Park East Square Homeowners Association

AUGUST MEETING MINUTES

August 11th 2026 (via Zoom)

Call to Order

The monthly Board meeting was called to order at 7:03. A quorum of the Board was present.

Board members present included:

- Steve Haymes – President
- Rene Sotola - Vice President
- Mark Liebendorfer – Treasurer
- Roxanne Royce – Secretary
- Christiane Sammoury - Board Member

Also present:

- Also present: Allan Orendorff -Trio Community Association Manager.
- Brent Chapman - Facilities Manager

Homeowners in attendance: Steve Henry, Ivette Visbal, David Longenecker, David Bartelt, Karen Fassler, Janet (#1141 B), Renee Ford, Ryan Balciar, Bjorn Bermann, Martin Walter, Theresa Spears, Lois Bennett, Wayne Schroeder, Mary McMillan

Call to Order and Meeting Procedures

The Board reminded homeowners that, pursuant to Association policy, homeowners are not permitted to record Board meetings. The Board also requested that homeowners refrain from calling or texting the Association Administrator during meetings, as this can interfere with the Administrator's responsibility to facilitate the meeting. The Board noted that the Zoom chat function was available for participants to communicate without using their phones during the meeting.

Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes

July 29 Minutes

The Board reviewed the July 29 meeting minutes. It was reported that previously submitted corrections had been incorporated, and no additional corrections were identified.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the July 29 minutes as distributed. The motion was approved by the Board.

July 14 Minutes

The Board then reviewed the July 14 meeting minutes. No corrections were identified.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the July 14 minutes as distributed. The motion was approved by the Board.

Ratification of Out-of-Meeting Decision

The Board considered the ratification of an out-of-meeting architectural decision concerning Unit 4150A. The application involved installation of an air-conditioning unit. The application had initially required additional documentation, and approval was subsequently granted after the required City permits were submitted.

A motion was made and seconded to ratify the out-of-meeting decision approving the air-conditioning installation at Unit 4150A. The decision was ratified.

The Board noted that additional forms previously distributed for consideration had not been formally addressed and would be considered later in the meeting.

Member Issues and Questions

The Board reminded members that each homeowner would have three minutes to speak during the Member Issues and Questions portion of the meeting.

Special Assessment and Roof Work

A homeowner asked whether there would be an update during the meeting regarding the special assessment and roof work, as the homeowner had been unable to attend a previously scheduled meeting.

The Board confirmed that updates would be provided later in the meeting. The Board also stated that a letter to homeowners regarding the matter was being prepared and was expected to be distributed within the next few days. A draft of the letter had been prepared.

Google Workspace

A homeowner stated that they had questions concerning the Google Workspace proposal, which would be addressed when that agenda item was reached. The Board indicated that the consultant's proposal would be reviewed at that time.

Facilities Manager's Maintenance Report

The Facilities Manager provided the following updates:

Building Repairs

DCS had moved to the final building scheduled for work this year, Building 4202. The Association was awaiting issuance of the required City building permit before work could proceed. Materials and preparations were in place pending approval.

Painting

Paramount had completed painting at Building 4279 and had moved on to Building 4227. Work at Building 4227 was expected to begin the following Monday, following power washing.

Paving and Parking Areas

Superior Aggregates had completed crack sealing and restriping in three cul-de-sac areas: the 4300 area, 4269 area, and 4140 area.

Irrigation

Association staff continued to inspect, adjust, and repair the irrigation system.

The City of Boulder had also recently performed work on sections of the bike path adjacent to the property. The City removed and replaced sections of the path and, in the process, damaged several sprinkler heads and water lines. Association staff had been repairing the resulting damage. The Facilities Manager indicated that the Association might request reimbursement from the City for the time and materials required for those repairs.

Sewer Repairs

Rays Backhoe completed repairs to two sewer offsets that had previously been identified at Buildings 4129 and 4139.

The Association had completed sewer scopes and cleanouts for all 18 buildings scheduled for inspection this year. One issue requiring prompt attention was identified at Building 4170. A section of cast-iron sewer pipe has a hole in the top with significant root intrusion. The repair will require a hand excavation near the edge of the concrete slab.

The Facilities Manager obtained proposals from two sewer contractors. The lower proposal was approximately $5,990, compared with approximately $7,950 for the other contractor, a difference of approximately $1,900. The lower proposal was from a contractor with whom the Association has previously worked and included a workmanship warranty. The repair is within the existing budget.

The Facilities Manager requested the Board's approval to proceed with scheduling the repair. The Board expressed its support for proceeding with the work.

The Facilities Manager noted that a portion of a bush may need to be removed to provide access to the repair area.

Siding Inspection

A question was raised regarding the status of inspections associated with the siding work. The Facilities Manager reported that the matter remained in the submission process and was currently believed to be in Stage 2. No additional comments or complaints had been received from the inspectors at that time.

City Bike Path Work

The Board discussed the recent work performed by the City of Boulder on the bike path adjacent to the property. The Facilities Manager stated that the work was a City project and that the Association had not been given an explanation for why that particular section was selected. It was noted that there were visible cracks in the concrete, which may have prompted the City's work.

Administrator's Report

The Administrator reported that the Association remained in generally good financial condition.

At the end of July, the operating account had approximately $61,000–$62,000, while the other accounts totaled approximately $682,000.

The Association continued transferring funds as necessary to cover insurance expenses and capital expenditures.

Capital Expenses

The Administrator noted that the paving category was approximately $40,000 over budget. However, the overall capital expense category remained generally within budget, and the variance appeared to be primarily a matter of timing.

The Administrator reported that the Association was under budget in the other major categories, aside from capital expenditures.

The Facilities Manager noted that additional invoices were expected, including invoices related to the recently completed crack sealing and restriping work. Plumbing expenditures were also anticipated, including work involving pressure-reducing valves (PRVs) and main gate valves.

Pressure testing of the remaining buildings was expected to be completed soon. The Association would then identify buildings with the highest pressure-related needs and prioritize replacement of PRV valves and, where necessary, older gate valves. This work was expected to result in a significant expenditure within the next approximately one and a half to two months.

Interest Income

The Administrator reported that interest income was tracking close to the budgeted amount and was approximately $220 below the amount anticipated at that point in the year.

2025 Financial Review

The Administrator reported that the Association's 2025 financial statements were out for review. A meeting with the auditor/reviewer was scheduled for the following afternoon, with completion anticipated by the end of the week or early the following week.

The Administrator agreed to distribute the completed financial review to the entire Board.

Reserve Funds

A Board member asked for the current amount held in reserves and the Association's monthly reserve contribution.

The Administrator stated that the exact figures would be obtained and provided.

The Administrator explained that funds are periodically transferred from the checking account into a savings account to ensure sufficient funds are available for the annual insurance payment. Depending on the balances in the checking and savings accounts, additional funds are transferred into the capital/reserve account, where they earn a higher interest rate.

The Administrator stated that the capital/reserve account had most recently contained more than $300,000 and agreed to provide the Board with the exact current figures.

The Administrator clarified the Association's reserve structure. Approximately $300,000 was held in the capital account, which was characterized as the Association's primary or "real" reserve funds.

The Administrator explained that the Association maintains four accounts, including a checking account, an account designated for insurance, an operating fund account, and an additional account that functions as a pre-reserve account. Funds are periodically transferred from the checking and pre-reserve accounts into the capital/reserve account as appropriate.

The Administrator subsequently distributed the financial statements to all Board members.

Treasurer's Report

Mark Liebendorfer stated that most of the financial information is covered in the Administrator's monthly report. The Treasurer's primary responsibilities include reviewing the status of the Association's accounts on a monthly basis and transferring funds as needed.

The Board concluded its discussion of the financial reports and proceeded to Old and New Business.

Old and New Business

Fall/End-of-Summer Newsletter

The Board discussed preparation of the fall/end-of-summer newsletter.

The Board noted that the Spring newsletter was never dispersed. Greg started the newsletter and Roxanne collaborated on it. Although it was ready to go to the printer, the process stalled after Greg resigned. Roxanne noted that Steve had been uncomfortable accessing it due to concerns about Google's terms of service and account permissions so it remained in limbo. The Association's existing Google account was originally structured for personal/family use rather than for a nonprofit business corporation. The Board acknowledged that the current system presents limitations and thus a transition to a more appropriate system was necessary.

The Board discussed assignments for preparing the fall newsletter. Roxanne and Christiane will work on drafting it. Potential topics discussed include the change in Board membership, roof work, and its special assessment, along with the standard newsletter material. Board members were invited to submit additional topics or suggestions for inclusion. The Board generally agreed that the existing newsletter template should be used as the starting point, with appropriate updates and additions.

Mark Liebendorfer was initially asked to assist with the financial arrangements with the printer. It was clarified that Brent currently has possession of the Association credit card and could handle the transaction, with Mark available to assist if needed.

New Forms

Records Request Form

The Board considered a revised Records Request Form. The form was developed following difficulties experienced with a prior homeowner records request, including a situation in which a homeowner was charged a fee without having been informed in advance that a charge would apply.

The proposed form is intended to provide a consistent process for records requests and to document when a request is received and when it is completed. The form includes space to identify the records requested and the purpose of the request, with additional pages permitted if necessary.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Records Request Form and place it on the Association's website. The motion was approved.

Revised Exterior Modification Form

The Board then considered a revised Exterior Modification Form.

It was explained that the revised form retains approximately 95% of the existing form but adds language concerning City permits. The proposed changes included identifying whether a City permit is required and, where applicable, providing the permit number.

The purpose of the proposed revision was discussed in connection with a recent exterior modification application that had been denied because the application did not include a City permit. The proposed language was intended to make the permitting requirement clearer to homeowners and avoid delays or incomplete applications.

Board members discussed a potential concern with requiring a homeowner to obtain a City permit before receiving final Association approval. It was noted that a homeowner could incur substantial permit costs and then have the Association deny the proposed modification.

The Board discussed an alternative process under which Association approval would be granted conditionally, with final approval contingent upon the homeowner providing the required City permit before the project proceeds. It was also noted that not every project requires a City permit, and the form should account for that distinction.

A suggestion was made to include a provision or checkbox requiring the homeowner to verify whether the proposed project requires a permit rather than automatically requiring a permit number with every application.

The Board discussed the possibility of having the language in the first paragraph revised to clarify that final Association approval is contingent upon obtaining any required City permits. A

Board member agreed to provide proposed wording, after which the form would be revised accordingly.

The Board also discussed the distinction between Association approval and City permitting requirements, including circumstances in which a governmental agency may require Association approval as part of its permitting process.

The Board's discussion indicated that the revised form should be modified to address the potential "chicken-and-egg" problem between obtaining Association approval and obtaining a City permit. The form would be revised before final consideration.

Homeowner Comment Regarding Exterior Modification Policy

A homeowner requested an opportunity to comment on the proposed form before final approval.

The homeowner asked the Board to reconsider adding a building-permit requirement to the Association's exterior modification process. The homeowner stated that the Association's current policy did not contain such a requirement and referenced a policy change made on May 13 of the prior year.

The homeowner stated that the policy change had been made, in part, because of concerns about a potential conflict between Association approval and the governmental permitting process. Specifically, homeowners could be placed in a situation in which the Association would not approve an application without a permit, while a contractor or governmental agency might not proceed with the permitting process without knowing whether the Association would approve the proposed project.

The homeowner further stated that this issue had previously caused problems for homeowners, including scheduling difficulties and loss of contractors, and that an attorney had subsequently questioned why the Association was requiring a permit as part of the process.

The discussion of the Exterior Modification Form continued.

Architectural Modification Application / Permit Requirements

The Board discussed whether the Association’s architectural modification application should require homeowners to provide a municipal permit number. It was explained that municipal permitting and the Association’s architectural review process are separate and independent processes. The City is responsible for permits and code enforcement, while the Association’s role is to review exterior modifications for compliance with its architectural guidelines and standards.

The Board discussed concerns that requiring proof of a permit could create an unnecessary bottleneck and delay the architectural approval process. It was also emphasized that the Association should not assume responsibility for enforcing municipal permitting requirements. The homeowner and contractor remain responsible for obtaining any permits required by the City and for ensuring that work is properly completed.

The Board agreed that the application should instead contain a reminder that the City may require a permit for certain projects. The language discussed was essentially that **the City may require the homeowner to obtain a permit for the project**. It was suggested that the reminder could be prominently displayed on the form.

The discussion also included the potential liability associated with construction and permitting. It was reiterated that responsibility for compliance with municipal requirements and proper installation rests with the homeowner and contractor, rather than the Association.

Insurance Renewal

The Board discussed the upcoming insurance renewal process. It was noted that the renewal process would begin in August and that renewal quotes were expected later in the fall, potentially around October. The Board was advised that the Association's current insurance coverage consists of six policies distributed among three insurers.

The Board discussed the potential impact of the Association's roof work on insurance costs. It was reported that the insurance representative had indicated that a complete roof replacement, including decking and shingles, could potentially reduce insurance premiums by approximately 30%, although the ultimate impact would depend on the scope of the roof work.

The Board discussed whether members should review the insurance policies. It was noted that insurance companies generally do not finalize renewal terms until approximately the final four weeks before renewal, limiting the amount of time available for review. The Board agreed that the insurance representative is experienced with the process and should be allowed to manage the renewal, while keeping the Board informed regarding the roof project and other relevant information.

Google Workspace / Records and Website Project

The Board received an update regarding the proposed transition to Google Workspace. On July 29, a one-hour video meeting was held with a Google IT consultant recommended by Greg to scope the project. The consultant's rate was reported as **$125 per hour**, with an estimated **15–20 hours** of work for the primary implementation. The estimated implementation cost was therefore approximately **$1,875–$2,500**, depending on the actual hours required.

The project will involve migrating Association information and data into a corporate Google Workspace environment. Steve indicated that he would perform some of the preparatory work, with assistance from Greg and others as available. Additional coordination would be required with Brent and Board members who currently maintain Association emails and records.

Steve explained that the proposed structure would use corporate accounts based on Board positions—such as President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer—rather than individual names. This would allow the Association's email and data to remain with the Association when individual Board members leave their positions.

The Board also discussed Google Vault, which was described as a retention-management system intended to help the Association maintain records in accordance with applicable Colorado requirements.

The goal is to have the new system in place by November, when the Association's existing website and mail-forwarding contracts are scheduled to expire.

The Board discussed the potential monthly cost of Google Workspace. The estimated cost was **$22 per account per month for six accounts**. Steve characterized the resulting cost as relatively small in comparison with the Association's overall dues and emphasized the importance of addressing the Association's existing IT and records-management problems.

The Board also discussed the Association's website. A more secure website is planned as part of the overall transition. Steve noted that the current WordPress-based website receives thousands of hacking attempts a day and described the proposed system as more secure. Steve also asked whether anyone knew of a web developer in the community who might be willing to volunteer to assist with rebuilding the website, which could reduce the Association's costs and his workload.

The proposed Google Workspace project was **not put to a vote at this meeting**. Steve indicated that he had circulated the consultant's proposal to the Board and wanted members to have time to review it before an out-of-meeting vote. A vote was contemplated approximately one week later, with the option of allowing two weeks if Board members needed additional time.

Homeowner Communication / Google Groups

The Board discussed the planned use of Google Groups as part of the new system. One Google Group would be available to homeowners for community communications and discussions. A separate group would be available for Board members.

The homeowner group could be used for general community communications, such as discussing gardens or offering items for sale. The Board group would provide a centralized means of communicating among Board members and would also serve as a mechanism for homeowners to contact the Board.

Records and Data Migration

The Board discussed the scope of the data migration and whether all existing files and photographs would be transferred to the new system. It was explained that the Association currently does not have an easy way to determine the exact number of files because the existing system does not provide the necessary administrative tools.

The intent is to migrate Association records currently stored in various locations into the new corporate environment. The discussion included photographs and other materials maintained by individual Board members that relate to Association business, including architectural survey photographs.

A Board member asked about the anticipated number of files and the resulting storage requirements. Steve explained that the precise number of files was not currently known but stated that the proposed storage capacity would be adequate.

The Board also discussed the costs associated with the project. The implementation estimate of approximately **$1,875–$2,500** was clarified as the estimated consultant labor for the migration and implementation. In addition, the anticipated Google Workspace subscription cost was discussed as approximately **$22 per month per account for six accounts**.

Roof Replacement / Special Assessment Update

The Board discussed the proposed homeowner communication regarding the roof issues and potential special assessment. The Board thanked Mark for preparing the draft letter. It was noted that the letter had been circulated to Board members but had not yet been distributed to homeowners.

The Board agreed that the letter should remain concise and provide homeowners with a general update, particularly for homeowners who did not attend the meeting. Board members were asked to provide any grammatical, spelling, or substantive wording changes promptly so the letter could be finalized and distributed.

The Board then received an update on the roof damage and replacement process. Brent reviewed the history of the matter, explaining that two severe windstorms in December resulted in approximately 41 roofs with apparent wind damage. Formula Roofing was contacted and performed temporary protective work while the Association pursued the matter with GAF under the existing 2015 roofing warranty.

GAF requested roof samples for testing and subsequently conducted its own inspection. Following its review, GAF determined that repairing the roofs in their current condition was not recommended. GAF's warranty-related offer covers a portion of the material costs, and the Association continues to work with the roofing contractors and GAF to clarify the amount of coverage and determine the remaining cost to the Association.

The Board discussed the temporary roof patches. Brent reported that the temporary measures had survived subsequent windstorms and heavy rains without reported leaks. However, he stated that neither he nor Formula Roofing could guarantee how long the temporary repairs would remain effective.

The Board discussed insurance coverage and the Association's substantial deductible. It was noted that the Association would effectively be self-funded for the anticipated roof work unless a loss exceeded the applicable insurance deductible.

The Board reviewed the remaining issues affecting the roofing project, including the condition of the existing roof decking. An independent structural survey, previously approved by the Board, is expected to assist in determining the appropriate decking approach. Options under consideration include:

1. Installing new decking over the existing decking.
2. Selectively removing and replacing damaged decking.
3. Removing and replacing the existing decking in its entirety.

The Board noted that the structural engineer's findings will affect both the appropriate construction method and the final project cost. The Board is also considering the potential weight implications of installing new decking over existing decking.

The Board discussed the importance of balancing project cost, expected longevity, and the amount of the potential special assessment. It was noted that a special assessment would require approval by two-thirds of the homeowners under the Association's governing documents.

The Board outlined the following next steps:

- Obtain written responses from all roofing contractors to the Board's questions concerning pricing, warranties, and technical issues.
- Complete the independent structural survey.
- Incorporate the survey findings into the determination of the preferred decking option.
- Request best and final pricing from the roofing contractors based on the selected decking approach.
- Determine whether additional savings can be achieved through negotiations with the roofing contractors.
- Select the preferred roofing contractor based on established criteria, including but not limited to price.
- Prepare detailed information for homeowners explaining the proposed work, cost, and anticipated special assessment.
- Hold a homeowner meeting to present the proposal and receive homeowner input.
- Conduct the required homeowner vote on the special assessment.

The Board also discussed homeowners' individual HO-6 insurance policies. Homeowners were advised to contact their insurance agents to determine whether their policies require a claim under the Association's master policy before providing coverage for their portion of a special assessment.

Steve emphasized the time constraints facing the Association. He stated that, under his reading of the governing documents, homeowners must be given approximately one month to consider and vote on a special assessment. He also noted concerns regarding the anticipated weather conditions and the need to complete the roofing work before the fall/winter weather becomes problematic.

The Board discussed the additional time required to obtain permits after a roofing contractor is selected. Members agreed that the process should proceed as quickly as reasonably possible and that activities should be conducted in parallel where feasible.

Brent reported that approximately six homeowners still needed to coordinate access to their attics for the structural engineer's inspection. The engineer is expected to inspect the roofs in approximately the second week of September. Brent asked homeowners who had not yet scheduled access to cooperate in arranging appointments.

The Board discussed providing homeowners with additional updates as information becomes available. Members agreed that the immediate priority was to distribute Mark's general informational letter, while more detailed information and final numbers would be provided once the roofing bids and structural survey results were available.

Rene noted that he and Brent had developed a preliminary project plan approximately two weeks earlier and suggested updating the plan as responses from the roofing contractors are received. The Board agreed that continuing to work on the various components in parallel would help keep the project moving.

The meeting concluded with the understanding that the Board would continue working with the roofing contractors, proceed with the structural survey, and work toward obtaining sufficient information to present a specific roofing proposal and special assessment to the homeowners.

Structural/Roof Assessment and Special Assessment Planning

- The structural engineer's **final report is expected in September**.
- An **interim/preliminary report** was requested following inspections scheduled for **August 17–19**, with the intent of obtaining preliminary information immediately after the final inspection.
- The Board discussed meeting with Brent to review and update the project plan once the preliminary engineering information and roofing proposals are available.
- Karen advised against prescheduling a special-assessment vote too early because the Board does not yet have sufficient information and applicable notice requirements may require substantial lead time.
- The Board discussed the likelihood that there may need to be:
    - an **informational homeowner meeting**, followed by
    - a separate **meeting at which a vote could occur**.
- Lois noted that the assessment might require more than one voting round and that, after approval, at least **30 days may be needed to collect the assessment**.
- The Board acknowledged that completing the process before severe winter weather may not be realistic.
- Members discussed the possibility that the special assessment might **not be approved**, and the need for a **Plan B**, including obtaining estimates for roof repairs rather than replacement.
- Roofing contractors are being asked for repair estimates concurrently with the broader structural investigation.
- The Board discussed communicating with homeowners before all figures are available, emphasizing transparency without providing premature or unsupported dollar amounts.
- A potential homeowner communication would explain:
    - what a special assessment is,

  - what is required for approval,
  - why the proposed project may be financially advantageous, including the possibility of receiving some materials at no cost.

Wildlife/Safety Communication

- The Board discussed reports of a **bear and mountain lion** in or around the community.
- Karen noted that the Association's rules prohibit feeding animals and that Boulder regulations also address feeding wildlife.
- The Board discussed sending a **community-wide email blast** warning residents about the wildlife and reminding them not to feed animals.
- The communication may also include information regarding reporting wildlife concerns to the City.
- The matter may also be included in the Association newsletter.
- Steve requested that Karen provide additional information regarding the reported bear sightings so that an appropriate communication could be prepared.

Request for the “99-Item” List / Records Issues

- Karen requested the list of approximately **99 items** that had reportedly been identified as potentially illegal provisions/policies and that had been referenced in prior open Board meetings.
- Karen stated that her request was simply to obtain the list because it had allegedly been used by Board members in discussions concerning which policies should be reviewed or changed.
- Steve stated that, based on his review, the list was prepared by a homeowner who was not serving on the Board at the time and represented that homeowner's opinions rather than an officially adopted Board document.
- Steve stated that he believed the list therefore did not constitute an Association record subject to disclosure under the applicable records statute.
- Karen disputed the significance of whether the list had formally been adopted, stating that Board members had referenced it in open meetings and that she wanted access to the information being used in those discussions.
- Rene stated that he had **recently distributed the material to the Board** and agreed to resend it to Board members.
- The discussion concluded with the understanding that the Board would review the material and that the issue could be addressed further with legal counsel.

Additional Records Request

- Lois raised a separate records request concerning email communications regarding **“how we lost Altitude.”**
- Steve stated that he had received Dave Longenecker's request that day and had reviewed the applicable statutory provisions.

- Steve stated that under Colorado state law, the requested material fell within a category that the Board was not required to disclose.
- Steve indicated that the matter would be reviewed with the **new Association attorney**, whom the Board hoped to have in place by the end of the following week.
- Steve offered to provide the statutory citation supporting his interpretation.
- The discussion also referenced other materials, including approximately **eight documents, 67 pages, and the 99-item list**.
- The Board did not reach a final determination on disclosure during this portion of the meeting.

Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at approximately **9:00 p.m.** following a motion and second, with the members present voting in favor.