

Call to Order 7:25pm

Total members voting in person or by proxy 89. Total number of members required to meet the threshold 89. Duly called meeting requirements met.

Two thirds threshold for a proposal to pass- 59.

Proposal #1: replacement of entrance signs

The proposal failed with 49 Votes in favor and 40 Votes against.

Comments from members:

- Why do we need signs when everyone knows where they live.
- Suggestion to replace rotting posts and keep the look we currently have.
- Will all signs be removed as the signs at Jette 3 are a safety hazard as you can't see who's coming either way. If they are replaced, can they be moved to another location near the entrance so they don't obstruct the view?
Response- reiterated plan to only place one, double-sided sign on the northbound side of each road.
- What was done with the damaged signs at Jette 2?
Response- they were taken down as the posts were rotting and the signs couldn't be used again due to damage.
- Was the association reimbursed by the parties who damaged the signs at Jette 2?
Response- the board didn't think it was sensible to pursue reimbursement to replace rotting posts.
- If the fire mitigation proposal passes, we can have a contractor save trees to cut new posts.

Proposal #2: Fire Mitigation grant

The proposal passed with 60 In favor and 29 Against

Comments from members:

- Why are we asking for a special assessment and why isn't the annual assessment covering the costs?
Response- there are multiple proposals before the membership. If there are sufficient funds we can reduce the assessment.
- Does the HOA have enough funds to cover the cost of the grant up front until everyone pays their special assessment?
Response- yes, there would be sufficient funds to cover the costs.
- Does the grant require the money upfront?

Response- the fire mitigation coordinator has not provided that information.

- The HOA could sell the lumber since the tariffs on imported lumber are so high, if not we could split and sell as firewood.

Response- no lumber mills will take the pine, and it is very difficult to even give the pine wood away for firewood. There aren't enough volunteers to attempt to do the work ourselves on the same scale as the grant.

- Why haven't the common areas been maintained before and how will they be maintained in the future?

Response- there have been some attempts to remove dead trees in the common area, but it was done by volunteers. The membership doesn't have the knowledge and skill, nor support, to tackle the scope of work that can be addressed through the cost sharing grant. Attempting to handle the scale of work needed on our own would be cost prohibitive.

- A lot owner describe the expense she's incurred managing trees on her own lot and believes the cost sharing is much more affordable. She thanked the board for doing the leg work behind the grant.
- A Lot owner asked what area would be getting the work done and how many acres the HOA has.

Response- the Board believes it would be best to have Mrs. Cooley assess the common area and recommend what area(s) would make the most impact under the grant.

- The method of determining the special assessment amount was explained and also referenced in the Special Assessment meeting notice.
- A member inquired if independent contractors had been contacted to determine if they would give a better price than \$2500 per acre.

Response- the amount is just a rough estimate given by a licensed professional who currently works with the county on these types of projects. The cost per acre would be determined by the density of material needing removal. If the grant is awarded a list of contractors will be available for the Association to seek a bid from.

Proposal #3- Chip seal of .22 miles on Great Pine Hill Road

The proposal Failed with 19 In favor and 69 Against (one ballot did not vote for this item)

Comments from members:

- A written statement from Pauline and Ron Baran was read aloud.
- The questions/comments were opened with a Lot owner accusing the Board president of being a liar and a poor money manager. Another member challenged the comments as a matter of decorum.
- A member asked if an engineer has assessed the road and given an opinion.

Response- there hasn't been an engineer's assessment, and the Board believes that would be a necessary step.

- Mr. Lemm stated that his offer to provide a personal, no interest loan for the project was off the table.

- A member asked how many lots were on GPH.

Response- four. Three with homes and one in process of development.

- A member asked why this was a special assessment and isn't covered by the annual assessment.

Response- this is considered a capital improvement project and requires a member vote. The assessment amount could be offset if reserves are available.

- Mr. Lemm commented that road maintenance done in 2023 reduced the width of the road and made the ditches too deep.
- Board president stated that discussion of the project is a moot point as the interest free loan had been rescinded.

Response- Mr. Lemm stated the offer was back on the table.

- Comment made that research needs to be done to see if chip seal is a viable option and would hold up over time, and who is responsible for the maintenance costs if completed.

Response- there has not been an engineer hired to assess the road base or viability. The bid from Treasure State highlighted this point. The association would be responsible for maintenance of that road under the current covenants regarding road maintenance.

- A member asked about the lawyer fees and how it's going to be resolved.

Response- the Board received a demand letter from an attorney representing the Lemms and voted to seek legal counsel to address the issue.

Meeting adjourned 9:17 pm

Note: Teri Bolan approached the Board and offered to audit the results of the votes.

Arrangements were made to meet with Teri on March 18, 2025 at the Lake County Library to audit the count. The final audited count is

Proposal 1: In Favor 49 Against 40

Proposal 2: In Favor 60 Against 29

Proposal 3: In Favor 19 Against 69

Teri volunteered to work on the nomination committee. Sean volunteered to act as the Board member of the committee.