



HIGH LONESOME RANCH ESTATES PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION

P O Box 215, Elfrida, AZ 85610-0215
Official website: www.hlrpoa.com
Official BOD e-mail: admin@hlrpoa.com



Board of Directors Meeting, 10 May 2014 Minutes

The regular meeting of the Board of Directors was called to order at 10:01 am at the Tombstone Community Congregational Church in Tombstone. Attending were Dennis and Charlet LePard, Doug Crouch, Greg Briner and Joe Alberti in addition to Board members Phyllis Cavanaugh, Wolf Holt, Adele Crouch, Margaret Baxter, and Joel Levin.

President Cavanaugh reminded us that we should adhere to the new bylaws, especially in the conduct of business among the board members; any discussion of Association business via email or otherwise that involved more than two members of the Board must be deferred to an open meeting.

The previous secretary, Ms. Cavanaugh, reported that the minutes of the annual members' meeting were missing only the attendance list and would be forthcoming. With that exception, Ms. Crouch moved and Ms. Cavanaugh seconded approval of the minutes. The Board approved 5-0. The current secretary presented the minutes of the Board that followed the annual members' meeting. After some changes were suggested and accepted, Ms. Cavanaugh moved and Ms. Crouch seconded approval of the minutes. The board approved 5-0. The secretary, Mr. Levin, then brought up the subject of the open email Board meeting held during April. The email transcript of the meeting with all the comments by members had already been posted on the web site; but minutes needed to be prepared summarizing the meeting. The secretary plans to look for a better way to host such a meeting, preferably using the format of a web page comment area to allow members to post comments and read responses in real time; the method used in April was a lot of work and delayed posting of comments by Board and members up to 24 hours.

Ms. Crouch presented the treasurer's report and a request for reimbursement for funds expended preparing and mailing realty listing packets. Mr. Levin and Mr. Holt moved and seconded that the request be granted, and the board approved. Mr. Alberti brought up the \$350 fee that Cadden used to charge for preparing Realty listing packets. While that would be too much for us to charge, we should consider charging a reasonable fee, to be split by buyer and seller, to cover expenses and the treasurer's time. An amount of \$50 was suggested. Ms. Cavanaugh made and withdrew a motion concerning the realtor packets, stating that it should go on the agenda next meeting. Ms. LePard requested a copy of the ranch roster, but was informed that the roster is confidential and used for ranch business only, as it contains certain personal information. Mr. Briner noted with approval that delinquencies are continuing to go down.

The Architecture Review Committee presented its report. Lot 28 had an issue with filling the swimming pool. Mr. Crouch suggested that the ARR include a requirement that a new pool's initial fill must be from an outside source. Mr. Alberti said that the ARR form should use the phrase "highly recommended". It was decided to consider issuing recommendations for installing and maintaining pools to go with the ARR form at the next regular board meeting. The property owner having earlier expressed his intention to truck in the water, Ms. Crouch moved to accept

the lot 28 ARR as written, Ms. Cavanaugh seconded, and the board approved. For Lot 58, Ms. Cavanaugh moved the four ARRs presented be accepted, Ms. Crouch seconded, and the board approved. For Lot 124 Ms. Crouch moved and Ms. Cavanaugh seconded acceptance of the ARR, and the board approved.

Mr. Levin provided the report of the Nominations and Elections Committee.

Ms. Cavanaugh reported that according to Barbara Brown there was no Windmill Committee report this month.

Next topic was the report of the Road Committee. The committee presented estimated costs for repairing part of the roads. The cost will be approximately \$4700 for 2 miles, and \$6390 for 3 miles, with a 2 mile minimum. It is not clear whether this kind of repair will actually work, and the Road Committee believes this is up to the property owners to decide. One question is how many miles of road to try to repair. Another question is which roads on the ranch to test these repairs on. Mr. LePard thinks this won't work long-term, and we should save our money until traffic grows and we need to make serious repairs, because this is really just a test. Mr. Alberti is also concerned about the money, as the original test was just going to be a .6 mile segment on Legend Trail costing under \$2000 instead of the \$6400 test to do the Legend Trail and High Lonesome segments. Also he would like to wait on High Lonesome repairs, just grading it for now, to see if earlier fixes there will help during monsoon. Mr. Alberti would also like to see a breakdown of the per mile cost: e.g., grader, roller, operators, fuel, etc. He suggests looking at doing the Legend Trail piece and 1.4 miles on High Lonesome from Stagecoach and grading the rest of High Lonesome since the grader will be here. Mr. Holt asked about gravel on the curves that get muddy. That would run from \$900-\$1200 per truckload. Ms. Crouch moved that the Legend Trail piece and High Lonesome Road from Stagecoach north for 1.4 miles be repaired according to the method estimated by the Road Committee, and the rest of High Lonesome Road be graded as normal maintenance. Mr. Levin seconded, and the board approved unanimously.

There was no report this month from the CCR Committee.

After a one minute break, the meeting resumed at about 11:15.

Ms. Cavanaugh summarized the lawyer's comments on the water ordinance. Short of paying him for a researched legal opinion, it all came down to whether the county would enforce it, and in that unlikely event we could then choose how and whether to defend it. According to the Windmill Committee, removal of the trough would compromise the water tank by not providing drainage and circulation. Ms. Cavanaugh said feels that we have some basis for saying that this ordinance is not a major factor in deciding about the fence. She said the choice is whether to have the trough with or without the fence, not whether to remove the trough. Ms. Crouch wonders if we really *have* to fence the water system, and notwithstanding older opinions from lawyer, believes we don't have to. Ms. Cavanaugh would like the fence in order to deter cattle from the water so they eventually would stop congregating at the windmill, which would help community folks who feel strongly about the cattle. That could beautify the area, and fencing would help. And finally the fence would show we are attempting to deter wildlife, in further defense against the ordinance. Mr. Levin stated that he did not feel strongly about fence, and sees no pressing reason to spend the money. Mr. Holt believes that the fence is a waste of money. Ms. Baxter asks who would pay for maintenance and repair of the fence and protected common area? Mr. Crouch spoke against the fence, stating that the ordinance was written for people living near

cities, not for those in a rural area. Mr. LePard stated that wildlife and cattle will keep coming because they will smell the water even if they can't get to it; they could kick and damage the tank. Ms. Baxter agreed with the issue of the smell of water. Ms. LePard liked the idea of being able to beautify the area, but she is more concerned with the supports of the tank – they look like they need to be built up. Mr. Briner agreed that it would be nice to beautify the area and make it look nice, but without the fence. He also believes liability is not an issue, nor is the water ordinance; and also wonders about responsibility for maintenance. Mr. Alberti reported that he talked to a county supervisor who was also a cattle person. This ordinance has never been enforced as far as he or she knows. Ms. Cavanaugh would like to see an agenda item to talk about beautification and perhaps putting a logo on the tank. Regarding the leftover wood from the dead tree, there is a property owner who wants all the wood that's been cut down in that area and he should be taking it all away soon. The board voted on the pending motion made by Ms. Cavanaugh and seconded by Mr. Holt during the April Board meeting via email, to accept the smaller of the two estimates and begin work as soon as possible: it was rejected by a vote of 4 to 1 with Ms. Cavanaugh voting in favor.

On the committee memberships, the question arose about adding Mr. Briner to the Road Committee and removing Mr. Browning. Mr. Briner said that Mr. Browning does participate at least with him. Ms. Cavanaugh moved to leave the committees as they are except to add Mr. Briner to the Road Committee. Ms. Crouch seconded the motion, and the board approved it.

The vote continues on the revised Articles of Incorporation. All property owners who have not voted are urged to obtain a ballot if they don't still have one, and vote.

Concerning the CCR Enforcement Policy: the new bylaws address violations, so is this policy now null and void? Ms. Cavanaugh will pass a recommendation to the CCR committee via Ms. Cook to review this policy in light of the new bylaws, including whether a membership ballot would be required to approve it.

Call to the public: Ms. LePard mentioned the May 17 Rotary rummage sale at farmers markets.

Ms. LePard suggest having a ride or celebration when the Gleeson Road project is completed.

Mr. Briner wished all the mothers present, and absent, a happy Mother's Day.

The meeting was adjourned approximately at noon.

Respectfully submitted,



Joel B Levin, secretary