

PHEASANT RUN ROAD MAINTENANCE ASSOCIATION, INC.
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MEETING SUMMARY
September 1, 2010
6:30 p.m.

A regular meeting of the Pheasant Run Road Maintenance Association, Inc., Board of Directors was held at the Administration Building, Leisure Services Conference Room on Wednesday, September 1, 2010.

Members Present: Ann Conklin, Canton Township, Tom Casari, Canton Township, Mark Waldbauer, Pheasant View, Craig Stephens, Fairways, Pete Sandys, Fairway Pines

Members Absent: None

Others: Tim Kljun, Roadway Manager

I. Call to Order

Ms. Conklin called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

a. Approval of Meeting Minutes:

- i. July 14, 2010 Meeting Minutes
Motion by Waldbauer, supported by Stephens to approve the minutes for July 14, 2010 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

II. Financial Activity Review:

a. Current Reports

Mr. Kljun stated he closed the books for the month of August, 2010 and each Board member was emailed the financials and narratives for the month ending August 31, 2010. Mr. Kljun stated the “future road repair accounts” (reserve account) is currently at \$176,703. The expenses for the month of August 2010 totaled nearly \$10,000, with accrued expenses from the previous month. The first portion of the roadway expenses was paid which totaled approximately \$207,000. Mr. Kljun stated he was informed this morning PRRMA will still probably own \$45,000 in expenses for the roadways. Ms. Conklin stated this is not additional expenses. These expenses were projected and nothing out of the ordinary. Mr. Kljun stated if there are any Board member questions, please contact him.

Mr. Kljun stated PRRMA is now in the first quarter of the 2010/2011 fiscal year. Three subdivisions: Fairways, Fairway Pines and Pheasant View have submitted their dues contributions for the first quarter.

Mr. Kljun stated the current cash position in the checking account is \$44,506. Mr. Kljun stated some additional money will have to be withdrawn from the reserve account to cover anticipated final invoices.

b. Cash Flow Projections

- i. Reserve “SIM PRRMA” Update (Craig Stephens)

Mr. Stephens stated a lot of the golf cart crossing were redone and arranged to have them striped. Mr. Casari stated Planning is inquiring beyond the striping what will be done? Will we consider a tape that makes it look like cobblestone crossing? Mr. Waldbauer inquired if it is substantially more expensive to paint the width of the golf cart crossing a solid pigment. Ms. Conklin stated we looked into that. Mr. Casari stated there is actually a decal that will last a few years. Mr. Waldbauer stated he would be in favor of something more than crosshatching. Mr. Waldbauer stated even a solid color would be good.

Mr. Stephens stated he had a starting balance of \$391,000 as of July 31, 2010 which was the projection. Our general expenses for next year are close to \$27,000, maintenance is just over \$21,000 and our budget of \$320,000 for the roads. The total amount of funding for the fiscal year is \$368,000 will be required. This was an adjustment factor to try and even out the expenses so we did not completely run out of money. We needed to push some of the funding obligations further out. Mr. Kljun stated the July 31, 2010 balance sheet showed an ending balance of \$383,935. Mr. Stephens stated the \$391,000 was what was projected; however he would like to be accurate and will change the starting balance. Mr. Stephens stated when we began looking at this spread sheet we indicated we would need to increase our dues by 10% each year, until the 2015-2016 time frame. Mr. Stephens stated with the way we have planned the roads and managed the money and the redistribution of the percentages of the roads, it looks a lot better. There is one year we need to go up by 10%, but by in large, we have some pretty low numbers. Two years we don't have to raise the dues at all. The remaining increases look to be at 5%.

Mr. Stephens stated he feels PRRMA is in much better shape now than a few months ago. Mr. Waldbauer stated Pheasant View's picture is not as rosy. Mr. Waldbauer stated they would like to lower their dues and collect from all residents than to continue to raise the dues and not collect. As the dues increase they see fewer people paying. Mr. Waldbauer stated Pheasant View will relax the dues to \$500 and see if they can get everyone back on board and this will give them more money. Mr. Waldbauer stated if Pheasant View raised the dues and doesn't get it, we are still no further ahead. Mr. Kljun stated you can lower the dues and still not get it. Mr. Waldbauer stated that could very well happen.

Ms. Conklin stated the construction cost may not be \$320,000 either, it may be significantly less. Mr. Casari stated Al's Paving is honoring the same price next year. Mr. Casari stated there maybe years out that we might only be spending \$150,000. However, we need to stick to the model for the time being.

Mr. Waldbauer stated the homeowners at the Pheasant View Subdivision Annual Meeting were pretty adamant to park the dues at \$500 and let them get caught up. Mr. Waldbauer inquired if there was a way to pay in installments. Mr. Waldbauer stated his covenants and by-laws don't provide for that. Mr. Waldbauer stated annual assessments are due by January 1 according to the by-laws. Mr. Sandys stated Fairway Pines has been allowing homeowners to work out a payment plan. Mr. Waldbauer inquired what Fairway Pines does if the homeowner does not meet the annual assessment due date. Mr. Sandys we give them three months, after that we charge late fees. Mr. Sandys stated for those that want the lien taken off their homes we try to work out a payment plan to get them caught up. Ms. Conklin stated for the Summit membership, we do the automatic deposit from their checking account and possibly the HOA could do the same. Mr. Waldbauer stated the by-laws are very specific the annual assessment

is due by a certain date. Ms. Conklin inquired if the Board could change their by-laws. Mr. Waldbauer stated yes there is an amendment process and would require the entire subdivision to amend the change. Mr. Waldbauer inquired if a resident does not have the quarterly lump sum, have they been allowed to make payments. Mr. Sandys stated no, only the residents who are behind. Mr. Waldbauer stated there are some residents that want to spread it out over the year after it is due. Mr. Waldbauer stated this simulation is making the assumption that all HOA are 100% collective. Ms. Conklin stated it also makes the assumption we will spend \$320,000 every year and we will not.

Mr. Stephens stated his fear is that if a subdivision is not able to pay their share of the dues, then we run into a serious problem. Mr. Stephens stated he has no idea what PRRMA would do at that point. Mr. Waldbauer stated that is why he brings this subject up. Mr. Waldbauer stated he has homeowners walking away from their homes, and are taking some of the inside structures in the homes with them. Mr. Sandys stated he has some of the same issues. He would like to suggest that sometime in November we have a three-hour session to discuss these issues. Ms. Conklin stated we have had joint meetings in the past and are probably overdue for one. Mr. Stephens stated Fairways has negotiated some payment plans. Mr. Kljun stated we could use the 1% per month delinquent fee such as what they use for delinquent taxes. Mr. Kljun inquired if the associations could use this fee also to encourage payments. Mr. Stephens stated Fairways charges late fees. Mr. Waldbauer stated his late fee is 12%. Mr. Stephens stated the late fees do not seem to be a deterrent for some.

Mr. Casari stated possibly a planning model with AI's asphalt would be a good idea.

Mr. Stephens stated he will adjust the simulation for the projected non-payment rate.

Mr. Stephens showed the current bank balances for Pheasant View and Fairways; however he did not have the bank balance for Fairway Pines.

Funding to maintain at PASER Roadway Rating at 57 is as follows:

V5.0 Added in Links Contribution, rebase to 2008
 V6.0 Added in the accounting for homes that did not pay, corrected error in 2019/20 formula

PRRMA Homes 734

Rate of Inflation 1.04

Year	ACTUAL	PROJECTED										TOTAL	AVERAGE	
	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20			
Starting Balance as of July 31 Each Year	490.00	383.94	263.94	143.94	43.94	17.94	17.94	17.94	17.94	17.94	17.94	17.94		
General Expenses (k\$)	30.80	26.99	28.07	29.19	30.36	31.58	32.84	34.15	35.52	36.94	38.42	324.07		
Maintenance (not roads) (k\$)	14.10	21.10	21.94	22.82	23.73	24.68	25.67	26.70	27.77	28.88	30.03	253.33		
Road Maintenance (k\$)	320.00	320.00	320.00	320.00	320.00	320.00	320.00	320.00	320.00	320.00	320.00	3200.00	320.00	
Annual Funding Required (k\$)	364.90	368.09	370.02	372.02	374.10	376.26	378.51	380.85	383.29	385.82	388.45	3777.40		
Additional Funding for Future Anticipated Expense (k\$)	-124.00	-120.00	-120.00	-100.00	-26.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-366.00		
TOTAL Funding Required (k\$)	240.90	248.09	250.02	272.02	348.10	376.26	378.51	380.85	383.29	385.82	388.45	3411.40		
The Links Contribution	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
TOTAL PRRMA Funding Required (k\$)	240.90	248.09	250.02	272.02	348.10	376.26	378.51	380.85	383.29	385.82	388.45	3411.40		
Canton Township Share 20.48% (k\$)	49.34	50.78	51.18	55.68	71.26	77.02	77.48	77.96	78.46	78.98	79.52	698.31		
Fairways Share 28.22% (k\$)	67.98	70.01	70.55	76.76	98.23	106.18	106.82	107.48	108.16	108.88	109.62	962.70		
Fairway Pines Share 32.96% (k\$)	79.40	81.77	82.41	89.66	114.73	124.02	124.76	125.53	126.33	127.17	128.03	1124.40		
Pheasant View Share 18.34% (k\$)	44.18	45.50	45.85	49.89	63.84	69.01	69.42	69.85	70.29	70.76	71.24	625.65		

Fairways		HOA Annual Expenses per Home (\$)	263.19	428.53	246.09	255.93	266.17	276.81	287.89	299.40	311.38	323.83	336.79	3032.83	
Number of Homes	PRRMA Funds Required per Home (\$)	258.49	266.20	268.27	291.87	373.51	403.73	406.14	408.66	411.27	413.98	416.81	416.81	3660.44	
263	Average HOA Annual Dues per Home (\$) - See below	500.00	514.58	550.00	577.50	606.38	636.69	668.53	701.95	737.05	773.91	773.91	773.91	6540.50	654.05
Initial Bank Balance (k\$)	Number of Unpaid Homes	0.00	11.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00		
70	HOA Surplus (k\$)	-5.70	-53.04	3.87	2.03	-14.82	-17.90	-13.39	-8.62	-3.58	1.75	-2.40	-2.40	-106.10	
	HOA Bank Balance (k\$)	64.30	67.99	71.87	73.90	59.08	41.18	27.79	19.16	15.58	17.33	14.93	14.93		

Fairways Pines		HOA Annual Expenses per Home (\$)	225.00	234.00	243.36	253.09	263.22	273.75	284.70	296.08	307.93	320.25	333.05	2809.43	
Number of Homes	PRRMA Funds Required per Home (\$)	256.96	264.63	266.68	290.15	371.30	401.34	403.75	406.24	408.84	411.54	414.35	414.35	3638.82	
309	Average HOA Annual Dues per Home (\$) - See below	435.00	515.75	541.54	568.61	625.48	656.75	689.59	724.07	760.27	760.27	760.27	760.27	6602.59	660.26
Initial Bank Balance (k\$)	Number of Unpaid Homes	0.00	22.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00		
21	HOA Surplus (k\$)	-14.51	-6.06	4.32	2.15	-9.05	-12.24	-6.54	-0.52	5.84	1.20	-3.63	-3.63	-24.52	
	HOA Bank Balance (k\$)	6.49	24.94	29.26	31.41	22.36	10.13	3.59	3.06	8.90	10.10	6.48	6.48		

Pheasant View		HOA Annual Expenses per Home (\$)	226.00	195.00	202.80	210.91	219.35	228.12	237.25	246.74	256.61	266.87	277.55	2341.19	
Number of Homes	PRRMA Funds Required per Home (\$)	272.72	280.86	283.04	307.95	394.08	425.96	428.51	431.16	433.92	436.78	439.76	439.76	3862.04	
162	Average HOA Annual Dues per Home (\$) - See below	512.23	513.33	514.58	539.58	564.58	592.81	589.58	619.06	650.01	650.01	715.01	715.01	5948.56	594.86
Initial Bank Balance (k\$)	Number of Unpaid Homes	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
0	HOA Surplus (k\$)	2.19	0.94	4.66	3.36	-7.91	-9.93	-12.34	-9.53	-6.56	-8.69	-0.37	-0.37	-46.39	
	HOA Bank Balance (k\$)	2.19	50.94	55.59	58.95	51.03	41.11	28.77	19.23	12.67	3.98	3.61	3.61		

Ratio of Homes to Roadway Area	
Fairways	8.28
Fairway Pines	9.29
Pheasant View	7.07

Average Annual Dues Calculator (for PRRMA Aug 1 Financial Year)		
Last Years Dues	This Years Dues	Average Annual
500	525	514.58

III. Unfinished Business:

a. Road Repairs

i. Discussion on Seal Coating

Ms. Conklin stated she received an email from Al's Paving indicating they have one more full day to finish the seal coating. Due to the weather they need to cancel. Notices will be sent to all Board members for the cancellation. Ms. Conklin stated Glengarry is the one roadway left for seal coating and the redo areas.

Ms. Conklin stated she did receive Mr. Stephens's suggestions for next year and she totally agrees with and make a matter of record.

The suggestions are as follows;

Better signage, addresses not lot numbers

Maintain a master schedule to mail out via the webmaster

Use portable barricade in some areas

Use yellow tape the day before

Ms. Conklin stated there will be some additional fees, unknown at this time, for seal coating the areas they have to go back to. Mr. Casari stated it shouldn't be much at 6 or 8 cents per foot.

Ms. Conklin stated the response has been pretty positive. Residents are generally happy with the end results. Mr. Stephens stated he did not get too many complaints even about the scheduling. He did receive a few. Most of the complaints came from the Board, very few from the homeowners.

Ms. Conklin stated homeowners came up to her and stated the communication was outstanding and the end product was great and they are very pleased. Mr. Waldbauer stated once we got past the sidewalks it went quite well. Ms. Conklin stated we provided suggestions to the contractor. Ms. Conklin stated Dave from Al's Paving is the most responsive contractor she has ever dealt with.

Ms. Conklin stated Al's Paving could have actually turned off the sprinklers themselves but they can't. Ms. Conklin stated the contractor using the big roller was in need of water and he used water from a resident's hose. Mr. Waldbauer stated Kevin Yamada stated he was going to pursue it. Ms. Conklin stated he did. In the long run it probably cost us more than a ticket. Mr. Waldbauer stated Mr. Yamada wanted PRRMA and Pheasant View Board to pursue it. Mr. Waldbauer stated he told Mr. Yamada that he already settled it himself by meeting with the police after he called them and refused to accept anything and the police closed the case. Mr. Waldbauer stated if we had communication that was not clear we could get Paul from Spalding DeDecker or Dave or Jim from Al's Paving voice on the web or any additional communication. Mr. Sandys stated he found a gap in their email and was only getting 40% of the residents. Mr. Sandys stated next year he has a few *layout* suggestions for the PRRMA website so we can direct more people to it. Mr. Sandys stated when they put up a sign directing the homeowners to the PRRMA website is when the communication began. Mr. Sandys stated residents from his subdivision inquired why certain portions were not

done in his subdivision. Mr. Sandys stated to the residents the seal coating was just a preventative measure.

Mr. Waldbauer stated following up on Mr. Sandys comment, if there is a section where nothing was done, can we assume that it is slated in the model for a more major repair? Mr. Casari stated yes, that is correct or it could be something that just got missed. He would say in general next year or the following year a major repair will be done. Mr. Waldbauer stated the more “ugly” areas they did route and crack seal. Ms. Conklin stated they cracked sealed everywhere. Mr. Casari stated they were going to route and crack seal and surface seal if there were other unusual cracks. Mr. Waldbauer stated those areas that had no work done is telling him there will be more extensive work to be done next year.

ii. Pending Issues

1. Additional Charges for Paving

Mr. Casari stated most know that when they do the asphalt they do it in lifts, 1 inch, 2 inch, and 3 inch, depending on the design of the pavement. When they mill, we had a mill quantity of 1.5 inch and mill and resurface quantity of 2.5 inches. Early on one of the extra cost he put through dealt with an area, Sandalwood Court, where they did their incremental mill and they noticed a fine layer underneath where they milled was also peeling up. Mr. Casari stated that is the layer horizontal joint where the one surface was applied to the other surface. Mr. Casari stated when that layer peeled up they had to remove it. This area that was peeling was 5,175 square feet of additional area. They charged us 16 cents a square foot times the area, \$1,100 and we approved this repair. Mr. Casari stated as the job progressed apparently this was an issue more than the one location. Dave stated he did not realize it until he saw it himself. Mr. Casari stated for the job, Dave said based on the square footage he was figuring approximately 814 tons of asphalt and when completed it was approximately 244 tons of asphalt. Dave provided this information to Paul. Paul denied it; he indicated we had a quantity of a certain thickness. Ms. Conklin stated we did not pay for a site inspector to be on for the entire job, it was incremental. Mr. Casari stated the inspector was there on the Sandalwood Court issue. Mr. Casari stated Dave, Ms. Conklin and he met and it was explained. Mr. Casari stated Al’s Paving needs to submit all the information to Spalding DeDecker; they need to evaluate it and make a recommendation to PRRMA.

Mr. Casari stated we received Paul’s review of the whole situation. Mr. Casari stated Paul stated the industry standard for the weight of asphalt is 110 lbs per square yard per one inch thick for 30 years. Paul indicated if you take that number and apply it to the square yards that we figured for the project, he comes up with 1,861 tons that should have been the job quantity. Mr. Casari stated we need to find out from Dave what weight that he used for the 1,814 tons. Mr. Casari stated Paul’s review of this indicates he does not agree with the 244 tons, a difference of 230 tons. Mr. Casari stated Paul indicated the Sandalwood Court item has already been paid, which was also in the tonnage and must be taken out, 31 tons. Mr. Casari stated Paul came up with 151 tons would be the additional tonnage due to this work. Ms. Conklin stated Dave has all the delivery tickets to show the total tonnage. Al’s also indicated a price per ton of \$67.51. Spalding DeDecker reviewed this price and feels it is fair. Mr. Casari stated it doesn’t

appear that Al's Paving is trying to gouge us and we know there was additional peeling. Mr. Casari stated he feels that we have to rely on what Spalding DeDecker is telling us, and go back to our engineers for the correct ton overage. Mr. Casari stated if you calculate it out at 151 tons at \$67.51 it equals \$10,221 of an extra cost to the project.

Mr. Stephens stated we still come in under our projected \$320,000 by a substantial margin. Mr. Casari stated Dave was great to work with and the job turned out pretty good. Mr. Waldbauer stated do you recall looking at all the sheets and there was no place where they were milling where they called for anything more than 1.5-inch mill. On sheet no. 15 there was a 2.5-inch mill. Mr. Casari stated yes, there were quantities for 1.5 and 2.5 inch mills. Mr. Casari stated a 2.5-inch mill probably doesn't make a whole lot of sense. Then if there is a thin layer we will be into the next 2-inch layer. Mr. Sandys stated what he does not quite understand is the 400 feet of roadway, will be putting 1.5 inch asphalt down, and may take 4 truck loads to put it down and when it takes 5 truck loads which is what was happening. Why wouldn't someone raise the flag and indicate we are using more asphalt than planned? Ms. Conklin stated the field guys wouldn't know that only 4 truckloads were scheduled to be used. Ms. Conklin stated if we go to 2 inch across the board we won't have that issue.

Mr. Waldbauer inquired if Spalding DeDecker carries a 10% contingency for issues like this. Mr. Casari stated the Board authorized Ms. Conklin to approve up to \$2,000 for miscellaneous. There were several areas that were approved. Mr. Casari stated overall the numbers are pretty good. Mr. Casari stated if we use Dave's number, we are at about 10% over the bid amount. Mr. Casari stated normally we want to be in the 3-5% overage amount. Ms. Conklin stated in the construction business you are digging underground and you just don't know what is there. Mr. Waldbauer stated he will remember this overage come next year when they bid. Ms. Conklin stated they have already bid for next year, holding this year's price. Ms. Conklin stated we received 2.5 inches of asphalt when the bid was for a 1.5-inch layer of asphalt.

Mr. Kljun inquired what was the bid for the next lowest bidder. Mr. Stephens stated it was substantially different. Mr. Kljun inquired if these additions were anywhere near the next lowest bidder. Mr. Casari stated no. Mr. Waldbauer stated the base bid for Al's Paving was \$160,000 and ABC Paving was the next closest at \$202,000. The difference is \$42,000.

Mr. Casari stated he has spoken to Spalding DeDecker in regards to the eBuilder. Mr. Casari stated he will inform Spalding DeDecker that they need to update eBuilder on a much more frequent basis.

Motion by Stephens, supported by Casari to pay the \$10,221 to Al's Paving for the additional work completed. Motion carried unanimously.

iii. Board Members Comments and Suggestions

Mr. Stephens stated he found one area in his subdivision that still has a pothole. Mr. Stephens stated it will only get worse this winter and he needs some kind of patching. Mr. Stephens stated he will email Paul with this information. Mr. Casari stated if it is only one area, just email him and he will have someone take care of it.

b. Insurance Updates

Mr. Kljun stated we have received all payments for insurance and there is nothing outstanding. We are still on a monthly basis for payments and expected to continue. No other issues with insurance, rebates or insurance claims.

c. Lights

Mr. Kljun stated we are making repairs along Summit Parkway and the photocell lighting along Glengarry, from Summit Parkway to Beck Road. There are no other issues at this time. Mr. Kljun stated he has begun to look at other lighting fixtures and poles as the Board discussed at the last meeting. Ms. Conklin stated we will keep this as a standing issue on the agenda. Mr. Kljun suggested calling it lights and signs. Mr. Sandys stated he would like to see in the next 5-10 years all the wooden signs replaced by metal. Metal is cheaper and last for years. Mr. Kljun stated he will continue with an examination of the information. Mr. Kljun stated he will put together a cost for signs and lights. Ms. Conklin stated we probably need to do that soon as we will be replacing signs and lights in the near future. She would like to transition to it instead of spending any more money on wood signs. Mr. Stephens stated a toe board around the signs will not make them last any longer. Mr. Kljun stated he has received two of the three bids for sign toe board repair. Mr. Kljun stated he will email the cost as soon as he compiles the information. Mr. Kljun stated it appears at this time that Fast Signs is the lowest bidder. Mr. Stephens stated he thinks we might have to do some painting of the signs, no matter what. Mr. Stephens stated if we can agree on a design we need to make some decisions with an alternative. Ms. Conklin inquired if Mr. Kljun will take a look at the governing documents and make sure we can change the signs and lights. Ms. Conklin inquired if Mr. Kljun is getting a price for the painting. Mr. Kljun stated at this point he has not got painting bids. He will get a cost for painting all the signs once the repairs are completed. Ms. Conklin stated if we don't do it soon, the weather will prohibit us from painting this year. Ms. Conklin requested Mr. Kljun get a bid relatively quickly and email to Board members.

Mr. Stephens stated a lot of the signs have a toe board with a little post sticking underneath. What does it mean when we say to replace the toe boards? Mr. Kljun stated they will make the toe board the same size with a metal wrapping. Mr. Kljun stated the signs that Mr. Stephens is speaking of, were not installed deeply enough into the ground. Mr. Kljun stated he can ask the contractor to make the toe board go all the way to the bottom of the post and shouldn't cost that much. Ms. Conklin requested Mr. Kljun get the information for this request. Mr. Kljun stated in the original package for the signs the quote was up to \$2,500 to do all 31 signs.

Mr. Stephens inquired if all Board members are in agreement that we don't want to keep replacing the wooden signs and would like to find a replacement. Ms. Conklin stated yes, ones that are not in conflict with the governing documents.

Mr. Waldbauer stated Kevin Miller, Fast Signs, would like us to stop doing the signs as we are currently doing them. Mr. Waldbauer stated the anodized aluminum can be ordered in any font and color. Mr. Waldbauer stated Mr. Miller stated the aluminum will be half the cost. Mr. Kljun stated a standard stop sign with post brand new, as he

recalls, was \$1,100. Mr. Waldbauer stated the last one replaced for Pheasant View was \$2,260.

Mr. Stephens stated since we are all in agreement, we should go around all our subdivisions and assess the current signs for replacement. Ms. Conklin stated we will probably not get these completed this year and should come up with a transition plan. Mr. Stephens stated we can assess for those which need to be done immediately before winter or turn into a safety issue during the winter. Mr. Stephens stated go around and look for the ones that are rotted. Mr. Sandys stated he would like to volunteer to help Mr. Kljun and form a subcommittee for signs. Ms. Conklin stated all Board members assess their signs and get the safety issues back to Mr. Kljun. Mr. Kljun stated if we eliminate too much work, the unit price will increase. All labor is predicated on doing all 31 signs. Ms. Conklin stated Fast Signs will work with us. Mr. Waldbauer stated when Fast Signs found out they would not be doing as much work as first suggested the price increased. Ms. Conklin stated if they know what will be coming down the road that we will be transitioning out we will just have to negotiate with them.

Mr. Kljun and Mr. Sandys will get the information needed as to the style and materials the Board wants for the new signs and have an action plan available for the next Board meeting. Mr. Stephens stated if the subcommittee chooses 5 designs then the Board can choose from those five.

Mr. Stephens stated he feels we should postpone painting any existing signs. Ms. Sandys stated he concurs, unless it is a safety issue.

d. Sign

i. Pheasant View Signs

Ms. Conklin stated we are very close. PRRMA will be responsible for some of the replacement cost. Mr. Waldbauer stated the Pheasant View Signs are completed. Mr. Waldbauer presented Ms. Conklin and Mr. Casari with the APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF TRAFFIC CONTROL PLANS. Ms. Conklin stated Pheasant View, PRRMA and Canton are jointly paying for the signs. Mr. Waldbauer presented Ms. Conklin with Canton's invoice. Ms. Conklin stated the ones that PRRMA is responsible for are the ones that were in terrible shape. Ms. Conklin stated Canton was responsible for the golf cart crossing signs. Mr. Kljun inquired if Mr. Waldbauer will share the cost of the signs with the subcommittee to use as part of the action plan. Mr. Waldbauer stated yes, he would share. Ms. Conklin stated engineering will review and Public Safety will go out and look at the signs. Mr. Waldbauer stated at this time he sees no reason to charge any portion to PRRMA. Mr. Stephens stated he would like the minutes to reflect these individual charges within the minutes. Ms. Conklin stated we have a graph that will be included in the minutes. Ms. Conklin stated once engineering reviews and public safety review it will come back to the PRRMA Board for approval. Mr. Casari stated once engineering signs off Public Safety will do a traffic control order to enforce.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Price</u>	<u>Install 6x6 w/sign</u>	<u>Replace w/24 x 24</u>	<u>Replace Crossing</u>	<u>Install 6x6 w/sign and name flag</u>	<u>Repair Name Flag</u>	<u>Total</u>
24 x 24 Stop Sign	\$ 48.50	\$ 48.50	\$ 48.50	\$ 48.50	\$ 48.50	\$ 48.50	
24 x 24 High Intensity	\$ 62.50						
Stop Sign Backer	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00		\$ 130.00		
Stop Sign Backer w/Crossing	\$ 190.00			\$ 190.00			
Reflective Crossing	\$ 18.90			\$ 18.90			
Build 4x4 post	\$ 295.00						
Build 2x4 lapped	\$ 495.00						
Build 2x6 lapped	\$ 695.00	\$ 695.00			\$ 695.00		
Install 4x4	\$ 160.00						
Install 2x4 lapped in concrete	\$ 395.00						
Install 2x6 lapped in concrete	\$ 595.00	\$ 595.00			\$ 595.00		
Install sign & backing	\$ 95.00	\$ 95.00	\$ 95.00	\$ 95.00	\$ 95.00		
Install Name Flag	\$ 125.00	Price is an estimate			\$ 125.00	\$ 125.00	
sub total		\$ 1,563.50	\$ 273.50	\$ 352.40	\$ 1,688.50	\$ 173.50	
Number of Replacements		2	9	1	1	1	
Total		\$ 3,127.00	\$ 2,461.50	\$ 352.40	\$ 1,688.50	\$ 173.50	\$7,802.90

SIGN LISTING BY SIGN NUMBER ON TRAFFIC CONTROL PLAN

	50	5	28	31	13
	58	17			
		18			
		24			
		44			
		49			
		60			
PRRMA	\$5,341.40	68			
Pheasant View	\$2,461.50	74			
Total	\$7,802.90				

ii. Fairway Signs

Mr. Casari stated he went to a meeting as an advocate for the signs, not as a reviewer, and gave the proposal to Mr. Serchak, engineer. Mr. Serchak reviewed the Michigan manual. His initial response was you cannot install stop signs. Mr.

Casari stated you have a half-mile stretch of roadway. From the research, we cannot install stop signs. Mr. Casari stated he has documents to confirm this result that he will give each Board member. Mr. Casari stated he met with Scott Hilden, Public Safety and Mr. Serchak and it was indicated that there are two approaches. The language states "should not" and he is led to believe they can come up with an engineering judgment. Mr. Casari stated the language states "in addition the use of yield or stop signs should be considered at the intersection of two minor streets or local roads where the intersection has more than three approaches and one or more of the following conditions." Mr. Casari stated we cannot even get to the perspective of a four-way intersection. Mr. Casari state County Club is a high volume road and there is a low volume road. How do we approach that? The language stated then a yield or stop sign should not be installed on the higher volume roadway unless it is justified by an engineering study. Mr. Casari stated if we do an engineering study it will bring us right back to the fact we cannot do it. The 2003 version stated "shall not", the current versions indicates "shall not". Ms. Conklin stated we just cannot install stop signs. This will increase PRRMA's liability if something does happen. Mr. Casari stated Mr. Hilden stated has read that unwarranted stop signs have actually made intersections unsafe. Mr. Casari stated engineering cannot recommend approval. Mr. Casari stated there are plenty of articles that indicate stop signs do not help regulate speed.

Mr. Casari stated the one thing he has noticed is that his condo association has put up addition stop signs without anyone's approval and regularly people run the stop sign. Mr. Stephens stated he agrees that if stop signs are installed without the proper justification then there is a liability. Mr. Stephens stated he will take this information back to his HOA. The speeding problem is still something they take seriously. He believes they will want to come back and consider other options. Mr. Casari stated we can install additional speed limit signs that are not an issue. Mr. Stephens stated we will want to go back and look at traffic measures, and is it possible to reassess the speed limit to 15 miles per hour. Mr. Casari stated the minimum recommended speed limit for residential is 25 miles per hour. Ms. Conklin stated it is 25 miles per hour and we looked at that when we originally put the speed limit signs up. Ms. Conklin stated Mr. Serchak stated the design of the street is suppose to control speed limits.

Mr. Stephens stated he believes the study that public safety did, by in large, most people are obeying the speed limit. Mr. Stephens stated if you have children playing near the street, 25 miles per hour seems awful fast. Mr. Stephens stated residents are not complaining about the 90 % that are obeying the speed limit, they are complaining about the 10 % that do not obey the speed limit. Mr. Waldbauer stated his subdivision requested the same and everything that he is hearing is consistent with what they were told. Mr. Waldbauer stated Southwick is a drag strip. Mr. Stephens stated Mornington is their issue.

Mr. Kljun inquired if there is any data that when a person is given a ticket for speeding, how long does that person drive the speed limit before reverting back to speeding. Mr. Casari stated for one day. Mr. Sandys asked that question and public safety indicated three months.

Motion by Stephens, supported by Sandys to table this discussion. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. New Business:

Mr. Sandys stated his Board would like to know what they can do about commercial trucks in their subdivision. Mr. Sandys stated Fairway Pine's and PRRMA's by-laws indicate there is not much they can do about commercial trucks being parked in someone's driveway. Mr. Kljun stated discipline has to be corrective in nature and progressive in nature. Mr. Kljun stated start off with a fine and once it get to \$100, lien the house. Mr. Stephens stated what authority does the HOA have to fine anyone any amount of money. Mr. Kljun stated it is in the covenants and restrictions. Ms. Conklin stated she will check with public safety and see if they know of anything. Mr. Casari stated there is home occupation of business issues that the building department might have. If they take the vehicle to and from home to work they are allowed to park the vehicle at their home. If they are doing a business out of the home, that is a different issue. Mr. Waldbauer stated the PRRMA covenants and restrictions Article 7, Section 11 states storage of vehicles: no house trailers, commercial vehicle, trucks, boats, recreational vehicles are allowed. Mr. Waldbauer stated Pheasant View usually calls Canton Ordinance Department for these issues. Mr. Casari stated the homeowner has so many days to move it and then a ticket is issues. Mr. Sandys stated they use the vehicle every day for work. Mr. Kljun stated the covenants and restrictions talks about fines also. Mr. Sandys stated he will do some research.

V. Other Business:

No other business.

There will be a Joint PRRMA meeting will on Wednesday, October 25, 2010 at 6:00 p.m. in the lower level of the Administration Building. Ms. Conklin requested items for the agenda be sent to her. Ms. Conklin stated currently she has the SIMS model and strategies for collection of dues. Ms. Conklin stated if the light study is completed we can also put that on the agenda. Mr. Stephens stated that is a good idea for all the Boards to be included. Mr. Sandys stated he will forward the study to the PRRMA Board before the meeting.

Mr. Casari stated if there is any other Canton staff the Board would like to have present at the joint meeting, let him know. Ms. Conklin stated we could have Mr. Hilden from public safety and ordinance attend.

VI. Adjournment:

Motion by Waldbauer, supported by Sandys to adjourn at 8:50 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.