Raspberry Mountain Ranch Property Owners' Association
Annual Meeting October 3, 2025

Members were welcomed by the President, Chris Matson. The meeting was called to order at 4:05pm by Aliyah Field, moderating.

Roll call documented those members attending in person or by zoom link (each lot owned allows one vote).

Don Elias
Gayle & Doug Mayne – new members
Cole Bedford
Chris & David Matson
Aliyah Field
Colleen Millard
Paul Nichols
Mark Lancaster
Don Atwood – on line
Chris Daly – on line
John and Cynthia Salvesen
Tom Lessar
Jennifer Convery - on line

Proxies were certified:
For Aliyah:
Matthew Bayless –
Eve Berman
Eileen Fritson
Tom Bettis
Andrew Spruiell
Chris Daly, contingent on zoom connection

For Chris:
Myland Pride
Forrest Dykstra

For Mark Lancaster:
Cory Fassiotto

<u>Old Business:</u>
<u>Fencing:</u> Fencing repair was completed last year by members coordinated by Chris Daly; with clearing of cattle guards completed early in the summer by Paul Nichols in collaboration with CRE and Tim Wood. Maintaining intact fences is now the responsibility of the holder of the grazing lease for a three-year period (starting in 2025).

Control of noxious weeds: Chris presented the benefits and requirements for controlling noxious weeds on Raspberry including more space for native wildflowers and grasses, and thus more beautiful meadows and increased property values; reduced spread of noxious weeds to downwind neighbors and beyond; and compliance with Colorado law mandating landowner responsibility for managing noxious weeds. The weeds designated in the law as list B and C weeds ('management required') were identified, and detailed management methods reviewed for our most abundant noxious weeds: knapweed and common mullein. She described resources including County weed office, commercial sprayers and sources for identifying noxious weeds, listed under Resources. For members interested in a team approach to manual removal of mullein and knapweed, feel free to contact Chris Matson to discuss options. The presentation will be posted on RMR-POA website; including relevant Architectural Standard policies.

Potential sale of our Volvo grader
N.B.: Background for evaluating budget Scenario #2 (discussed later in the agenda, and in retrospect, discussing the intertwined nature of the potential grader sale and the income/expense columns earlier may have clarified the budget discussion) is that RMR-POA and CRE board members recruited (a handshake agreement) Ron Jameson this summer (of Chaparral Construction; a company located within 3 miles of our entrance, with decades of experience with roads in the area), to upgrade and maintain our roads, beginning with most-needed and -used areas on Mountain Valley Rd; to plow the major roads for each snowfall of >6 inches, and to offer optional plowing for private driveways ($75/plow if automatic plowing is requested; and $120/plow if owner opts for 'optional' plan. For optional plowing, owner would have responsibility for notifying Chaparral (719-989-1337) prior to their clearing RMR roads.)
Given that Cuchara River Estates committed to $10,000 to begin upgrades to trouble spots on Mountain Valley Rd; and that RMR-POA and CRE have collaborated financially on maintaining this key road for RMR-POA members' access for at least the last 8 years, the board authorized up to $10,000 to start this much-needed road upgrade, with timing dependent on moisture availability on the roads.

Budget discussion:

Aliyah introduced the budget discussion by showing the previously-distributed budget, with sources of income (primarily members' dues and grazing lease); and the major expense item in RMR-POA budget: road maintenance. She presented two alternatives for road maintenance expense:
Scenario #1: retaining our 24 year-old Volvo grader, and continuing to recruit, retain and pay an individual to operate the grader including providing an option to plow snow for private owners; maintaining the grader (e.g. defending it against rodent attack), preventive maintenance, replacement of deteriorated parts as needed such as tires; paying insurance for grader and liability for its operation; and accepting the depreciation inherent in aging equipment. The approximate annual cost for these items over the last two years has been $9240.
Scenario #2: Authorize the board to sell the grader (the board has received a low end offer of $20,000) using due diligence to obtain the best possible price, within an optimal

term of time, accessing the best possible input from those with experience in selling heavy equipment (e.g., auctioneers, RMR members with experience, regional contractors). Board members reported their findings to date, including Aliyah's exploring interest from local contractors and regional equipment dealers, Don's reviewing some auctioneers' experience including one experienced with on-line sales of heavy equipment (Mr Hoobler); as well as Mark Lancaster reporting his experience with equipment sales; and that he'd met auctioneer Mr Hoobler this morning and discussed an approach to selling the grader. With this scenario, the expenses, including depreciation, associated with owning the grader would be avoided, and cash obtained from the sales could be considered for needed road maintenance, with membership approval. And the considerable time requirement for maintaining the grader -AND assuring a competent, reliable operator-would no longer be needed.

Aliyah responded to Mark's question regarding possible need for increasing member dues to support needed road repairs by requesting holding that question until we determine outcome of decision re: grader sale; with potential addition of cash from that sale into 'income' column; that with members' dues and access fees paid by non-members is approximately $30,000 annually.

*grader heist: Alluded to during the budget discussion: An individual who is not a member of RMR-POA took the grader without permission during a 50+ inch snow event that prevented his reaching his rental house in RMR. The grader was not damaged, but some damage to the roads occurred; and we lost our previous grader operator partially because of the incident. The individual's company paid the damage and use fees that the board assessed; and the homeowner paid for costs of training a new grader operator (who unfortunately died by suicide several months later). The incident demonstrates some of the risk and drama associated with owning and operating our own grader.

Don moved to accept the budget with two contingencies: a) that approval to sell the grader would delete insurance, maintenance and fuel costs and b) without the sale of the grader, the budget would include these costs. David seconded the motion.

In the discussion of the motion, Mark reported his experience this morning with trying to start the grader; and suggested removing the engine panels to deter potential rodent invasion. Don's motion then passed unanimously.

Next Don moved to authorize the board to exercise due diligence in preparing the grader for sale including creating a video for marketing on line, working with local auctioneer Mr Hoobler to sell by on-line auction. Motion was seconded by Chris Daly.

The discussion included costs of NOT selling the grader as discussed under Budget Scenario #1; risks of further deterioration of tires, etc. and associated depreciation; and best time to sell (e.g., related to beginning of snow season, and tax benefits for potential purchaser). Mark framed a friendly amendment to the motion: set $25,000 as a minimum acceptable price; accepted by Don. Another amendment was also accepted: April 2026 as a time limit for the sale. The motion passed unanimously.

<u>Report of Architectural Review Committee (Chris Daly, chair)</u>

<u>Background:</u>

1. Covenants and Declarations need a majority vote by a quorum of the membership (e.g., height restrictions); the Architectural Standards (e.g., siding of buildings) are within the approval authority of the Board.

2. At the 2024 annual meeting, the ARC presented their recommendations that a single height limitation replace the 2 ½ story limitation within our Covenants. That single measurement was referred back to the ARC for reconsideration. The committee, whose members' credentials include architectural and building certification, decades of experience with planning and building homes, as well as years of service on RMR-POA's Architectural Review Committee, researched Colorado local governments and HOAs with hilly terrain to arrive at a commonly used and defensible approach.

Chris D presented the conclusions of the committee: that using 2 ½ stories for the height restriction is problematic; with variability in definition across jurisdictions or architectural contexts. The committee recommends using 35 feet from an average of the natural grade, based on its more straightforward measurability; information from rural fire protection districts that 35 feet is the highest structure they consider defensible on a house fire; and that it is among the highest maximum height in Colorado for regulated single family residences.

A long discussion ensued that included Mark's objection to the committees' recommendation, questioning of the committee's due diligence and credentials for their conclusions, and his different view of definitions regarding height specifications. Different opinions were expressed in support of the Committee's work, credentials and process. Another member expressed that more background could have been more recently provided to the membership prior to this discussion; the appropriateness of which was acknowledged, given the very long term that committee had worked on the issues; their energy invested; and the complexity for those not versed in architectural issues. At the conclusion of the discussion, Don moved to accept the ARC's recommendation of 35 feet as the maximum height for building in RMR; Cole seconded the motion; but the motion failed.

Mark volunteered to send definitions to the board related to height restrictions for which he reports having knowledge differing from the ARC's conclusions.

N.B. Given that the term of service for the ARC specified in the Architectural Standards Policy is 2 years, Chris Daly will be stepping down to allow another member to be appointed by the board, and to replace any other member who might leave. The ARC tasks remaining include:

1. Continuing to offer required review of required architectural plan for any new construction planned by members, to avoid delays for those members desiring to build within RMR.

2. Determining whether to continue to address a maximum height restriction for building plans more easily defined and implemented than “2 ½’ stories” that is acceptable to a majority of a quorum of the membership. The most recently approved Architectural Standards policy effective May 3, 2025 specifies “2 ½ stories’ as the maximum height restriction.

3. Once the height issue is addressed, if changed; (and measuring procedure clarified) then the relevant sections of the Architectural Standard Policy need to be revised for consistency within RMR-POA’s founding documents.

<u>Other business</u>

John asked for clarification regarding restrictions on plowing Rawhide and how those affect his ability to access his property with snowfalls. His request was noted and will be addressed by the board.

<u>Next year’s annual meeting:</u>

Consensus for time/date next year’s annual meeting was Oct 2, 2026 at 3:30 (hopefully allows us to meet at the La Veta public library; members will be informed of location.)

The meeting was adjourned ~ 6:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Matson