

Sierra Los Pinos Property Owners' Association
Board of Directors Meeting
October 12, 2021 at 6:34 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by the President with a quorum: Paul Lisko, Keith Rigney, Jeremy Oepping, David Stuedell, Josh Toennis, Cindy Hines and John Hines

Absent: Ann Cooke, Paul Rightley

Guests: Mary Moore, Kristi Cross, Jonathan Morris, Barbara Van Ruyckevelt and Suzanne Star.

Approval of Agenda. There were two additional items added. Firewise: Notification of Prescribed Burn. Reports for Firewise by Ann Cooke. Jeremy moved to approve agenda; seconded by Cindy. There being no opposition, the motion carried.

Approval of August 10th Minutes drafted and submitted by Paul Lisko: Keith moved the minutes be accepted; seconded by David. Motion carried and minutes were accepted.

Paul announced that he had prepared and submitted the draft minutes from Annual Meeting and if any board member had corrections to submit them by October 26. These will be submitted at next annual meeting and approved by non-board members.

Approval of September 14 minutes drafted and submitted by Keith: Cindy moved minutes be accepted; Josh seconded the motion, Motion carried and minutes were accepted.

OFFICER REPORTS:

PRESIDENT:

1. Paul Lisko reported he had sent an email to District Ranger Brian Riley on 9/14, in support of the extension for LANET. The result was LANET received a two-month extension until the end of November before they have to get the gear tower and solar panels off the forest.
2. Submitted questions to Alan Saenz that Scott Turner wanted asked regarding his plans. It took a while for Alan to answer as completely as he could. Scott was cc'd on Alan's response. The last two questions had to do with SLP specifically to clarify membership thoughts and comments regarding the proposal and input from the Architectural Control Committee.

3. The membership was in favor of LANET setting up their operation. I copied and pasted the email Josh sent me of his interpretation of the CC&Rs and that a communication tower does not need to be placed on a commercially-zoned lot. Those were sent to the attorney and Scott, and I'm going to save a reply until a little bit later.
4. Notified on October 1 of potential hazard tree leaning over roadway near Aspen Well by a gentleman who lived in the area. Responded that trees, as long as they have a good root base, it will take a long time for them to fall over unless there is a wind storm or impact from a vehicle. We'll take a closer look when NV5 has the contractor put in the comingling line from Aspen Well.
5. Followed up with Casey Spradley at the Cuba Soil and Water Conservation District on landowner thinning grants on October 1st. She informed me that she had just received the letter to proceed. She had not gotten the funds yet, but stated that it's going to be on a first come/first serve basis. She is waiting to send out the application forms. As soon as I get those, I will forward them to the Board. If you know someone interested, have them fill out the forms as soon as possible. The cost sharing has to be one acre minimally and it's an 80/20 split. Casey is going to open a separate account for the 20 percent from the landowners and she'll pay the contractors from that.

Paul spoke with her about the possibility of individuals being trained to learn how to do the prescriptions for thinning projects. He had already spoken with Lawrence Crane and Todd Haines, but she recommended not talking to those individuals but allowing her to follow through. Correction... She got the grant contract from New Mexico State Forestry on September 30th but she has not yet received the order to proceed

6. Paul advised that he had prepared a draft letter announcing the November 6th meeting to discuss the water situation and asked if anyone wished to comment before it was sent out.

SUZANNE: Since no one on the Board has any comments, could the President summarize what the content of the letter is for those persons not on the board attending this meeting.

Paul summarized what was in the letter (attached) and indicated took that last quote from a ten-year-old SLPOA water system upgrade document, which I thought would underscore how this issue is still being avoided and how urgently it needs addressed.

SUZANNE: How many people in this Association know we even have a water problem at all? If you're going to go ahead and have a meeting – I know that the intent is there as far as let's get people involved and let's let people know what's going on. This is the first letter going out to tell people that we're either going to do water billing or water infrastructure updates or whatever. What facts, what statistics, and what kind of education have you given anybody out there? Eighty-five percent of our membership probably has no clue what's going on. They are just going to show up and listen to this? Is that the intent of this?

PAUL: this is where the education is going to take place. We are going to have all these people, with all this knowledge and expertise in one place. The letter is going to be sent out well in advance. People can attend in person or by Zoom and he's looking into the possibility of filming it with a filmmaker and then it would be available for people who don't attend.

SUZANNE: So you would just expect this meeting is going to be the education process and everybody is going to jump on it and say yes we know everything that is going on. I can't quite understand that, Paul. I understand that you want to have a meeting, I understand what you're trying to do is bring the agencies in and all these people, but they don't know anything about our water system, they know about other people's water systems. We don't even know about our own problems because there hasn't been any education out there. I haven't seen anything in the newsletters, anything in the minutes, even discussion in the Board meeting minutes that even talk about most of our water problems. I don't know how many people know we've got water problems. I don't even know how they could because it hasn't been established. However, that being said, I'm just going to make this comment as an active member of this Association and that is, I think this meeting is premature. I think you should have gotten some information out to the people of why you are having this meeting, not just one big letter and say yes, we're going to tell you everything you need to know about our water system and how it's failing and what we need to do and water billing and mutual domestic and go on and on and on and think that this meeting is going to sink in to anybody and make a difference when you finally get out for the vote, but that's my opinion and that's what I have to say. Thank you.

Paul stated that the only thing he can respond to that, is that this is an educational process and this is the start. All of these people are

committed to come to Jemez Springs and meet with the people. He referred to a discussion held at a meeting in August when people expressed their opinions of what they wanted to have. It's varying opinions about stuff. He is going to send six or eight pages of those minutes to the experts so they can get a feel for what this community is looking for with respect to water, and then they can form their presentations accordingly to address those issues.

JONATHAN MORRIS: We moved here less than four years ago and, at the time, someone indicated that there were two water systems and one of the water systems was pumping out 100,000 gallons of water a month. It was so crazy to me that I didn't believe them. There was no way that we would ever tolerate leaks of 100,000 gallons of our well water. So I just dismissed that and I haven't really gotten involved in any Board stuff until the last big members meeting a couple of months ago. Again, they brought up, and hopefully more people heard, that we are actually pumping out of System 1 something like 160,000 gallons of leaked water. Four years ago there was this problem and it still hasn't gotten fixed. So any other projects that the Board was interested in doing, kind of immediately fell to, okay, I'm not going to support any of this until we get the priority, which is fixing this System 1 water issue. That's what I've gathered over the last three years through one Board meeting and the letters that have been sent out. So, if you're trying to gauge what people know and don't know, that's the information that I know. I think this meeting is a great idea, as long as your expectations are tempered to it being a starting point, and I think everyone that I have talked to, including myself, is a little leery about anything that turns even a semblance of control of our water system over to someone outside SLPPOA, even if it comes with the potential of getting money from the government for that. Most of us are pretty leery of that and most of us think status quo is the way to go, but maybe we need to focus whatever money we are using to fix a little bit of the problem over the course of several years instead of one big mass thing. Those are the opinions I've formed and hopefully those are helpful to you when trying to gauge how to educate all of us in this meeting or any others that you have.

PAUL: Thanked Suzanne for the comments and he agreed this is a starting point for the Association. He believes mutual domestic is the way to go personally, but definitely is opposed to ever turning control over to someone outside the Association. He is in favor of whatever

the majority of the people here want. When we talk about relinquishing control, we should not ever relinquish control of our water system to anyone. If we can set up either a board for a mutual domestic or a water co-op that will give us access to funds, and those boards can be comprised of people in this community, then he thinks that's a good way to go. If the majority of the folks want to keep it at the status quo, and take out low interest loans or special assessments that we pay off over twenty years, he is good with that. But I think that the options need to be presented and this meeting is the purpose for that.

JEREMY: I would like to add at the beginning of the letter that it is an "EDUCATIONAL MEETING," it's to learn more about what the different options are and those sorts of things, so that you are very clear at the beginning. The other thing I would say is we can talk about this for hours, and we're already a half an hour in today. So, if there is any way we could, you know, continue on, please.

PAUL: Stated he would incorporate those comments and asked if John Hines had a comment.

CINDY: Stated that she agreed with Suzanne, in that she felt the meeting was a little premature also, but suggested that in addition to the letter being sent, wondered if should she prepare something via email with the major bullet points of: We have some issues with our water system, this is how much water we are losing every month on System 1, we need to do something about it. Then end it with we are going to have a meeting, it's an informational meeting, it should be very informative, and we hope that you will come and listen to the options. She would be happy to run that little blurb by the Board quickly before she sends it out and could have it ready in the next few days.

PAUL: I think that sounds like an excellent plan. Any time that we can, provide more communication and education, the better off we're going to be.

CINDY: And then we can follow up in the coming months with a little bit in each newsletter and maybe we can do some shorter, quicker newsletters that can have just a short educational update section.

PAUL: I think that's a good idea. That addresses specifically what Suzanne was talking about

KEITH: I know Jeremy said that we could talk about this forever, but I just wanted to include an informative session of, like, our current

status. I know Suzanne sent a link/website a while ago with pictures and whatever else it might be, but before we start talking to professionals, could we say why we are here is because of blank and maybe that's informative and that would reiterate Cindy's email, as well, and then if people are watching, then they get the full scoop, not just the professionals' info, it's our current situation and beyond. Maybe we have to say it a hundred times to get it to stick to people.

PAUL: So how do you suggest that I do this with that letter?

KEITH: It could be a simple, short message of before professionals begin to speak on their areas, there will be an informative session led by blank. I don't want to throw Harold Corn or John Hines under the bus for them being there and presenting something, but I don't know if we need a little spice to show our current situation. It's just an idea.

PAUL: So are you suggesting the informative session should be on the same day, November 6th and come before any of these other people get up and speak on the same day?

KEITH: I was thinking from 12:00 to 1:30 is food, potluck, whatever. From 1:30 to 1:45 is SLPHOA explaining our current situation and why we have this here. And then 1:45 on is the professionals saying we can fix these exact situations you've talked about by blank, if that makes sense.

Paul agreed and will add those items presented by Jeremy and Keith to the letter before it goes out.

Cindy Hines moved to accept the letter with the two additions and send it to all property owners. Jeremy Oepping seconded the motion. There being no opposition, the motion carried.

7. Paul indicated he had the reply from the attorney regarding the purchase of Lot 3, Unit 6 by LANET and that he and Keith had a little bit of a difference of opinion on this and were going back and forth with Scott Turner about this. Scott considered the idea of the tower being designated as a utility, but to do that, he thought it would be best for the Association to purchase land and then run the utility, which he didn't think any of us wanted to do. The default position was initially what we started out with Harold in making the tower a community utility, with LANET owning the land and operating the tower with a 600-foot cabin being constructed. That way it complies with the CC&Rs for that unit. That's what I passed on to Josh, and that's all I had on that. So, Keith, did you want to pick it up from there?

KEITH: We're kind of being forced here to have them build a 600 square foot dwelling to make it a "residential lot." There's really nothing that we can do about it right now according to Scott. What I proposed is that we kind of run two paths in parallel. One right now being we do exactly what we're doing, having them build the 600 square foot home, lodge, whatever they want to call it, and then in the other path, since we're going to be voting on water here in the next couple of months, we do have the ability as the Board to select Unit 6, Lot 3 as a "utility" is how we put it, Paul, I don't remember. But if we're going to be voting on water in the next year, or two years, or whatever it may be, I would like to put the vote up that this lot can be used as a "utility easement" from here on out. That just protects us regardless if that gets voted through with two-thirds, then technically the residential lot or residence of 600 square feet would not be needed. But we're looking at the fastest path and a path in parallel to save us in the future from any legal issues. I don't know what the Board thinks about that, but I figured we might as well throw it out there and try.

CINDY: Does that mean LANET won't be able to proceed for another year or two until we have this water vote?

KEITH: No. That's why we have two paths in parallel. We have our fast path right now which is submit a plot map, which will provide the architectural control form, indicating where the tower and the building will be. Once they have that sent to Josh, that will get approved, they can buy the lot now, tomorrow, whenever they want, which will then allow them to start construction immediately. The other path in parallel I was talking about with voting is allowing them to have a utility on that lot. It's kind of a gray area, but if it's a utility, if it's going to be a sight for sore eyes, if it's what it's going to be, the community can vote two-thirds vote on passing that lot on being a utility easement, which would then allow LANET to have their tower there regardless. I don't know if I worded that correctly, but the reason why we do that is so if we ever have to go to court for it being ugly or we have to protect on why we allowed this 70-foot tower in this area, we will have that to go back on if two-thirds voted this in. We also have the other path to get internet here ASAP.

CINDY: That makes sense.

PAUL: I wanted to add to what Keith was saying. So, again, the path right now is to maintain compliance with the CC&Rs, which means they build a residence. The thing that I think is good, and I think

everybody is onboard with this, is that it's going to be more important from everybody's perspective to get that tower put in like now. And then the residence, the plans and everything else can come a little bit later, but it has to come in order for it to be in compliance with the CC&Rs, because that's all we have right now. Bottom line is Alan Saenz specified that he was okay putting that cabin in. He was talking about having his family there at certain times for recreational purposes, so it's all good. And then I think the path that Keith is talking about, it's a longer process to get there, especially if we are trying to look for a variance, which is what I think he is talking about. So that's going to be a lot further down the road for us to be able to do that, but the quick way, you know, here's the plot plan for the cabin, here's the plot plan for the tower, and get it all done. Just so that we have all of our ducks in a row, that we have this variant eventually in place. I think that's the long game anyway.

CINDY: That sounds good; let's move along.

VICE PRESIDENT:

1. Keith Rigney reported that he had made three posts in the last month. The first post, September 13th, was saying that it was brought to his attention by one of the local people that Facebook would be a very good avenue to get information out. The second post was right after we wrapped up our annual HOA meeting. The last one was right after our regular Board meeting and he briefly described Paul Lisko and David Stuedell were both voted back on the Board. Other topics consisted of LANET to provide internet to the area, and the Board looking into a MDWCA/Co-Op and it's currently being researched. He indicated that you can go to Sierra Los Pinos Homeowners Chat on Facebook. You will easily be accepted and you can read those for yourself.

PAUL: I think that's sufficient; thank you, Keith. And now, finally, introduction and nomination for our secretary.

2. KEITH: Last month we found out that we don't have a secretary anymore. Kristi Cross, who is actually in this meeting right now, she was there and volunteered to help us at the time, but without putting her on the spot, allowed her some time and since then she has decided to help us and volunteer on the Board as our Secretary. Thank you and please feel free to ask us any questions.

PAUL: What we have to do now is actually vote her in, so motion to accept Kristi Cross as our new secretary, so I will entertain a motion.

Cindy Hines moved that the Board install Kristi Cross as the new secretary. The motion was seconded by Keith (and Jeremy) and with no objection, the motion carried. Welcome aboard, Kristi.

SECRETARY:

Paul indicated that Geraldine had returned all the equipment to him and it was currently housed at the Firehouse. He will make arrangements to meet Kristi to give her the equipment.

Cindy indicated that there were two secretarial issues that had been dealt with: (1) the issue of our webmaster being able to access GoDaddy, and we worked together and have resolved problems with website; (2) The secretary is responsible for sending out a welcome packet to all new property owners and she and the others will help Kristi with what is involved in doing this. The list is current at the moment and only two new property owners will need to be provided with the information.

Paul had two issues involving secretarial matters. He again stated that he will get the available equipment to Kristi as soon as possible. The second involved missing posts which were brought to his attention by Suzanne. This included the minutes from July and August, but we couldn't post the ones from August; they were just approved tonight, as well as half a dozen missing financial statements which are now up-to-date. Suzanne, do you have any further input about those missing posts?

SUZANNE: No, everything is fine; thank you.

TREASURER:

Jeremy Oepping reported:

1. The balance in accounts as of September 30, 2021 is as follows:
 - Operating Account: \$134,295.52
 - Reserve Account: \$125,985.22

As of September 30, we have 11 delinquent accounts totaling \$12,774.79 (increase of \$18.25 from last month). The interest charges caught up with some folks who were not paying.

2. The September amount of \$666.67 was transferred to Reserves during the month.
3. There were two changes in property ownership:
 - Ryan and Jamie Rittenger, 41 Hovenweep Loop and
 - Konstantin Borozdin at 11 Lauer Lane.

4. One other item that I've got is I did make an executive decision to pay December 2018 tax bill for water conservation fees. This is something that I mentioned a number of months ago. I've actually been working with the State now for about four months. What had actually happened, what we've decided has happened and show that had happened was back in January of 2019, that December payment was sent to the New Mexico taxation and revenue, but it was sent to the wrong department. It did not go to the Water Conservation Fee Department, it actually went to the Unclaimed Property Department and they are having a challenge getting it moved between departments at the State and I received a nastygram at the end of August that they were basically going to send us to collections. So I paid it again and I will be working on getting a refund on that. The total amount was \$222.79. Instead of having that go to collections and having Sierra Los Pinos get drug through the mud with that, I just paid it again and will now work with those departments to get us a refund.
5. The only other item I've got is the proposed budget for 2022. I had sent a note to the Board on Sunday, September 19th with all of the updates and information that had been provided in the last meeting. I just need any questions or comments on that and whether or not that will be good for us to move forward. That's what I have now; thank you.

PAUL: Suzanne, you wanted to address something about the Board budgeting 53,000 for roads and 7,000 for water?

SUZANNE: No, that wasn't the question, but maybe you'll get that answered a little bit later or maybe not. My question was is that I think we had somewhere about \$30,000 in the budget last year for water and we spent \$7,000, but we had a \$53,000 expense for roads and my only question was are we going to, this year, put forth more effort in getting more monies put forward towards our water issues and make it more of a priority. And, what I did ask, I guess also through an email is that, I was kind of hoping tonight I might hear a little bit about the goals of the Board, other than just, well, we're going to have this budget and here's the money and we have no – we're just going to spend the money as we need it, but we have no goals, no focus, no nothing. So I was just interested to know a

little bit more about what was going to happen in the future and what your plan for funding our water system improvements might be this year.

PAUL: Okay, thank you. I think that Jeremy – this was brought up a couple of meetings ago about having a financial plan. I looked at his – the attachments that he gave where he talked about that proposed budget that he sent out September 19th. I thought that he did a pretty good overview of the budget up to and including 2022. And we have those different – he had the one about staying at the status quo and not raising the annual assessment and then he also put out one which would include the 10% increase.

I think the concern that I read in the budget and I think it was kind of really a one-off on the money that was spent for legal consultation this year was extremely high, but we had some issues that really needed to be addressed. Specifically what to do with those lots owned by Jemez Mountain Development at the top of Unit 6 and so, you know, we really had to get some clarification from the attorney on how to proceed with that. It was kind of dropped on us. That was something that Bootzin had actually – he made some side deal with whomever the person was that was buying that, that they wouldn't be a part of the Association, but the lots were actually a part of Sierra Los Pinos Subdivision, but they weren't part of the Association, so we had to get that cleared up. So I think that we're probably going to get back down to normal considering that, plus what had to be spent with respect to figuring out LANET's role and what we were going to do there. So, I think those were big issues that I think we've finally got squared away.

So the only other thing that I saw, Jeremy, from your email of the 19th of September was if we could use NV5's assessment of our water system as a quasi "reserve study" for a couple of years since the water system and roads are our largest common property. I think we can do that. I think what we have to do first though; they're sending out to bid that contract for putting in the co-mingling line from the Aspen Grove well. And I think that once we have that come back in from whoever is going to bid on it, then I think we'll have a better idea of what the going rate is per foot on replacing water lines. So that's just my two-cents worth and what I've seen in the

comparison between the budget now and what he had broken out for the budget for 2022, I think it would be in our best interest to raise it by that 10% and then just even it out, like not sending it out as dollars and cents, but just a flat dollar amount as suggested by Ann Cooke. I don't know if we're making a decision on that tonight. Jeremy, are we?

JEREMY: We need to final no later than the next meeting because it needs to be communicated with the membership 30 days out from when they will actually get their annual increase. Suzanne makes a great point, you know, around what are the plans and so forth. I mean, part of that is, from a water perspective, is to work through with NV5 and we're just not going to have that information. So, where we stand today, based on the previous conversations is that for 2022 we will do a 9.95% increase in dues that gets us to \$996 even per lot. So that is part of the conversation we had. That additional, roughly \$15,000 is really being added to roads, water and snow removal, is really where the bulk of those particular items go. The idea is instead of doing a reserve study next year and paying the \$5,000 to get that done, we will actually use what NV5 provides so that we can focus on water, which we've heard over and over is where our focus needs to be. So again, we don't necessarily need to finalize it today, but we will have to do it at the next meeting at the latest so that we can turn around and get it shared. Again, if there is no other changes, I guess, I'm not sure why we couldn't finalize it today.

PAUL: So I guess what it comes down to is does anybody have an opposition to us raising the annual assessment by 9.95%? Is anyone opposed to that? I don't hear that anyone is opposed so in that case we'll entertain a motion to raise the annual assessment rate by 9.95%, which then raises it to \$996 per lot. I'll entertain a motion.

Cindy made a motion to approve the budget and approve the increase of the annual assessment to \$996 per lot. David seconded the motion. There being no opposition, the motion carried.

DAVID: This is just an observation and maybe I'm off base but it seems like we are going to the lawyer too often. In other words, it's easy to say

let's just go to the lawyer and lawyers are expensive. It's just something to keep in mind. That's just an observation, that's all I'm saying.

PAUL: And I agree, I think I addressed that. I think this was kind of an odd year for us with respect to going to the attorney, because there were a lot of situations that came up that we were kind of lost with it, so we had to go there, but I agree with you that we shouldn't just automatically turn to him. We had to, to get some clarification on where we wanted to go, but I don't think we need to do that as often as we did this year, that's for sure.

SUZANNE: I just wanted to ask one thing here. You're going to go ahead on this meeting and maybe have an educational process for the membership and get some information out. You might think about going ahead and using some of this monies that you think we've had in the past of proposals of system improvements added to that educational information because the amount that you're talking about is more than a million dollars – couple million dollars – If someone comes to the meeting like myself and would say, well, wait a minute, you spent \$53,000 on roads last year but you only spent 7,000 on water, I don't see the problem. Seven thousand dollars is a drop in the bucket, so, what are you talking about money-wise, the one million, two million, three million dollars that we've had from various engineers in the past may help drive the point home for your education, during your meeting or before the meeting.

PAUL: I think Suzanne that that documentation that you sent me, all that stuff I thought was very important and I think that's going to be something else that we could email out or part of that educational process, that communication that Cindy had mentioned, I think that we can do that. I agree, but I thought it was kind of important that it be kept in the spotlight and we don't lose track of it because, like you said, after about three or four years, nobody was interested and it just went back to situation normal and we can't let that happen. The thing that I'm afraid of and I don't want this happening, is where we have a catastrophic failure and then we're kind of standing around trying to figure out what the hell to do about it. I want to keep moving ahead on this and I agree with you. I think that could be something that we could communicate to the membership, especially those who are unfamiliar with it. But, yeah, there was an engineering group that

came in and figured that it was going to cost over a million dollars to do this. So we're trying to get a start on this with the co-mingling line, but yeah, we've got to get to the point where we're replacing System 1 because it's just failing. But we're kind of getting off track here, but thank you for that.

HOT TOPICS:

PAUL: Jeremy I'm going to let you lead the charge on this. And you and I kind of went back and forth on this but we basically agree with that road agreement that Keith helped get drafted from the attorney. So why don't you go ahead and give your perspective on it and then I'll put in my two cents' worth.

JEREMY: All right. This is in relation to the lot that is currently under Jemez Mountain Development, LLC that is being sold to LANET up on the hill there. We need to be able to bill accordingly for the road maintenance, through the road maintenance agreement that has been structured and put together. I think that what we've agreed to is that we're not going to go after any past dues for Jemez Mountain Development, LLC. Again, there is a precedence set for the last several decades that they have not paid dues as part of the Association. We have agreed that we are not going to go back to Jemez Mountain Development for any future dues. We're going to leave that long-standing precedence to hold there. And what we've all agreed to is that yes, we are going to have future dues for the new lot owners as those lots are sold. The new lots owners will have dues and those dues will fall under what Keith and Scott have put together from a road maintenance agreement. I believe the outstanding issue there is, there is a – under Article 2, letter B the owner shall be responsible for payment of all assessments associated with the property arising after November 1st, 2020, of which, I would contend we're doing no past dues, no future dues for Jemez Mountain, thus that amount is zero dollars. Basically, the new owner is going to have a prorated fee to get us back to assessment time at the beginning of the year and then they will have their assessment going forward based on the road maintenance agreement. Thank you.

PAUL: So what I wanted to put in with that is that the contract, the road agreement contract, has already been drafted. In that contract, Scott Turner has placed in there about assessing those dues from November 2020 to whenever LANET purchases the property. The way I figure it, it's going to be under \$500 if that stands and the reason why is for whatever reason, Jemez Mountain Development decided to join the Association after not being a part of it. After 40 years, hey decided to join the Association in 2020 and actually became members of the Association. So that falls under the category in the by-laws that they're responsible for paying those annual assessments. Now, in this particular case, it's not going to – we're not going to count water, because they are not getting water from us. So it's really going to just go back to that road agreement. My feeling about that is, is that I don't want to try and delay this any more than it's already been delayed. I certainly don't want to go back to the attorney and have him rewrite that. If Jemez Mountain Development is recognized as a member of the Association, in order to make this all work, they're going to have to withdraw that status, which could take time as well. All of this is going to delay the sale of this property to LANET, which I don't want to see happen. I think we need to move forward with it. So, basically, my feeling is that Jemez Mountain Development basically shot themselves in the foot, for whatever reason, by joining the Association and actually kicking in that requirement in the bylaws that they have to be responsible for paying the dues, in this particular case, from November 2020 until LANET takes control of that property. Like I say, if you figure out what that assessment is, less water, it's going to come out to about 500 bucks. So to me, I think we keep the contract as is, that Jemez Mountain pay that 500 bucks, that we tell them from now on they should withdraw from being a part of the Association and go back to like they were. They basically crossed that line and because they crossed that line, they're going to make I don't know how many thousands of dollars off of LANET anyways, so it's another 500 bucks. If we go back and have the attorney rewrite that, it's going to cost us at least that much. So I say we go with the contract as Scott Turner wrote it, charge them the 500 -- go through Ron Brown who's selling it and tack on that 500 bucks and we just keep moving forward. I don't want to delay this based on this situation.

JEREMY: Paul, I agree, I don't want to delay it either and we should not rewrite the contract. I would contend though that the amount of the past assessment is zero, because we have not billed them anything for any of those lots for decades. And so, if you read that line that says, you know, the owner shall be responsible for payment back to 2020, well, that payment is zero dollars and zero cents. So done, easy, let's move on.

CINDY: I agree.

PAUL: Okay, yeah, if that's the way it works, but I don't see it working that way, but, yeah, if it does, that's great. I mean, yeah, let's move ahead. I think it's still going to come back to them. I think it will, but you know, maybe you're right. Maybe it'll just – maybe it won't matter. So, okay.

KEITH: I agree with Jeremy and I feel like if we have to, we could probably take a vote to make that happen, because I do read that as well, identical to Jeremy, in the report.

PAUL: Okay, well then it's just a matter of passing that road agreement on to Ron Brown and have him pass it on to Alan at LANET. Let's just go for it.

KEITH: Can I get approval from the Board to pass that document forward to Ron Brown? Do I have to make a motion for that?

PAUL: Well, you're seeking a motion for that, so does somebody so move Keith's motion?

Cindy moved to proceed with getting the road maintenance agreement to Ron Brown.

PAUL: As is?

CINDY: As is.

Josh seconded the motion, and with no opposition, the motion carries.

PAUL: Go ahead, Keith, and send that on to Ron Brown and please cc me when you do.

KEITH: You'll see an email shortly.

PAUL: Okay, that settles that. Now we get our standing committee reports.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Water:

1. JOHN HINES: As far as the systems running independently again, everything seems to be running well. We did have a pipe burst in the Aspen Grove well house. Fortunately I check them every Monday. Tuesday, I had to go there and found it, so it didn't leak a lot of water. It was a small leak, but it did spray inside the building. I had that repaired. I assisted one customer in leak detection. I'm still waiting to hear from the State on when I can take my test. Everything has been submitted. They did waive my requirement to work with an operator due to my experience. Scott Christenson came and did our semi-annual well measurements again on our wells to see where the aquifers were and everything came out well, except for the Aspen Grove well was showing a little more usage, which was understandable considering there was water spraying. Since that's been fixed, I'm sure it's okay. I met with the NV5 Engineers and we did a walk-through on the co-mingle line in preparation for sending out the RFPs on construction and we're hoping to get that done still this fall. I am attending a webinar on water efficiency and meter testing and AWW meter audits for all of our water meters; that will be in November. Also, I have scheduled with a company called Mountain Pacific Meters, who are going to be here in the first week of November to do testing on our three well meters to see that they are reading properly and are calibrated correctly.
2. As far as the systems go: System 1 pumped 560,892 gallons. We used 257,000, which means we lost about 50,000 gallons this last month on System 1 with the main leakage rate of 54%. We actually lost 303,000 gallons. There were nine leaks flags identified on System 1; they were all repeats. There were eight users over 7,000 gallons, six of those were ones with leak flags.

System 2, the well pumped 152,220 gallons. Usage was 152,000 gallons. Average household use was 79 gallons, with our main leakage rate being .99 percent. We lost 165 gallons that were unaccounted for. There were two leak flags identified on System 2; they were both repeats. We had four over 7,000 gallons with one of those being on a leak flag.

3. As far as compliance goes:

System 1

- Total Coliform – Absent
- Total E. Coli – Absent
- Disinfection Residual 0.07 mg/l

System 2

- Total Coliform – Absent
- Total E. Coli – Absent
- Disinfection Residual 0.10 mg/l

Roads:

DAVID STUDELL: I have two items. I would like to place an order for red cinders, like we did last year. That came to a total of \$1524.00. So I would like to get approval to basically order those cinders and get those put at the firehouse. Do I make a motion to approve anything or do we just say okay?

PAUL: Entertain a motion for David to purchase the cinders for the winter roads, approximately \$1500 to spend. Cindy made a motion to approve the purchase of cinders for winter for the roads in the approximate amount of \$1500. Keith Rigney seconded the motion. With no opposition, the motion carried. Go for it, David.

DAVID: Now the big item, I sent it out to the board and that was the snow plowing contract for this year.

PAUL: Before we get into that, there is one smaller item. What is the status of the repair of the sanding equipment?

DAVID: Davie Raue put the parts in the sander and the manual in the sander and Jonathan, our new plowing guy, has picked up the manual and is looking at that. So the unit is not currently working, there is some issue with one of the sander units, but that is being worked. This new – His name is Jonathan Morris, he really seems to be a class act. He put together a wonderful contract. In past years, Dave Raue basically supplied us with an invoice and Paul mentioned that we should have a number of other items added to the contract and he was more than happy to add those items to the contract, along with many others I asked him to add. The one question that I had, that Paul asked us to add and he did add it, but it cost us an extra \$400 or \$450 dollars and you can open that contract up, I sent it to the board members, so anybody on this can see it or I can show it. Paul asked us to add a surety bond; so, you now, there's insurance and insurance covers accidents, you know, liability, that kind of stuff. Bonding is a surety thing where you basically get a bond that the person is going to perform the work. It's not an insurance policy, it's a bond. So the question is, do we really want Jonathan to be bonded and if we do, that's fine. That costs us \$450. I personally wouldn't add it, but Paul asked us to add it – or he asked us to look into it and it's in the current contract. So I'm going to open that up to the Board.

JEREMY: I looked at the information. Everything looks good on the surface. I was just double-checking our Vendor Application Packet that goes through our management company HOAMCO. They require a Certificate of Liability Insurance with a limit of at least a million dollars per occurrence and two million general aggregate, with both the Association and HOAMCO as additional insured. They need to have proof of Workmen's Compensation as required by local and state statutes, copy of a Contractor's License, copy of a completed W-9 and then a copy of an executed contract and agreement. Obviously, we can waive those pieces if we'd like to. We have the prerogative as a Board, but I'm not sure that what I saw on there sort of fell under what HOAMCO typically requires, so just a comment there, thank you.

Paul: So, Jeremy, do you think that we should waive those? Are you saying we should waive that stuff?

JEREMY: I'm not saying we should or we shouldn't. I mean, we're going to have to if this individual cannot come to those. What I'll do is send a copy of the Vendor Packet, Paul, to you and to David, just so you've got that specific information of what they look for. It's located on page two of that packet. It is what we require or we ask of all of our folks. We have waived that requirement in the past but it's been awhile and I don't remember exactly what the circumstance was.

KEITH: For last year's plow, did we waive these or did he have proof of all of these?

DAVID: We never asked. He is set up in HOAMCO's system, so Raue either has this or we have waived it in the past. We don't need a vendor packet every year. It's a one-time deal, either you conform to it or it's been waived and you go about your merry way.

KEITH: I was just wondering what we held our last plow guy to as far as standards. Would we be able to get that information from HOAMCO?

DAVID: It won't take long. I'll just ask for it; that's a good idea.

PAUL: See my initial concern – this is like the third iteration of this contract, which I think looks pretty good. But, initially, his first contract looked like some standard form he had downloaded from somewhere, which that's a good way to do it, but the thing that really bugged me about that first contract, which kind of got me to thinking about insurance was he wanted us to sign off that whatever happened with him plowing, he would be held harmless by the Association. And I said, no, to me it works the other way around, that you need to have the insurance in case something happens, SLPPOA is held harmless, that we are not holding you harmless. So that's where it came down to the insurance. As far as the performance, the guy lives here locally, so I think we could probably waive that \$450. But, again, it gets down to what Jeremy was saying, and what Keith had said about comparing what Raue did through HOAMCO, and we kind of want to mirror that, I guess. So as long as he has insurance, I'm depending on what HOAMCO determined about Raue. So once we know those things, I think we can move forward with the contract without the surety bond.

DAVID: Okay.

KEITH: I don't know if this is true or not, but I know David is probably wanting to sign this contract and/or pay them 50% because we got a skiff of snow today, and I don't know if we continue this path for looking for what our past plow guy had, do we have the ability to approve this between now and the next Board meeting? I don't know if it's going to snow. It's getting colder, we have the ability to snow, but it's in our best interest to get our plow guy. I know it's important to take these steps, but is there a way we can approve this without having a Board meeting?

PAUL: Yeah, I think we can, but Jeremy is going to have to send that information to me and David about the vendor packet, and then we need to determine what was in place with Raue. Those are the things we need to figure out. So, I think everybody is in agreeance that we need to have a snow plow guy onboard as soon as possible, and so once we have those two things resolved, I think we can do that without having a Board meeting.

KEITH: Perfect. I just wanted to make sure.

PAUL: So is everybody in agreement with that?

CINDY: So are we making a motion and voting tonight or how are we going to frame that?

PAUL: Let's do that. So entertain a motion to move ahead with the plowing contract once we have determined if we can, first of all, waive the requirements of the vendor packet; and secondly, get an idea from HOAMCO what Raue had in place. So the motion would be to accept the contract once the HOAMCO stuff is addressed.

DAVID: I would like to make a different motion. I would like to make a motion that we accept the contract as is and waive the vendor requirements, because he does include his liability insurance of half a million dollars. This may be more of a discussion, but do we really expect an individual plower to have Workmen's Compensation? Do we really expect an individual plower to have two million dollars of liability? Do we really expect a copy of a contractor's license? Maybe a W-9 would be expected. So, what do we really expect here? Are we trying to shoot

ourselves in the back, or foot, or are we going to get the plowing done this year?

PAUL: No, I think that's a great point. Go ahead, Cindy.

CINDY: I want to make a comment about that. We did require all of that of our water operator, and he is currently paying \$4,000 a year for insurance, so that's a little historical information.

KEITH: Do we have the ability to make a motion for the snow plow and our water operator; can we do a two for one and help them both out because they are helping us out? And I'm not saying get rid of insurance, I'm saying limit the amount from millions down to – I don't know what's reasonable, but something different.

DAVID: Right. So the snow plowing contract included personal liability of 250,000 per person and 500,000 per accident; property liability of 100,000 per accident. And that seems reasonable for a plowing person.

CINDY: Yeah, that sounds reasonable.

JEREMY: So I was just doing a little bit of searching to find what we've got. So the vendor packet is the parameters I read. There is actually a document that is acceptance of the contractor. It's basically waiving all of those minimum requirements (reading from document) then it lists the requirements. And it says, based on the foregoing, HOAMCO respectfully requests that the Association authorize a representative to execute this document affirming that after considering HOAMCO's reservations, the Board has determined that it's in the Association's best interest to authorize the contractor providing the above-stated service... It basically states that we are authorizing those basic minimums that HOAMCO is telling us should be followed, that we're basically saying, yes we understand and we don't care, we're going to do it without. So, it is literally either you do the vendor packet or you do this form where we waive those requirements. And then we can't go back to HOAMCO for anything when we're doing that. I can send a copy of this form out to the Board, but I'll have to fill it out if we're going to actually go this direction for whomever.

KEITH: I would like to look into this for the snow plow and John Hines, if this helps him out. Four thousand is a lot. So if we could cut that down to something more reasonable. I would like to put this on the agenda for next month, so we can move on here, but I'd like to give John some time to look into insurance this month. If he can lower by two grand, deal, let's help him out.

PAUL: I'd like to entertain a motion that we just go ahead and approve this contract without that \$450 surety bond, otherwise leave the contract as is and Morris provide us with a W-9.

KEITH: Move to accept Jonathan Morris' contract, not including the bond of \$450 and change, also completing the form to not complete the vendor packet, but also paying 50% of the quote we were given.

PAUL: Is there a second?

CINDY: Second.

PAUL: Anybody opposed? If not, the motion carries. Go ahead, David, and let him know.

DAVID: Thank you everyone. The last thing I have is there are sand barrels in the shed by the fire house. I don't know if anyone has ever taken any. So if anyone needs one, they can go to the shed and get a sand barrel. That's all I have.

PAUL: Thank you, David.

Legal:

PAUL: Paul Rightley with legal sent me an email and said he had a family issue and could not attend. He addressed both of the items under legal for the agenda. Regarding placement of cameras on people's property, the exterior places of your house are where you have no expectation of privacy. If somebody walking by can see it, someone can take a video of it. Someone is within their right to put something on their house to limit the view of cameras. Like using curtains, for example, they would only be illegal if someone is recording things occurring in a place with an expectation of privacy. So that answers those game cameras pointing at that neighbor's house.

Regarding the puppy mill, Sandoval County Animal Control says the location in SLP is operating within their statutes, the Sandoval County statutes. He is trying to get public records request from the Sandoval County Sheriff's Department for the reports on that address for Animal Control. He says he will prioritize that when he gets a chance.

Firewise:

PAUL: Ann Cooke was also excused. You all saw the letter. Mary Moore sent me a draft and I revised it and sent it out to you earlier this evening. Does anybody have any objections to me sending that to Brian Riley? Hearing none, then I will go ahead and send that out tomorrow.

David, you might want to address removing a snag on USFS property bordering yours.

DAVID: I had a positive experience. Ann Cooke connected me up with two gentlemen, both named Luke from the Forest Service. They came out and looked at this snag, and this snag was a whole group of dead trees, and they chopped them down. They literally came out and looked at them and chopped them down. Thank you, Ann Cooke big time for doing that. My property looks better because I don't have to look at a whole group of dead trees. They didn't really address clearing the area because it's very thick forest in that small section there. For now I am good with where we at, and I just want to thank Ann Cooke.

PAUL: The two other items I added at the beginning of the meeting. Ann got this email from one of the Lukes, Luke McLarty. And he writes the Jemez Ranger District is planning on implementing a 1600-acre stable canyon prescription starting as early as Wednesday, October 13th. This area is located adjacent to Forest Road 604, approximately six miles west/northwest of the Village of Jemez Springs. Overnight smoke is expected to flow down in the Guadalupe River Valley, with possible impacts on the Village of Gilman, Canon and Jemez Pueblo, so I don't think we will be too much impacted by it, but you never know which way the wind blows. The other thing she wanted to mention she has collected what they call effort reports indicating time and money invested in Firewise and she will be reporting on those soon.

Architectural:

Josh Toennis reported that there were no new requests in the past month, and that he is waiting on LANET to finish their request. I sent a follow-up email today, asking Alan if he needed any help getting the lot layout done. Then just gave him some of the basic guidelines, like being 25 feet away from the property lines. So, hopefully, we will hear back from him soon and we can get that approved for him.

Parks:

PAUL: I want to thank you. That issue of the newsletter was excellent. I just wanted to mention that. It was really well done.

Cindy Hines reported she was notified that there is a yellow jacket nest in an old dead stump in Black Bear Park. This is being dealt with.

One of the swings on the playground broke and she ordered two new, more industrial, which John will install.

I want to acknowledge Jonathan Morris for taking the initiative after reading my newsletter and mowing the park by the firehouse. I believe he also mowed around the wells. We really appreciate that.

Lastly, I have a cost for the signs only, without any additional posts and brackets. Tonight if we can approve the payment to Highway Supply Traffic Control Solutions for creating the signs in the amount of \$1,611.66. That gets us all of the street signs that we have identified needing. So if someone would like to make a motion?

There was a lengthy discussion concerning the speed limit signs, and various incidents of potential accidents, washboards and dust,

BARBARA: suggested that putting information in the newsletter to please so down, especially on the roads like Los Griegos because it's going to get worse in the wintertime because you're going to slide out.

CINDY: I'm happy to put that in the newsletter.

Jeremy moved to make the signs 15 miles per hour; seconded by Keith. There was no opposition and the motion carried.

PAUL: We need a motion to approve to the expenditure of \$1,611.66 to Highway Supply Traffic Control Solutions.

David moved we approve; seconded by Keith. There was no opposition and the motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS:

PAUL: Keith, this is something you had mentioned last time about figuring out Windstream and where are they going with that fiber optic cable. Were you able to find out anything on that?

KEITH: I was not able to find out anything. There was a Windstream tech here the other day that Josh Toennis tried to talk to, but he didn't speak English, so that didn't go very well. I also was not able to find a point of contact of who to talk to. Whenever I called Windstream, it just sent it through a generic talk system. Then, when you get to someone, it was someone states away. I was never able to get to corporate, but when I did, it was Oh, I'm just sales. So I was never able to get through. There has been motion on Jemez Chat, which is different than our Sierra Los Pinos chat, of them coming up this way. They are trenching on the side of the road. I don't know how far they have made it or gone, but I guess if you drive that way, you might be able to see an open trench or something, but I

was not able to make any progress on exact details. My assumption is they will run it to the highway and then they'll just keep copper lines throughout our subdivision. It should not affect us, hopefully. They are just trying to eliminate the bottleneck of miles and miles of old copper.

PAUL: I saw that crew putting in cable and they did it past La Cueva and they started going up Thompson Ridge.

KEITH: That would be unfortunate.

PAUL: And I don't know that they're going up that mountain, they may stick to the flat area, but I don't know.

SUZANNE: Could I make a comment, please?

PAUL: Go ahead.

SUZANNE: I'm sorry. I was going to ask Jeremy during the Treasurer's report, but I didn't get a chance to do that. Jeremy, just real quickly, could you tell me what we've been doing to follow up and collect on the delinquencies we've had over the past year?

JEREMY: Sure. Currently the process is the HOMCO sends out their delinquency letters and then it flows through to putting liens on the properties. So that's basically where we are.

SUZANNE: I mean, are we sending out any – do they send out any late notices? Is the attorney getting involved in trying to collect on this, or is it something where pretty soon you're going to have a new mailing for the new billing assessment?

JEREMY: No. There's nothing else going on with that right now. I've got a few things that I've thought about in trying to do some additional collection there, but just never have the time to do it, Suzanne. So, yeah, that's where we are, it's based on HOMCO's process now.

SUZANNE: Okay. They don't take it to an attorney and they aren't served any kind of process, so they're just sending out letters? Is that

JEREMY: No, it actually goes to an attorney, and there are a few of those that are actually in attorney demand letters and so forth. So that is part of the process.

SUZANNE: Okay; thanks.

NEW BUSINESS:

PAUL: Presenting estimated expenditures for the special meeting of November 6th, I contacted Rudy's barbeque in Albuquerque. They are suggesting, you know – they wanted to suggest 11 pounds per person, and I thought that was a lot for 25 people. We can probably feed 50 people for what they were quoting, and that would be \$260. Then there would be another \$75 or \$80 for delivery. So I'm looking for approval from the Board to spend \$350 on meats to be delivered for this meeting. And then I need to find out if people on this Board want to do a potluck, like cover the rest of it, like potatoes and salad and dessert, or just contract the rest of it out to Rudy's? Comments, please?

KEITH: Is that meeting November 6th, Paul?

PAUL: Yes.

KEITH: I know you asked for RSVP's, but I wish we knew a rough RSVP number. How early does Rudy's need the order to get it us, because I'm wondering if you could come back to us in two weeks and say, hey, I'm spending this much on an estimated 25 showing up, and we can approve up to an X-number tonight?

PAUL: Yeah, okay, I can do that. When I talked to the guy at Rudy's, he said he needed at least three days lead time, and I added a couple extra days. So I wanted to have everyone RSVP by October 31st, and then that way I can get a more exact number. So, yeah, I can do that. If you all want to wait, I can let you know on November 1st how many people have RSVP'd. And then, you know, I can figure out what the expenditure is going to be from there. But I'm just giving you a ballpark right now. Does anybody have an issue with spending 350 bucks on this? And like I said, the other thing I need to know is are people on this Board willing to cover

the cost of the potatoes and salad and desserts or do we want Rudy's to cater the whole thing? What do you all think?

CINDY: I'd be willing to make something.

PAUL: So the question is, is everybody willing to make something or bring something?

JEREMY: I will not be bringing anything and we will probably attend via Zoom actually.

PAUL: So we have to have more than Cindy.

KRISTI: I will actually be in North Carolina so I may be attending by Zoom also.

PAUL: I'm getting the distinct impression we turn the entire catering over to Rudy's.

DAVE: I think that's probably the best answer. I'm not sure if I'm going to attend either.

PAUL: All right. The other thing I wanted to find out, and I haven't talked to this guy yet, but do you all think it's necessary to get someone to film this, or do we just say this is a meeting, you can either attend in person or by Zoom. What do you all think about that? Should we film it or not?

KEITH: Can we record it with Zoom and save it and send the link out to people to view?

PAUL: That's an excellent suggestion. I think we can do that. I'm depending on the technical abilities of the guy at the church. I will talk to him about that.

DAVE: We have to keep the meeting under six hours, correct, for the recording?

(Laughter)

PAUL: I'm not sure, but I'll tell you what, as I mentioned in my email, I got sick of hearing the sound of my own voice. I was, like, when is this guy

going to shut up. The other thing that was good for me, was that I realized I had catch phrases that I go to and after I heard it, like, a dozen times, I've got to learn to say something else besides "stat." Yeah, it's going to be limited for sure. So I will get back to you once we get an idea of how many people are going to attend, thank you.

SUZANNE: A comment?

PAUL: Yeah, go ahead.

SUZANNE: Didn't you also say that you were going to take notes and then that would be available as well?

PAUL: A Zoom meeting?

SUZANNE: Yeah.

PAUL: It will be recorded on Zoom, just like this is, and the notes...

SUZANNE: Well, the reason I was asking, we tried that once before. I know you sent the link via Zoom. I think that's when you had someone come up from the Forest Service, or I can't remember what it was, and I had asked for the Zoom meeting, just to watch his video, what he was presenting but I never could get there. It didn't work for me to get a link via Zoom. But I was just asking if it's going to be recorded and transcribed and offered as a written document, as well, which I thought you told me in the email.

PAUL: Yes, it will be transcribed and made as a written document, but I can't guarantee – because it's on the 6th, I can't guarantee that it will be available on the regular Board meeting on the 9th.

SUZANNE: That's okay. As long as we get it at some point, we can read it. Thank you.

ACTION ITEMS:

PAUL: The only other thing is the logistics of delivery of two 25,000-gallon tanks to the Fire Department for fire suppression. This company called Masthead was supposed to scope out how they were going to maneuver

the roads. We're going to talk to them about being able to cross that bridge over the Rio Vallecitos, making sure their equipment can handle that. They're also talking about bringing up a crane that is going to lift this tank off the trailer that is transporting it. We had two days last week, Tuesday and Thursday that this guy could have showed up, and he didn't show up for either one. So I haven't heard anything more from Assistant Chief Scott Allen, who lives here in SLP as to when this guy is going to come back.

But I went to a Fire Department meeting on Wednesday and met with Chief Taylor and Assistant Chief Allen, and one of the things that I mentioned to them early on with this, because in order to improve our ISO rating, our insurance rating, there has to be at least 30,000 gallons dedicated for fire suppression. So, initially, Intel had two tanks, one was 33,000 gallons and one was 32,000, and Chief Taylor was supposed to secure one of those for us, but whatever happened we didn't get one of those tanks secured. So now, Intel has two 25,000-gallon tanks available that they are willing to give us. But the last time John Hines and I spoke with Taylor, he was saying that this would cost \$16,000 per tank to get them up here. And I was like, well, if our insurance rating is based on 30,000, then I think we should get one of these 25,000-gallon tanks and then get a 5,000-gallon tank to supplement, so that's kind of up in the air right now. And the other thing is, is we're trying to find funds to pay for this. I had a gentleman who was on a fire watch group with me, and he was telling me about FEMA doing this, but then he never followed through, so I did my own checking. There is money available from FEMA through the New Mexico Homeland Security and Emergency Management Department. I've got a call in to them to find out more about accessing that funding. But that's where that stands right now. Any questions about that?

Our next regular Board meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 9th at 1830 hours. Kristi's first duty will be to get out the letter for November 6th and Cindy will help her with mailing list.

Keith Rigney moved the meeting be adjourned. It was seconded by Jeremy Oepping. There being no objection, the meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

