjourn the meeting. Skip seconded. Tom adjourned the meeting at 5:24 p.m.