Phone Conference

The executive meeting minutes are subject to review and approval by the board of directors (BOD) at the next meeting.

The executive BOD meeting of the RCC Townhome Association (RCCTH) was held via phone conference due to the COVID-19 guidelines of limited physical contact. The meeting was called to order at 2:13 pm by President Dave Preller (DP;) board members present were as follows: Ronald Urhammer (RU,) Treasurer; Gretchen Trebnick (GT,) Member-at-Large; Nadine Sands (NS,) Vice President; Karen Mackesey (KM,) Secretary. Miranda James (MJ,) Cities Management, was present.

The following agenda items were addressed:

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes

DP requested approval of the March 16, 2020, monthly BOD meeting minutes. No changes were noted. NS motioned to approve minutes; RU seconded motion. All were in favor of accepting minutes as submitted.

The March 27, 2020, executive board meeting was submitted by DP. No additions or corrections were required. NS motioned to approve minutes; GT seconded motion. All were in favor of accepting minutes as submitted.

2. <u>Homeowner's Input</u>

Due to the COVID-19 restrictions, the meeting was closed to members. Thus, there were no in-person input or issues.

3. President's Report

DP reviewed the DWC tree 'entrance' plan. Plan A, where the trees are near the WCD boulevard at the DWC entrance, will not work as originally planned due to multiple interferences of gas lines, water pipes, electrical and cable lines, etc.

Plan B was reviewed which was to place the trees away from the obstacles and have approximately six feet of distance from the sidewalk. However, the HOA would then be responsible for future damage issues of city sidewalks due to tree roots. This, too, was not viable.

With the assistance of Eric from Willow River (WR,) Plan C will stake out where the trees would be an acceptable fit. The current plan is for:

# of Trees	Approx. Location (Unit #)
2	147
4	37
3-4	45/47
1	39
2	55
2	53

NS noted the need to be careful not to obstruct or prevent future blind spots for drivers. DP mentioned that the owners of these units will be notified of the plans for additional trees.

Phone Conference

DP spoke on the current 'Brick Policy' and how it relates to the upcoming 'tuck point' task. GT added that she and Larry Williamson (LW) would be reviewing the Association's units for necessary repairs as it related to this topic as well as verifying additional needs for tuck pointing.

The background, as DP pointed out, involved all units being grandfathered in 2010 with respect to the attached items on the brick. Nothing was to be added after that unless it was given permission through an Architectural Request, which is still a requirement.

The current BOD, again, grandfathered everyone in during 2019 with the exception the item would be removed if it was causing/creating damage to the brick/mortar. Secondly, the BOD noted when a homeowner moved, all items were to be removed. The tuck-point project would be repairing these areas at this time and only at this time. After this project is complete, it will be done at the cost of the homeowner to properly repair the areas.

4. <u>Treasurer's Report</u>

RU reported out that the CM financial contact person, Percy, is no longer with the company. His new contact person is Marie. He has asked her to send him quarterly statements showing our two CDs; she is currently having technical issues.

He noted the Pechacek roof bill (from 2019) showed up again on the financials. MJ will look into the issue as Percy was to have removed it from the 2020 statements.

A similar issue showed with a Squeegee Squad (SS) invoice which is for services rendered in 2019. This bill, per MJ, cannot be assigned to 2019 until it is approved. To ensure this action, the BOD discussed approving the vendor invoice. DP mentioned that SS needs to address a residual brown liquid found on his windows (and potentially others) and clean up would be necessary. KM motioned to pay the SS bill once they addressed the potential issue; GT seconded the motion. Motion carried and approved. Once completed, the expense will be appropriately noted in 2019.

Further, MJ is researching the \$100,000 which Percy was supposed to reapply to the reserve fund account. At a designated time, MJ and RU will work through numbers after the meeting. DP requested Marie, at CM, make time available to work with RU to further explain the noted financial transactions and reasons.

GT questioned where unit 263's water pipe break was being assigned. This unforeseen expense was unexpected and not budgeted. The BOD did not make a decision as to whether it would be taken against Operating Expenses or the Reserve Account.

MJ noted the invoice for attorney fees associated with the rental committee project. The bill was for \$2,152.50. DP asked for a motion to approve the bill; GT motioned to accept and pay the invoice; NS seconded the motion; all were in favor.

RU noted he was not ready to submit and ask for an approval of this month's financials until he and MJ reviewed the numbers and corresponding transactions as it relates to the statements. After items have

Phone Conference

been reviewed in the portal and discrepancies reviewed, he will submit to have the financials approved which will be at a later meeting.

5. Committee Reports

The rental committee submitted their information. It is estimated they will have another invoice in the future of approximately \$2,000 for additional work to finalize items originating from the 'Rental Policy.' Bob Stabell (BS) will check with the attorneys on adding a hardship clause to the proposed change. The hardship clause was in coordination with the article GT relayed to the BOD and rental committee on potential and unforeseen concerns regarding a 'no rental' policy. DP will follow up with BS to ensure the attorney is aware of concerns. Passing this change before 2021 requires a 90 percent favorable vote rather than a 75 percent vote post date.

6. Manager's Report

MJ reviewed the information in the manager's report. She stressed the need to finalize upcoming 2020 projects such as gutter cleaning, sealcoating, the asphalt project, landscaping needs, etc.

MJ will be communicating with RU regarding the financials so that they can be reviewed again at the next meeting. Further, she noted different items that could be added to an upcoming newsletter.

7. Old Business

<u>Mulch and Shrub proposals</u> – In order to approve either Meadowlark Landscaping (ML) or Willow River Landscaping (WR) bids for mulch and shrubs, MJ will reach out to ML to revise the shrub list to the specifics provided by the Landscaping Committee (which will be identical to WR.) The BOD will make a decision at the next meeting. Currently, ML bid \$9,241.80 and WR bid \$9,709.29 for mulching 1/3 of the units (with a slight volume difference of mulch needed: 85 vs 99 cubic yards, respectively.)

The plant and shrub bid from both companies is above and beyond this amount. It has approximately 130 shrubs/bushes being removed and 100 being installing.

<u>Gutter Cleaning</u> – NS obtained three additional bids for gutter cleaning. Thus far, we have the original bid from Cities Management Maintenance for \$5,980, Stayglassy for \$1,400, Squeegee Squad for \$4,480 and RC Seamless Gutters for \$8,900. NS stated the bids have a wide range regarding pricing. The BOD discussed if we are getting additional value for the additional pricing; do we have gutter issues; are the vendors removing debris; where are the majority of issues when there is a gutter problem (eaves, downspouts, etc.;) is it value add to have the vendor use blowers. The BOD is placing this project approval on hold until additional investigation is conducted to where the problems lie as well as documentation to substantiate a more robust cleaning system.

<u>Seal Coating/Asphalt Project</u> – Per GT, at the time of the meeting, we have not yet received a bid from FPI Asphalt, Ron Burch (RB,) for the driveway/lanes as it pertains to the large asphalt project. She reiterated that he would not recommend an overlay as was previously discussed amongst the BOD.

<u>Firepit Policy</u> – MJ reported the insurance company was aware of the approved 'Firepit Policy' and noted it in their files. Some homeowners were concerned with allowing the policy. However, the BOD made clear the policy prohibited permanent, in ground pits, and prohibited wood, paper, cardboard material. Safe practices, just as with the grills, are a must: away from the buildings, not under the soffits, caution

Phone Conference

with use, etc. MJ said the BOD should send out the policy with a published newsletter. DP remarked the policy will now be removed from the old business agenda.

8. New Business

<u>Fence Policy</u> – GT suggested amending the 'Fence Policy' to reflect the approved company, Elite Fence Products, but to remove the 'approved' installer. Discussion merged the need to keep the current specifications, adherence to the city policy and it notes it is the homeowner's responsibility to maintain (for example the painting) the fence. Further, the 'new standard' states no brick columns with the installation of the fence.

As with the patio, it is the responsibility of the homeowners to maintain the fence (for example painting.) It was suggested that during one of the 'Architectural Review Walkarounds' fences be examined for adherence. If painting or repair is needed, the owner would be sent a notice.

Maintenance Responsibility Chart — The RCCTA Maintenance/Repair/Replacement Responsibility List can be found on the CM website. The BOD discussed the division of where different scenarios of HOA versus homeowner responsibility rested. It was agreed soffit cleaning is a homeowner responsibility. If the owner is unable to clean the soffits, an outside vendor, at the expense of the homeowner should be utilized. Cleaning is not a 'maintenance' category but a general housekeeping and upkeep responsibility. Again, this is similar to the patio cleaning and brick cleaning. MJ was to update the policy to confirm the demarcation of responsibilities.

<u>Maintenance Request Management</u> – MJ requested the BOD ensure the maintenance requests are closed in a timely manner. The BOD agreed. In order to do this, the BOD decided to each take on individual requests and send information back to the others. This would potentially mean going to the different owners to discuss and take pictures of their issues. MJ can send a note to the requestors when a BOD member will need to investigate further. This will prevent unexpected visits and will allow the BOD to gather pertinent information.

The next meeting will be 1 pm., May 5, 2020. This will be an Executive meeting anticipating decisions on mulch and shrubs, brick repair (tuck pointing) and a vote to approve this month's financials. Further, seal coating and the asphalt project will be discussed. At this time, it will be a tele-meeting. GT is to set up the meeting details.

RU made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 4:01 pm. NS seconded the motion. All approved. DP adjourned the meeting.

Respectively submitted,

Karen M. Mackesey Red Cedar Canyon Townhomes Association, Secretary