

Glenshire Devonshire Residents Association
ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING
MINUTES
September 3, 2018 10:00 A.M.
at Glenshire Clubhouse 15726 Glenshire Dr, Truckee, CA 96161

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Board members present: Jamie Brimer // Peter Tucker // Pam Stock // Martha Frantz
Staff present: Lori Kelley.

II. Pledge of Allegiance: Done

III. New Business:

1. 2019 budget

Article XII of GDRA's By Laws and California Civil Code section 5300 require the Board of Directors to adopt a budget and distribute it to the membership

- Jamie read aloud main points of final budget draft notes and correction of budget title typo of 2018, should be 2019. Stated there is attachment of salaries, wages and bonuses.
- Peter asked if Lori can do her best to answer any questions and anything you don't feel you can we can put instructions in minutes for Dan to answer later.
- Peter wanted to clarify if \$20,000 Lake trail/open space budget item, reflective of \$15 dues increase, is for Lake Trail or general lake. Jamie clarified we haven't designated exactly what it is going to but will be something to do with lake and/or trail.
- Peter thinks 2019 estimated gm bonus incorrect since board designated a different amount. Lori clarified the amount they designated was for 2018, and the budgeted amount is an estimate with a slight increase for 2019.
- Peter questioned that estimated salaries for gm and Lori and asked if those numbers now reflect base salary plus health stipend that we can no longer be called health care stipend. Peter asked when that was changed. Lori recalled being discussed approximately February or March board meeting but change wasn't reflected on paystubs until July. Peter asked if during that entire time staff was paid correct amounts, it was just a difference in regulation that required healthcare stipend to be reflected differently on paystub, that it can no longer be called health stipend, but you guys were paid correctly regarding whatever rule you found about about? Lori replied yes, we were paid stipend of whatever board allocated and to her knowledge paid correct amounts. Marty, questioned that incorrectly itemized on pay stubs but numbers were all correct. Lori, yes.
- Jamie asked if anyone had questions or clarifications regarding budget
- Marty asked about \$5,000 outside consultants increase. Peter clarified this was for HR consultant to update policies/manuals. Pam mentioned HR \$5,000 amount has not been approved by board. Lori clarified that's why this is on list of changes that were not reflected at last budget meeting. Pam stated we need a lot more information. Peter requested reasoning behind. Lori stated Dan has been working on updating employees manuals, and needs professional assistance including we are up to par on all labor codes, rules, policies, etc. This would probably be a one-time consultant then it could mostly be maintained by us. Dan has more details. Peter would like to get reasoning and rationale behind this from GM. Peter would like to approve budget without the specific amount for HR.
- Jamie sated we will move onto pool staffing but wanted to jump ahead a little bit regarding a statement that that Dan Warren, GM, made in GM report. For me it was a little bit contradictory and left me wondering what's going on. I'll read this one part: After the GDRA board of directors adopted the pool staffing and expenses for the 2019 financial year I conducted (I being Dan) a meeting with Lori Kelley, the pool manager and head guard. Although I have 12

years of lifeguard experience and overseeing pool operations for another 11 years, I still rely on staff to give me the best feedback for day to day operations. We all agreed that staffing could be cut back to the levels on the compromised budget sheet. (What he's referring to there is the board had approved altering the hours of staff at the pool based on is there too much staff there and also the idea of cost cutting, which was approved. Nothing negative was said at that meeting from the GM, and we felt we were doing something in a positive direction.) I'll read on: We all agreed that staffing could be cut back to levels on the compromised budget sheet. The current adopted schedule would cause loss of swim instructors, loss of senior pool staff, possible violations of state employee breaks, closure of pool due to low to no staffing, etc. "I'm really sorry Dan's not here today because my question to him would be why, as pretty much the guy that knows everything about everything and guides us on certain matters, did you allow us to pass a policy to lower the hours and then come back in your report with "you guys really screwed up and you're setting yourself up for violations" is kind of the way I read this. With that said, we did have the pool staff make recommendations based on that we were a little too aggressive on our cutting back of the hours and made a proposal which we will go into next. Ashley is here so we may have some questions for Ashley and ask her to explain things. Jamie has always felt that the people in charge down there know more than he does, personally he will go along with their recommendations. We'll discuss it, but will take the weight of their recommendations very heavily. Jamie: Stated we have 3 schedules – the previous board approved schedule that took it from staff costs of \$63,000 down to \$51,000. The counter offer from pool staff is \$53,800, so \$2,200 more. Ashley, would you mind if I have you come up here and give us an overview of how you feel this \$2,200 will take us from what Dan sees as catastrophe to having a full staff and everything runs well. Ashley: I got my first job at the pool in 2004, started out as a pass office person, when I could get my lifeguard cert I got it right away, when I could become a swim instructor, I got that cert. This has been my community since I was 5, this is your community. The pool faces in here, I know all of you by name, you know me by name. The pool is more than a swimming thing. I think it's a really good place for our community to come together and meet each other and know each other, be a neighbor, a friend. I am not opposed to change; I embrace and like change; however, when the new schedule came up, it's catastrophic to me as well. There is no way with the amount of training, amount of saves I've seen at the pool, the amount of rules we enforce, there's no way that I will return next summer with the proposed budget at this point. It leaves one guard alone watching the whole pool at certain times during the day, which in the event of emergency or even just with the amount of people we see in the pool, I would feel guilty knowing that these children and people were in the pool by themselves with one guard on. I've seen way too many things even just this summer; our guards are putting together a list of saves and first aid this summer. So when I saw that budget, I was willing to work and put in time to work with board to cut, and sat down with Ken and staff – Ken has worked here many years and is a key part of pool community. She had discussed with Ken there were parts of the day she would not feel comfortable just being there by herself, so really sat down and figured out how to cut and also how to stay safe at the pool and came up with another budget, which she worked on with Ken, Dan and Lori. Because it's slow at fire and police departments, they don't staff lower. She realizes they are over staffed at times and try to send staff home. She is really willing to work with change and she and staff would not feel safe working here with adopted schedule. Pam mentioned that when board & GM were discussing pool schedules, they did ask Dan if there were any state regulations about what kind of staffing needs to be at the pool and recalls him saying no. Jamie and Pam are disappointed in his current statement that the adopted schedule could cause state regulation violations, so they think that needs to be clarified. Pam to Ashley: Saw on Pool Schedule that there are at least 2 lifeguards on at every break except at 9:30 and 10 am and from 10:30 – 6:30 at night, there are 3 LG on. Your schedule show up to 4 LG on beginning at 1:30 – 6pm. Lori and board member informed Pam she was looking at

wrong one. Peter said Dan stated the pass office person is also a lifeguard, and Ashley said not the case this year. Lori offered to clarify, and Peter said he has a lot of questions that Dan will have to answer. Peter said the board had discussed with Dan how we could best utilize the pass person, and thinks there are a lot of ways maybe we can speak with Ashley about how that pass person could become a swing. He asked Ashley for clarification on the blank boxes on compromised schedule she put forward showing no LG on duty from 10:30 to 11:00. Ashley said that would be the swim instructor; instead of adding on 1.5 hours where they teach swimming lessons, which is a different schedule than the LG schedule. So there is only one LG while other is teaching lessons. Peter said we've been viewing schedules as LG coverage and what we are operating under, and want to make pool safe. He said, just as background to the membership, it was discussed that there were times of having 5 LG's on duty at any one time for size of pool was overkill, and looking at this to try and save money and also make sure we are being good stewards of HOA budget so we were looking to see if we could reduce this. Dan came up with three different schedules, one was where staffing levels weren't changed, a medium schedule where he cut a little bit and then the most economical staffing level he thought he could come up with while making sure we adhere to break regulations. So the board passed the most economical schedule which we thought was still viable, and I absolutely respect that you (Ashley) have made adjustments. I have questions why Dan didn't talk to you and staff prior to making those initial recommendations to us which I thought would be more appropriate and assume he had, so I am glad you (Ashley) are voicing your on this and appreciates it. Just to clarify, in revised budget you've put forward, there at some point on this day is a swim instructor on duty, but on LG. She clarified break should be at 9:30, so 9:30 – noon would only be one LG on, and swim lessons start at 10:30. Ashley clarified it would be same amount of hours by moving break to 9:30 slot. Peter asked if Ashley would like to continue. Ashley said she has never called 911 in 14 years for swimming and takes pride in that, and TD has averaged 7 times/year. She cares too much to see something dramatic happen. She knows everyone by name, including parents and lap swimmers, and wishes the board would come down and hang out and meet people and be part of the community. She doesn't want to see anything that would dramatically culture we have now. Marty appreciates all the time Ashley has put into this and feels her schedule is a wonderful compromise. Peter said it looks like the appreciable difference in her schedule is that a 3rd LG is added in the afternoon, and that she's okay with only one LG in morning. Ashley confirmed. He doesn't think \$2,000 is a lot of money to fight over if we are trying to insure safety and is fine passing this. Peter feels there are logistical ways and lots of options to utilize a lifeguard to do double duty in a way we can save additional money. Member asked how we would check people in. Peter said there are logistical ways in terms of gates, specific times, pass officers going around, etc. Peter would love to talk to her (Ashley) about that. Going back to what Jamie said in support of these comments by Dan being a little out of left field for me, and it is unfortunate Dan is not here. Ashley, maybe you can shed some light on this for me. I understand that when Dan created these schedules he apparently didn't talk to you in advance in creating the original schedules, is that correct? Ashley said he had told her board is looking to cut the pool budget and you guys had this meeting when I was on vacation and could not attend (Peter clarified it was not intentional on board's part). He had told me before I left that pool budget is on the agenda and that he was exploring cuts and that he was making one that would sked him to cut pool schedule and he was exploring cuts and that he was making one that would be bottom of road, and what we have now and the middle of the road. She thought the board would go with middle of road one. She thought the board would probably go for the middle of the road one and it wasn't that way when she came back she and Ken wanted to put some time into hashing this out. Jamie said if we do approve this change, then it might make Dan's statement mute because it's addressing something we've modified. Peter agreed and thinks it speaks to a larger issue.

- Peter said these are questions he would impose to Dan so appropriate thing is write them down and ask for Dan to respond to them in the future:
 - Loss of swim instructor/lesson program - not mentioned by Dan in discussions about previous budgets.
 - On the budget he proposed, there is a line item for 2019 swim teachers. In the full budget (one with no changes) that amount is \$1,638. In the slimmest budget that we approved that amount is \$1,584. That is a net decrease of \$54, so my question to Dan is why in the proposed (approved) budget that he is saying we are losing swim instructors and a lesson program unless there's other budget line items that reflect a lesson program not on that budget. Ashley said she could answer that – when she came back and Dan showed her that budget, she said she would not come back. Peter clarified Dan is essentially saying loss of swim instructor and lesson program is that Ashley is the swim instructor and lesson program and she would be gone. Ashley: Yes, same with Ken. Jamie clarified it's not financial cuts that eliminate that position, that it's Ashley feeling unsafe. Peter said it would have been nice of him to clarify. Ashley said he didn't know when he wrote that because I was gone. But with his knowledge now, it would've been nice.
 - Loss of senior pool staff. Peter is assuming same issue as it is Ashley.
 - Most worrisome: Possible violation of employee state break laws. Question for Dan is: Why would Dan propose a schedule with possibility it would break state break laws? Secondly, why would Dan allow the board to vote on a proposal that would possibly violate state laws?
 - Closure of pool due to low and no staffing. The number of days pool is slated to be open in both full budget and most minimal budget, and budget Ashley proposed, the number of pool days is same in all of those budget, it's 82 days. So the question for Dan then is to what is he referring to when he is saying that the schedule he proposed and we passed would result in closures of the pool due to low and no staffing? Again, that was out of left field.
 - Lower pass sales due to pool closures. Same question. According to his pool schedules the pool is going to be open the same number of days, so what is he referring to?
 - Difficulty in hiring and retaining qualified employees; I don't really know what that refers to. He has expressed difficulty in hiring and training lifeguards in general because of general job market and less availability so we actually trained our own lifeguards this year which was a success, right Ashley? Ashley: Correct
 - Regarding possible impacts on Glenshire community, that is a risk with any decision that anyone makes involved with this entire, so I don't know what that refers to.
 - The most worrisome is why a proposal made with the possibility of it violating state law. The board can only act in reliance on Dan's information; he is the holder of most information, and we are only as good as the information he gives us. So it is unacceptable in my estimation that a proposal was made that could possibly break the law and he allowed us to approve that schedule that could possibly break the law.
- Board member, Pam: Understands how important the pool is in this community. There is a whole other part of this community that never uses the pool and yet in their dues we have been spending \$60,000 (approx.) for the days pool is open, per year. That is why we decided to look at cutting some costs and it isn't that we don't want safety, although we asked Dan when we were discussing this, has there ever been a serious incident in the pool and he said no, which was one of the reasons we thought we could perhaps cut down on lifeguards; it isn't a huge pool. The board has considered the people that have never used this pool and yet still pay for it.
- Member, George Cereeze: Lives on Glenshire. Feels very fortunate to have been able to swim

here, and actually learned how to swim. The greatest concern I can see is if you lose these superstars, your revenue stream is going to really fall. As far as people not using the pool, why? What have you done to market it, what have we done to market this whole community? This is the hub of the wheel; all of us live out on spokes of this hub. Why aren't we more of a proactive community and encourage more people to come out. A lot of people are intimidated to come out whether it is the pool or whatever active sport it is. What if we help hold their hand to come out, why don't we encourage the seniors to come out for water aerobics, a walking club? Why don't we become a more active community instead of trying to draw back, which is I see is what you are doing? Why are we trying to cut this budget drastically? I understand what you're saying, but on the other hand, I moved to this neighborhood because this pool is there. My grandkids live here; Ashley's got my little granddaughter swimming, and we never thought she'd get her face wet, and we now can't get her out of the water. You guys have a super team here – don't lose it. You have a budget you created and understand people don't use it. Well, they have the choice to use it and not to use it. Why don't we become a more active community? I feel we're going in wrong direction.

- Member: Has an observation on comment on board member comment that we have been blessed on not having incidents at the pool. I've been paying insurance for my home and vehicles my whole life and the idea is that if something does happen you're covered and hope you never have to use it. As a person that uses that pool and has seen at various times of the day about 40 - 60 kids at pool, so thinks the staffing is probably perfect as it takes a lot of eyes to keep track of all that random stuff. The fact we haven't had any incidents is fabulous, maybe we'll never have one. It's a kind of insurance that keeps us safe and out of liability.
- Board member, Jamie: One thing, as a board, we are not looking to be pennywise and pound foolish and are not looking to make things go awry. We based our decision, I'm sorry Dan's not here, on information that Dan gave us, and we're finding out now it was not accurate information. We discussed heavily that we don't want someone to get hurt and not have staff to take care of them, and so forth like that. It's not until this proposal was brought to us and Ashley being here, that it's clarified for us we did not have accurate information, unfortunately. Any other public comments?
- Member & Staff, Ken Rae: Lived here for about 18 years and worked at this pool for about 12 years, and teaches at the school. There are so many members of this community that this pool is such an important part of. Has about 25-30 years of pool experience, either lifeguarding, teaching or running pools and in 25 years you gain a lot of knowledge and experience and prides himself in that and in the way pool is operated. Feels Dan is a major part of that as he operates this pool. Dan's name has been brought up and is sorry he is not here to defend himself, but I would say in my experience, I've never had anyone operate a pool more efficiently. He has 100% trust in Dan and totally appreciates what he does and if he was gone, I would have second thoughts of working here. In my experiences, I've seen with lifeguarding staff levels, the more you have, the more accidents and incidents can be reduced. The job of the lifeguard is to prevent accidents. As you reduce # of lifeguards, you increase # of accidents. We can only see so much; if you're looking here, something happens there. We've had dozens of assists in past years, but have had zero major accidents, not because we are not needed it's because we prevent it. Lifeguards enforce rules that are in place to stop accidents and injuries from happening and he's very proud of the fact that we haven't had any. He's been involved in a serious incident years ago, and because of that there was a major lawsuit. In my experience, I would say that if you actually reduce lifeguards, you will increase accidents and incidents, and with those come potential lawsuits which will be hundreds of times more expensive than the cost of a lifeguard. With my experience, would say that unless something is done about budget that was passed, I won't be a part of the pool and won't feel safe here, which is very sad because it's my neighbors, my students, I know them all, but I won't feel safe being at this pool and wouldn't lifeguard or teach as well.

- Board member, Marty: Asked Ken if compromised schedule we're looking at with 3 guards in the afternoon is what Ken and Ashley put together. Ken: Right. Marty: Asked if this schedule satisfies your feeling of safety. Ken: Said it was the lowest we could go to where we both felt that we could manage. Marty: asked what maximum capacity is. Ken: 71 or 72. Marty: So if you had maximum capacity and 3 guards on duty that would be about 25 per guard, and no one is allowed in at a certain age without parent accompanying them? Ken: Right. Marty: Parents are kind of like aids in classroom (Some of members: said "some"). So if you're okay with those 3 lifeguards (compromised schedule), I would certainly like to try this for a season and see how it goes. Ken: Ashley and I both felt we could handle it; it would be a big change, but it's possible.
- Board member, Jamie: If it looked like it was a disaster, we would re-visit it and re-discuss it and don't want somebody get hurt. As a board, we would take immediate action.
- Member, Alice: Surprised no known state rules and regulations. I'm sure there are codes on how to keep pools clean. She imagines you could survey other pools regarding ratios. She feels we have great parents but wouldn't count on them.
- Board member, Marty: Said we aren't replacing lifeguards with parents. Marty says if it's doable for a lifeguard to more or less keep their eye on 22.3 children or whatever, and we have other adults here, it may not be moms and dads but other adults present. If staff is comfortable, I'm comfortable.
- Member: A thought that he believes for a small investment, it could be possible as he sees at Tahoe Donner XC to have a device that swipes a pass with barcode on it that logs you in so you know who's been there and for how long. This could be a good aid instead of a guard physically checking you in and make it more efficient.
- Board member, Peter: That's one the logistical things we've been talking about in terms of having that pass person being able to be utilized as a lifeguard as well. I think there are a lot of logistics like that to make fourth person more efficient. Whether or not we are going to continue to sell snacks as it's not a big revenue source for us, but it's kind of a nice things as kids like to have them, not sure parents like that. Just to the point about being no regulations, and Ashley and Ken please correct me, but the information we've been given is that there are no official regulations about how many lifeguards you are required to have on. In fact, we are not required, though we would never do this because safety is something we are very concerned with, to have any lifeguards on duty whatsoever. There are lots of hotel pools that just have the liability placard posted and you swim at your own risk. We don't want to do that because we value our kids and community members and we want to make sure that they're safe so we will always have lifeguards on duty, but it's just a matter of balance is what we're trying to achieve. It was unanimously agreed that having five lifeguards on duty at one time at the pool and because the pool is such an enormous cost center and because there have been many other community members that complained about how it such a budget suck for the HOA in general that we are just looking at ways to try and reduce costs while not sacrificing safety.
- Member: Feels the pool is the main asset of community other than the view. There's really nothing else out here and to keep minimizing the value of the pool? And I understand there are a lot of people that don't use it at all. I have five family members and one doesn't know how to swim and the other one never comes except sometimes with his kids. It helps their property values, and how many things do we pay for that we don't use ourselves; we still pay school taxes, if we don't have kids in school. This is the main asset, as I view it, here and to keep cutting back will have less and less people using it. Agrees with George, let's get a swim aerobics class going, build it up - there's many seniors and younger people too that want to keep swimming laps - it's warm weather, but there's never any money in the budget. I think there's some flaws in the rebuilding because not any teenagers us it now because no diving board; I understand it from going to the meetings with insurance. It's always into minimizing;

- the pool used to be packed, like last year lap swim was extended and this year it's cut back and many of us haven't been that vocal and there's a whole side of people who love the pool and see it as a very special thing here.
- Board member, Jamie: You being here and making comments if what can affect the board. And part of our job is to look for areas to save on costs. Marty would love to get rid of outhouse that is here, but I fight for it to stay. We are always looking for ways to save on costs. It's not that we're wanting to minimize the facilities here; I was thrilled to write out a check for the new pool. I've walked around it; I work too much and have not had time to swim, but was very happy because as you mentioned, it maintains my property value.
 - Member: Asked what money we generate from extra fee the pool users pay
 - Board member, Peter: It never breaks even; pool passes are \$35 - \$40k/year. The pool costs the association roughly \$30k/year. That's fine, it's an amenity; it's not necessarily meant to be revenue neutral or a money maker. It may never be able to be that, but that's fine; it's an amenity. We don't at this point generate enough revenue for passes in order to cover costs.
 - Member: But the balance is within \$20 - \$30k for rest of the population?
 - Peter: Asked what are actual numbers? Pam: Pass income: \$34k. Lori: Total pool costs have been approximately \$90k/year. Peter was just speaking about salaries (approx. \$60k cost). So with chemicals and other costs, the pool costs \$90k/year to run and generating \$35k/year revenue to cover that.
 - Board member, Jamie: Asked members if they have other questions, to please email us or something, especially if contrary.
 - Member, Analise Miller: Wanted to let us know she wrote the email and was one of the people that never used the pool and was intimidated. I agree with George and other member that if you could offer more things to older people like water aerobics or teach lap swimming. I just started a month as a half ago and love it. I was one of the people that wasn't happy with the cost increase of pool, but if you start reaching out and offering more things, you will get more people.
 - Board member, Peter: Wants to be very clear that we are not cutting anything we do at the pool, we are simply trying to make the lifeguards more efficient, so we are not cutting any amenities, no hours, no days, no nothing that has to do with the pool. I want to be very clear about that. We are just looking at in conjunction with pool manager and general manager how to make lifeguarding more efficient and trying to save some money. So we are not cutting any services or availability at the pool, just
 - Board member, Jamie: I'm sorry, we're going to have to move on.
 - Member, George Cereeze: Many of us made efforts to come for this; everyone has stuff going on. I don't think we should be short changed a couple minutes. I'm sorry you have other things to do, I really am, but if there's more people that have things to say, I feel you should hear them out.
 - Board member, Jamie: Okay.
 - Member: We had lap swim extended last year 2 or 3 weeks and that was cut this year.
 - Board member, Marty: What we are talking about now is 2019, and I would love to see lap swim season extended and hours extended because it's a little chilly at 9:00 am. At this point, I love what Ashley and Ken put together. I think it's reasonable we should try this for next year and see how it goes. It may not be perfect; we may have to go back and make other changes, but we'll never know until we try it and if it meets Ashley and Ken's standards and doesn't change overall hours that pool is available, we'll see how it goes; that's how I'm standing on it.
 - Member, Marta Hammond: Wants to be voice for the families and people that absolutely love this pool. We have raised our children at this pool, had pot lucks and kids birthday parties at this pool. There is a huge community in Glenshire that passionately love this place and this is our community center. We may not be representative here because we are working parents

- and can't get here during week. It is impossible for me to come here in the middle of the week on an evening because of family needs. I just want to say there is a huge community of us that love this place and are here all the time, but we're not all available to come to the meetings. We think you do a tremendous job. I love the lap swimming, I love what you guys are doing and really appreciate all who sit on board for those of us that can't, and she would if she could. Wants to say thank you and let you know how much we do love this place and how much it is utilized even though we may not be able to have as loud of a voice as the people that are available. Saying this on behalf of those unable to speak up. Just want to put that out there.
- Board member, Jamie: Want to let you know if you are not able to attend the meetings, we will listen, whether an email or call the staff and give a message. You are definitely represented, but we can't know what you don't tell us. Thanks for letting me know we needed to spend more time on this, sorry I was rushing.
 - Member, George Cerezee: Now that we've saved so much on the budget, does that mean that we can we take that money and extend the season? The rec center is closed for a couple weeks; could we work with them while they are closed and we stay open so their swimmers can come here, and when we're closed we can go there when they re-open?
 - Member: Maybe we can charge other swimmers to come in here
 - Board member, Jamie: If you could put these thoughts in an email, because this is something we can't take action on today as they're not on agenda, or speak at public comment in future meeting, we can put on future board meeting agenda to discuss.
 - Motion: Peter motioned we accept the 2019 budget as proposed with the staff recommended changes to the pool budget which was slightly more than the board approved at the last meeting. And the one budget item we need more input on that will be approved at a later date is the \$5,000 for HR consultant. Approved 4 - 0.
 - Member: Asked if \$15 dues increase is planned to go toward lake health, and feels lake health is important.
 - Board members, Marty and Jamie: Confirmed yes.

2. Presentations:

2. GDRA President, Jamie Brimer. "State of the Association"

- Jamie: "Things are going very well, and if you have questions let us know. And, thank you very much for letting me serve as president for the past year as this will be the last meeting; I will be stepping down as president. Thank you very much."
- Results of Election: Jamie: I would like to congratulate Carla Embertson, who is sitting here right now, who will be joining the board. We had a board member step away a couple months ago, so that's why there have only been four of us here recently. Thank you very much Carla. You will be getting a packet and binder. Dan's going to be on vacation, so you can get together with any of us to go over questions and procedures or anything like that.
- Jamie: We have two current members that we want to stay on and will be appointing to each of their seats. Peter and Marty, and will be choosing their positions. Is there anyone in the audience that would like to propose someone to fulfill a board seat? Seeing none. We'll move on and has to have clarification on the seat term that each of them will be fulfilling and then proposing Peter Tucker and Marty Frantz for other seat.
- Peter: One seat to replace board member who stepped down, which is one year. Then one board position, which is one full two year term.
- Jamie: Without violating something I am not aware of, can we appoint Peter to two year term and Marty to one year term?
- Jamie motioned: We appoint Carla Embertson to two year term: Approved 4 - 0.
- Jamie motioned: We appoint Peter Tucker to two year term seat: Approved 4 - 0.
- Jamie motioned: Marty Frantz be appointed to one year term: Approved 4 - 0.

V. New Business (Continued)

3. Open member forum

- Member: Feels STR 5 rules in newsletter aren't comprehensive enough. Also didn't talk about parking, what ifs, garbage in yard, and only one thing we can do about mitigating noise is by calling cops.
- Board member, Peter: Asked if he attended STR workshop or meetings. Said there was a very comprehensive STR committee process that went for almost a year and came up with a full set of recommendations that are ten times more extensive than what was published in the newsletter. The rest of the regulations that we are proposing to address STRs are extensive enough that they require changes to the CC&Rs of HOA. That entire set of recommendations in newsletter could be voted on has now been folded into CC&R committee, in addition to addressing other needed changes to CC&Rs that have not been updated in 20 years. There will be a lot of communication and publication around that so membership is very aware, and then CC&R, including STR proposed changes will be put to a vote by the membership.
- Member: Where is best source to keep up on CC&R meeting information if we can't attend?
Board member, Peter: We will have at least two public forums on CC&Rs revision proposal, and talked about having an entire issue of Shire dedicated to the CC&Rs revision proposal. E-blasts will be sent as well. He feels it's important to be extremely transparent, just like STR committee presentation, the CC&R presentation will be on website. Everyone needs to know as much about this as possible. People will be able to comment on and learn about what proposed CC&R changes are, and any issues will and the how we're specifically going to try and address them. The committee will review Bylaws, CC&Rs and the Rules.
- Member: Having a whole new set of rules and guidelines will require more time by staff.
- Board member, Peter: They have all time in world to answer questions to member. One proposed change will be to have a one-time fee to help offset staff costs.
- Board member, Pam: Said if there is a trash problem, contact GDRA and Dan will go out and there will be consequences.
- Member: Said no problem now, but they will occur.
- Board member, Carla: Asked staff if on website. Lori: Thinks there is an outline on website, not sure the presentation is there.
- Member, Alice: Asked about what percentage of STRs they feel there will be in Glenshire.
- Board member, Peter: Recalls that as of time the STR committee did presentation, there were roughly 27, 2% of Glenshire that were actively renting. Got this information from Truckee. We assume there are some not registered. A lot of what we talked about in committee is making sure STR issue did not become as big a problem here as it already has in other areas.
- Board member, Marty: Said distinction made between year round residents vs 2nd homeowner, distinction between owner present vs owner absent rentals. Idea was to incentivize owner present year round residents to allow them if they need to do some STR for financial reasons, to not pull that rug out from underneath them. And to dis-incentivize very strongly 2nd homeowners that are just running a year round business.
- Board member, Jamie: We don't want Glenshire to become a Tahoe Donner.
- Member, Annalise: Question on extending lap swim – when would the board be discussing/deciding this?
- Board member, Jamie: Said, unfortunately, we would have to have on a future meeting agenda and need a cost analysis to be done. Unfortunately a little bit of formality involved so it wouldn't happen this year. So we will discuss and agenda for future meeting.
- Board member, Peter: Said maybe we extend it a certain amount and at end of pool season we happen to have achieved cost savings, there may be a way to include flexibility in budget to

extend it. To your point, getting information out to members and being able to utilize that time is paramount. Otherwise it would be a waste of money to the association.

- Member, Annalise: Thinks throughout the summer people talked with Dan about requesting extended lap swim and thinks there was a miscommunication.
- Board members, Peter/Marty: It was never brought up to us.
- Board member, Jamie: We weren't aware of it.
- Board member, Jamie: Board wouldn't want to approve it, but it's just going to come down to the costs. As this gentleman mentioned about swipe card, which is great. Then where do we get the money without raising dues. This will be an item we will be discussing; it's not going to go away.
- Board member, Jamie: Said we need to get something in the Shire and have it say it will be at our next meeting. It's a matter of modifying our budget, talking to Ashley and Ken to make sure it logistically all works and then comes before board and public comment and board will vote on it.
- Board member, Marty: Mentioned people can sign up for emails on our website and will receive agendas and know when this item is on an agenda.
- Member: Is there a problem with short term rentals?
- Board members: Yes, there was one.
- Member: It seems to be getting more out of proportion. He works at Tahoe Donner and doesn't get many calls, and the few they get are homeowners not liking fact that someone is living next to them. There was one that a 12 pack of beer left out on deck. Just hoping we're not buying trouble and spending time, energy and resources on things not necessary.
- Board members, Pam: Said STR committee all volunteers. Thinks that once all is folded into CC&Rs people will see that all is fair.
- Board member, Jamie: We don't want another Tahoe Donner, not talking about complaints, but about weekends being busy because of the noise. Glenshire has been a community of full-time homeowners and we want to see that remain. Said we are not looking to change CC&Rs because of STRs, but many other items created years ago that are obsolete now. So, STR would become part of that but not because of it.
- Member: I work for an association that is paying much to staff because of monitoring STR's. He has a concern of staff cost increase, unless it's truly a problem for us. Or maybe there will be an additional item budgeted?
- Board member, Peter: No added cost because staff is already here to handle calls. Concerns because people calling in re: trash, noise – this is a concern and is very important to deal with issue now – being ahead of the game. This is time to put structures in place that will help preserve the year round residential atmosphere of Glenshire, and that's been expressed by the membership through surveys and a lot of different venues.
- Board member, Jamie: We wanted to be proactive instead of reactive.
- Member, Miriam Hoffman: Saw 60 to 70% of mail boxes down Whitehorse and Manchester. Board recommended calling police and post office.
- Member, Richard Grundy: House at end of Juniper Hills with driveway that goes down to Chickwich Reach. Now that another house is in, a new street has been made into our subdivision. Jamie suggested going to Town of Truckee/Nevada County.
- Board member, Peter Tucker: Recommended finding out if they had permission to put in that driveway. Should be public record.
- Member: Huge amounts of trucks. Permit should be public record and find out what right agency at Nevada County is to talk to. It's a thoroughfare. The board should look at this, not me.
- Board member, Pam: Says recourse is through Nevada County, not GDRA jurisdiction, but agrees they should not make a driveway a thoroughfare.

- Board member, Jamie: Offered to try and help by contacting Town of Truckee.
- Member: Said Town can't help. Can also talk to Juniper Hills Association.
- Member/Staff, Ken: Would love to invite board members out to the pool after meeting to take a look at what goes on at the pool.
- Board member, Pam: Invites everyone to have lunch out there.

VI. Adjournment: 11:45 a.m.

Submitted by:



Lori Kelley, Admin. Assistant

Approved by:



Peter Tucker, Secretary

