Pheasant Lake Townhome Association  
July 13, 2015  
Monthly Board of Directors’ Meeting Minutes

I. The board meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by President, Tom Krippel.

II. Board members present at the board meeting: Tom Krippel (President), Beth Murphy (Treasurer), Jerry Spehar (Secretary), Debbie Gardner (Director) and William Dziallo (Director).  
Scott Adler (EPI Field Manager)

Owners present at the board meeting: Laura Bachman, John Sokol, Jim Gardner and Rita Davis.

III. Guest: None

IV. Landscape Update: Not scheduled.

V. Homeowners’ Forum:  😊 Laura Bachman (18138 Pheasant Lake Drive) She asked for an update on the tree problem in her front yard. Tom explained that issue is to be covered in the Management Report portion of the meeting. She also asked if there is a delay in replacing the tree, would the area be restored with grass? 😊 John Sokol (18134 Mockingbird) No comments. 😊 Jim Gardner (8905 Bluebird) He was concerned there was unfinished repairs due to the roofing project. Tom stated there was a list of follow-up items to be taken care of and EPI will follow up. 😊 Rita Davis (8925 Pheasant Lake Drive) She is concerned about burned spots in the grass in back of her unit after spraying. Tom stated EPI will do a walk thru to determine the cause/extent of the grass damage. She also asked if her tree was on the list. Scott stated it was an Ash tree the will be discussed later in the meeting. Beth clarified that tree replacement was not automatic and that you cannot plant a tree in the same spot as the removed tree. Tom further clarified the tree replacement process.

VI. Approval of Minutes: Bill motioned to approve board meeting minutes. Jerry seconded. The minutes were approved by majority vote.

VII. Treasurer’s Report: - Beth

Beth referenced her Treasurer’s Report hand-out.

1. Beth noted that she received the bank reconciliations. Even though the ledger shows the 6/30/15 cash in the Marquette account as being negative, the Marquette checking account has never been overdrawn. The reason for the negative ledger balance is due to 2 roofing checks being written on 6/30/15, signed by Beth on 7/2/15, and Beth processed a bank transfer on 7/3/15 from the roofing money market account to the regular account. Beth also noted that the CD’s at United Trust matured on 6/29/15, but Beth could not get to the bank until 7/1/15 due to her work commitments. On 7/1/15 Beth obtained checks for the maturity value of the two CD’s and deposited them into the
Marquette money market regular and roof accounts, which are both being used to pay off the roofs.

2. The June autopays for Com Ed were posted to the ledgers.

3. The Accounts Payable detailed list matches the total for Accounts Payable on the financials for 6/30/15.

4. The July ACH is set up to process on July 15, 2015.

5. The breakdown of the delinquent assessments between regular and roof assessments were provided to the board and are at the lowest level since Beth can remember. Beth also provided the breakdown of the Prepaid assessments between roof and regular assessments.

6. The assessment income for regular and roof assessments is correct on the financials.

7. Beth did receive the 6/30/15 financials from EPI via email on the Friday prior to our board meeting.

8. No automatic bank transfers from checking to roofing money market were made or shown on the ledgers since the transfers have been stopped while paying off the roofs.

9. The increased Waste Management fee of $947.60 (from $920) is consistent with our contract and under the $966 monthly budgeted amount for 2015.

10. The interest was updated to June 2015 for the Marquette bank accounts, and the United Trust CD’s interest was updated at maturity, just prior to being closed.

11. Beth had Scott confirm that Pheasant Lake received a check for $977.87 from Nationwide for the fence damage, and the check was reflected in Account #5067 General Repairs and Maintenance to lower the repair costs recorded in that account.

12. As noted in the prior month, Beth reported that the volunteers’ work has saved owners a considerable amount of money. The total estimated savings from just sprinkler repair work done by volunteers and from accounting is $128,000, which is equivalent to $116 per unit per month for a one-year period.

13. Beth noted that the Account 3003 for Accumulated Roof Reserves has a 6/30/15 balance of $142,080; therefore, that account will be reduced to zero during July. EPI was instructed to take the remaining roof costs out of these accounts in this sequence: 1st: A/C 3000, 2nd: A/C 3001, and 3rd: A/C 32000. Beth also noted that the Account 3003 will still have roof assessments put into it through the end of 2015 since roof assessments are being collected through the end of 2015; however, at the end of 2015, those roof assessment amounts will be transferred to the non-roof reserve account since it is being used to help pay for the roofs on time while the roof work is being completed.

14. Beth noted that an owner had a Prepaid Roof Assessment balance that exceeds the remaining roof assessments for 2015. Beth asked EPI to investigate this issue at the June 2015 meeting, but Beth has not seen a refund check yet for her to sign. Scott indicated that Accounts Receivable is still investigating this issue.

15. Beth reported the sprinkler system cost savings to date for 2015 due to having Tom Krippel and Len Wiencek doing the repairs. The estimated cost if professionals were hired to do the labor and provide the parts is $5,865.00, and the association incurred only $227.20 to date in 2015 for parts, resulting in a cost savings of $5,637.80. Thanks to our volunteers!!!!

16. Beth asked Scott if the major elements in the reserve study will be set up in separate reserve accounts in 2016, with major elements being those estimated to cost over $100,000. Previously, Scott reported to the board that even if reserve accounts are set up, any subsequent board can change them. Scott confirmed this was true and that only a
special assessment voted by owners cannot be changed in terms of how the funds are spent. Scott did say that the board can set up separate accounts for each major element in the reserve study, but subsequent boards could change how the reserve funds are allocated to the elements.

Beth did indicate that the declaration does say we need to have adequate reserves to cover what the declaration says is required to be covered by the association.

Beth also indicated that the roof assessments of $195 will stop in December 2015. However, the regular assessment will now include a much larger amount to build up the reserves again for the major elements that need to be repaired or replaced. Currently, the $165 regular assessment has $12 going toward reserves, and all of the $12 is being allocated to the roofing project. However, going forward, that $12 amount is going to be increased substantially to establish reserves for elements included in the reserve study. Therefore, even though the $195 roof assessment stops in December 2015, the regular assessment will be increasing significantly above the current $165 monthly amount in order to build up reserves for the cost to repair/replace all of the elements that the association must cover that were identified by the reserve study.

17. Beth noted to Scott that if the fully Quinn landscape invoice was accrued as landscaping expense in 2014, and if this accrual was not reversed in 2015, there should be a balance in Accounts Payable for the portion of the invoice that we did not pay. However, there is no balance in Accounts Payable for Quinn. Scott indicated that he would have this issue checked out.

VIII. Management Report - Scott

A) Reserve study: Scott stated he did not include a copy of the reserve study because Beth has some corrections to it. Scott and Tom decided it was not necessary to make copies because of the proposed revisions. Scott referenced an e-mail Beth sent regarding the reserve study.

B) Beth Murphy Review of June 2015 Waldman Reserve Study. Beth asked Scott if Waldman had received a copy of the PLTA Declarations. Scott stated Waldman had received a copy of the Declaration, budget, income statement balance sheet, roofing contract and any other major contracts. Beth stated her intention was to understand the reserve study numbers. She stated she was able to replicate Waldman’s numbers. She stated she knew their formulas worked with their numbers. Beth then explained the context for the discussion of the reserve study. She stated the only thing needed to be fixed, of theirs, is what we identify. Beth explained her process for reviewing the study.

1. Beth stated, item for correction, is the estimated Reserve balance for January 1, 2016 of $860,940. All current reserves (roof and non-roof) will be needed to pay for roofs as they are completed. Beth estimated that the last 6 months of roof assessments would be used to replenish non-roof assessments depleted (see table below):

\[
\begin{align*}
195 \times 92 \text{ owners} \times 6 \text{ months} & = 107,640 \\
\text{Estimate non-roof reserves as of 1/1/2016 is:} & = 100,000
\end{align*}
\]

Beth stated the only unknown cost will be for landscaping. She stated Waldman needs to make the correction.
2. Waldman provided Current Costs for each element in Exhibit 1, of the Reserve Study: She stated she made a comparison of their Current Costs shown in Exhibit 1 called Current Day Expense. (see table below)

| Current Cost Total on Waldman’s Exhibit 1 | $2,994,500 |
| Current Cost Total Beth identified & Waldman Confirmed after initial report | $3,255,175 |
| Difference | ($260,675) |

She stated the reason for the difference is that some of the items expense will be incurred once and some will be incurred multiple times in a year. Beth referenced certain items. She explained the nuances in the Waldman’s Exhibit 1 are not consistent throughout the study. And she explained her process for her calculations. (see table below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Cost in Study</th>
<th>Partial Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Pavement Replacement</td>
<td>$520,000 x 54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick Columns</td>
<td>$3,000 x 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending Shoreline Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$10,000 x 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument Tuck-pointing &amp; Repair</td>
<td>$3,000 x 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Brick Tuck-pointing &amp; Repair</td>
<td>$650,000 x 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Sewer Main Repair Allowance</td>
<td>$10,000 x 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Driveways</td>
<td>$275,000 x 1-$4,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt Driveways</td>
<td>$275,000 x 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Beth believes the Current Roof Cost, in the report, is High (see table below):  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Waldman Study – Current Cost</th>
<th>Current Cost (projected assumes 3% inflation)</th>
<th>Projected Exp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$2,236,074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected 2015 Grand Total of ACTUAL Cost</td>
<td>$955,000</td>
<td>$1,941,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$294,756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beth asked Scott if current costs should be included. Scott stated that we are not sure of what cost is actually being, or will be, occurred. He gave deck wood replacement at a recently finished building as an example. There was a discussion regarding extra unknown cost. Scott stated he had doubts about using all of the $145,000 difference. Beth mentioned the future costs compared to current costs. Beth estimated the difference amounts to about $5.00/month/owner – now, starting in 2016. Beth also stated it is assumed that future assessments will rise about 3%/per/year, as well as contribution to the reserve.

4. Beth believes the following items are missing from the Waldman Study:
a) Landscaping costs (Trees, Bushes, Grass): Scott stated that landscaping is not included in the reserves from the engineering standpoint. Scott explained the reasons. Beth referenced the PLTA Declaration regarding tree replacement. There was a discussion regarding various aspects of the landscaping issue. Beth asked if other associations reserve for landscaping; Scott indicated that most view the landscaping costs as an annual operating cost, not an item that is reserved.

b) Uncollectable Assessments: Scott stated the reserve study does not cover this. He explained the reasons. These are typically not included in reserve studies; only physical items are included in reserves. The assumption is that all assessments for all units are 100% collectible.

c) Allowance for Emergency Repair: Beth stated her options for handling this issue. Beth suggested that the reserve balance not go below a certain, fixed amount, especially when roofs are being replaced. Scott stated he didn't see anything in the study, but will talk to Waldman regarding this issue. There was a board discussion regarding a contingent reserve. There was discussion on which items should be included as separate reserve accounts. Beth referenced her revisions of the Waldman’s Exhibit 3A and explained her projections. Beth estimated the 1/1/16 reserves to be $100,000 (as previously discussed). Beth explained the projected expenses came from Exhibit 1. The recommended annual contribution that Beth suggests of $134,000 will result in the reserve balance never going below $50,000. Assuming a 1% balance on reserve accounts, the $134,000 starting contribution will increase 3% each year and be able to cover the projected expenses. Beth notes that the reserve balance should not go below $50,000 in any one year. However, other edits to the study are needed, so the starting contribution of $134,000 may not be the correct amount.

5. Wood Repair: Beth stated that this item is included in the study. Also this item is included in our annual budget every year. Beth brought up the issue of: if soffit and fascia were sided, instead of wood the wood repair would go away and the painting cost would decline. Beth explained her cost analysis, and assuming that wood repairs would be $3,000/year. Waldman is projecting $14,000/year for 30 years in wood repair, and that seems very high, of soffit and fascia boards and would cost $140,000. With soffit and fascia siding then (see table below):

| Annual painting cost saving would also be: | $9,800 (cost saving obtained from painting contractor in Fall of 2014) |
| Wood repairs would decline substantially: | $3,000 (new rough annual estimate) |

This change would require homeowner approval because soffit and fascia siding is considered an improvement. Beth suggested this be a discussion at the September annual home owners’ meeting and explain the cost savings. A board discussion followed regarding budget line items. Based on the above numbers, the savings would amount to $11.00/month starting in 2016. It is assumed Waldman will not change their wood repair estimate of $14,000. Beth stated she would produce a report for the September meeting showing wood repair costs and projected savings impact starting in 2016. Beth will keep Waldman’s $14,000 estimate and explained her $3,000 reduction calculation. Beth asked Scott to
research past wood repair costs to provide an average and she will use that average for her September report.

6. Pheasant Lake Ledgers: Beth stated we have already talked about having separate reserve accounts set on the ledgers. She suggested it would be a good idea to include the list of items that are on the study with projected future costs at more than $100,000 in separate reserve accounts. Beth referenced Exhibit 1 of the Waldman Study. She explained how the ledger accounts should be set up. There was a board discussion on the items to be included. Wood replacement was again discussed. It was agreed to leave wood repair in the study, for now, and remove it in the future if the board desires.

7. Landscaping Costs: Beth stated she summarized the landscaping costs. She stated she was not sure if reserve money was to be set aside for landscaping. Beth referenced a March 13, 2013 summary. The board, at that time, was asked to make a list items that should be in the reserve. Beth read the Declaration and put together a list and declaration page references to determine if an item was discretionary or required. Landscaping, on page 15 of the declaration, is discretionary. Beth suggested board members read the declaration and determine if an item, on the list, is discretionary, required or homeowner responsibility. Beth specifically mentioned trees, because of all of the tree damage. Beth referenced the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$3,747.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$361.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$1,097.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$1,943.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$2,696.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$2,220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$3,806.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$3,668.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$2,585.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$2,760.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$3,495.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$17,154.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$4,075.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2001 Beautification Project (landscape front entrance) $6,782.44

**GRAND TOTAL FOR 2001 TO 2015 TO DATE** $56,445.12

2014: $6,570 accrued for bush removal/replacement; $10,584.80 for tree and stump removal.

Beth stated Waldman will not put it into the study. The board will have to decide if anything will be put into the reserve study for landscape replacement. Beth stated the board will have to make that decision.

8. The Siding replacement: Beth stated that Waldman assumed all siding will be replaced in 19 years. But, the roof replacement is slated for Year 24. This current roofing project replaced siding that abuts the roof. Beth explained the areas not included in the roofing project siding. She mentioned the concern regarding areas where there are gable vents that have not been replaced in 2015 that are surrounded by aluminum siding; Beth believed that the gable vents (for the ranch units) will not last to Year 24, as noted in the Waldman study. However, the siding not replaced in 2015 that does not have gable vents should be able to last until Year 24. There was
board discussion on the timing for this issue. It was suggested that EPI discuss this issue with Waldman, and Scott agreed.

9. Beth referenced the Declaration, regarding discretionary costs, and she referenced the previously discussed list prepared in March 2013. The board needs to review the declaration wording referenced in Beth’s March 2013 list to determine if they agree with Beth’s list of discretionary versus required items for the association versus items funded by individual owners. She specifically mentioned:

a) Water & Sewer Main Repair Allowance is optional. She described items on the list. There was a discussion of previous problems. Debbie brought up the subject of responsibility for driveway repair when there are water and sewer repairs, for the part of the driveway that is from the sidewalk to the curb, possible considered parkway. Scott described the village’s responsibility and the owner’s (association) responsibility. There was a discussion on responsibility for repair from the “buffalo box” to the curb and “buffalo box” to the unit. Beth suggested the board get written clarification, from the village, on this issue. Scott agreed to contact the village. Beth suggested the board should vote on whether repair of the water and sewer main is the unit owner’s or the association’s responsibility at the next board meeting.

b) Drainage Tile Repair Allowance: Beth stated Waldman’s allowance was $10,000 every five (5) years, beginning 2018. Beth and Scott discussed the description of “drain tile”. It was agreed on “black tile” and anything underground. Beth mentioned a cost of $2,000 for one unit to the lake. She stated that $10,000, every five (5) years would not match the cost if you had to dig up drain tile that’s any long string. There was a board discussion regarding individual cost incurred for drain tile repair. Scott clarified the areas of responsibility. Scott stated this was discussed and that this is a discretionary item. Beth asked if the drain tile item remain in the reserve study, as is. There was a discussion regarding precedence. There was a discussion regarding a procedure to survey the property. Debbie suggested the board get a legal opinion regarding this issue. Beth suggested that the issue be totally the unit owner’s responsibility. It was agreed, again, that the Waldman $10,000 cost was not realistic. There was a discussion regarding lagoon level.

c) Asphalt Driveways: Beth stated that Waldman did not have the complete cost the 1st time around and used $4,125. But they have driveways being replaced twice, in their projected numbers. Beth stated there has to be a board vote on this item should be included in the reserve study.

d) Concrete Pavement Replacement: Beth stated Waldman show this as partial. This item includes patios and sidewalks.

Beth stated that the above four (4) items will require a vote to determine if the association will be responsible for these costs (versus the owners). Beth suggested these items should stay in the Waldman’s Study and be voted on at the next meeting, after all board members read the Declaration and agree on which items should be included in the reserves.
Beth again suggested board members read the study and the Declaration to determine which item should be included. She also stated Scott will get past costs for rotted wood replacement.

Bill asked if the association had previously paid for a driveway replacement. It was confirmed. Bill made reference to 2001 board decision that the replacement was the responsibility of the owner. Beth’s reply was that boards change. It was again stated that the Declaration states this is a discretionary item. It was agreed that funds collected for driveways replacement could be diverted to different line items.

Beth asked if Waldman will be asked to change the January 1, 2016 estimated reserve. Scott replied it will be dropped to $100,000.00.

Other items Waldman should change:
  a) Keep the $14,000 for wood repair.
  b) Alter the schedule regarding gable vents and siding.

Beth revised the Waldman Study, Exhibit 3A by changing the 1/1/16 estimated reserves to $100,000:
  a) That changed the recommended contribution for reserves.
  b) The $100,000 reserve balance is included. Missing is replacing the siding for the 45 ranch units. That will come earlier than Year 19. If we are to contribute $134,000, and it will get higher, starting in 2016, and increasing it by 3%/year, the annual assessment, per month, would increase the monthly assessment by $121.00. So the $165 regular assessment, with the current numbers from the Waldman study, could be $121 higher, even though the $195 is going away. That will be higher with the siding added. HOWEVER, Beth stated that will also change depending on the boards vote on something being required or discretionary. Therefore, the numbers on her version of Exhibit 3A are tentative.
  c) Waldman included cement, but the board never officially voted on it. The board has to vote on this item.
  d) Drain Tile: The board has to vote on this item.
  e) Asphalt: The board has to vote on this item.
  f) Water and Sewer: The board has to vote on this item.

There was repeated discussion regarding previously discussed items.

IX. Management Report - Scott

I.  **Financial:**
  A) Statements – No comment
  B) Delinquencies – No comment
  C) Waste Management – Scott referenced previous discussion.

II.  **Miscellaneous Operating:**
A. **Roof Replacement Project** –
   1) Scott stated he inspected the last roof that Lang Exterior completed and found no issues. He stated the payment check can be signed. Tom's building's roof has been completed and there were no issues. The siding will be checked later. Beth will notify Lang to let him know to pick up the checks given to her at the board meeting for Lang.

B. **8901 Mallard, 18138 Mockingbird and 8826 Bluebird Porch Posts.** – Scott stated there are three posts rotting out. Lang and SMS did not quote all three units. Two of the units have been completed. Tom moved the board accept Lang’s bid of $500.00 per post, for a total bid of $1,500.00. Jerry seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

C. **Landscaping** –
   1. Scott referenced a quote from MVD Landscaping for erosion along the sidewalk at 18232 Pheasant Lake Drive for $525.00. Acres Group quoted $150.00. This was included in another proposal for $1,870.00 for addressing tree ring areas with seeding those areas, where trees were removed, removal/replacement of bush damaged at entrance island and removal of a damaged Arborvitae at 18144 Mockingbird. Unit owner stated they want the item replaced, for privacy. The $1,870 bid does not include replacing the Arborvitae. Jerry motioned to accept the Acres’ bid of $1,870.00. Tom seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously. (However, subsequent to the board meeting, it was discovered that units that lost trees in tree rings were missing from the Acres bid and that replacement of trees will be discussed/decided at the August 2015 board meeting. Thus, all locations where trees were removed needs to be itemized to ensure that all units are addressed, not just some of them. Therefore, the only work on the bid totaling $1,870 that is to be done is the $150 work at 18232 Pheasant Lake Drive.)

   2. E-mails between Management and A. Dziallo regarding trimming of bushes on “No Trim” list. Unit owner is requesting reimbursement of $80.00 for planned planting of replacement bushes. Acres disclaimed responsibility, as per their contract disclaimer. Jerry raised objections to the disclaimer. Bill also voiced his objection to the disclaimer. Scott discussed the rules. There was a discussion about doing future business with Acres. Jerry motioned that Acres be informed the association holds them responsible. Bill seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously. Beth asked if the association is responsible for this cost, and Scott said no. Beth also indicated that the board should tell Acres that all items bid will be bid out by other contractors, so no decision on those items will be made until multiple bids are obtained. Beth also pointed out that the landscape line item is heading into spending at a level that will result in the landscape replacement line going over budget.

D. **Tree Removal** –
   1. 18200 Pheasant Lake Drive stump removal. No decision.
   2. 8925 Pheasant Lake Drive Homer Tree Care bid of $550.00. Jerry motioned to approve Homer bid. Bill seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

E. **Rotted Wood Replacement at 18206 and 18208 Mockingbird** – Scott stated Lang Home Exterior completed the work for $36.00 as part of the roofing project contract.
F. **Aquatic Weed Treatment:** McCloud bid $2,040. Acres bid $1,250. Beth **motioned** approval of Acres. Bill **seconded** the motion. The motion was **approved** unanimously. Debbie suggested the board withhold $80.00 from the bid. No decision.

G. **The Reserve Study:** Reference Beth’s presentation.

H. **8915 Mallard Drain Tile:** This item was tabled for future discussion.

I. **Census Cards & Insurance Requirements:** Scott stated that Erie will not include the association as an additional insured. Jerry stated he has Erie home insurance, with the association as the additional insured. Scott, with Jerry’s approval, will contact Jerry’s Erie broker.

**III. Exterior Modification Requests:**

A) 8905 Mallard: Mud-jack their patio. Bill **motioned** to approve. Jerry **seconded** the motion. The motion was **approved** unanimously.

B) 18128 Mockingbird – Install retractable awning. Board approval with stipulation the awning is as close to white as is available. Jerry **motioned** to approve. Bill **seconded** the motion. The motion was **approved** unanimously.

C) 8903 Bluebird – Patio extensions using brick. There was a discussion as to where the actual property line is. There are sprinkler heads in the proposed extended area. The board agreed a letter should be sent, to the owner, requesting additional information.

**IV. Pond Signage:**

A) Bill brought up the subject of signage. Jerry explained the list he provided contained all the signs’ suggestions submitted by the board members. The board agreed to table the discussion until the August meeting.

Management report concluded.

**V. Beth** requested that EPI get bids for the dead bush list generated by Scott so that all landscaping work costs are know when making any future decisions in 2015 for landscaping work.

**VI. Rules Violations and Appeals:** Not discussed

**Miscellaneous Correspondence:** Not discussed

**Sales Summary:** Not discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Previous Owner</th>
<th>New Owner</th>
<th>Closing Date</th>
<th>Sale Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Inspection Report:** Not discussed

**Old Business:** Not discussed.

**New Business:** Not discussed.

The all present board members **motioned** to adjourn. All present board members **unanimously** agreed.

The meeting was adjourned at 09:00 PM. CDST.