

**UNIVERSITY GLEN HOMEOWNERS' ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
**Minutes for Thursday, February 18, 2020 (6 PM)**  
**UG Community Center-Lounge**  
**45 Rincon Drive, Ste. 104, Camarillo, CA**

**1) Call to Order (Chair)**

- a. Chris Williamson opened the HAC meeting and informed the group of the several agendas items and topics that need to be covered. He further requested that the group hold off on questions not tied to the theme of the meeting and requested those queries be asked at the end of the meeting. Williamson further stated that any decisions the HAC makes are just strong suggestions and may not be followed by the CAM office or the Site Authority. Williamson further informed the group that the next CAG meeting is on Thursday at 4pm. Jake Friesen confirmed the Site Authority Board meeting is on Monday the 24<sup>th</sup> of February in the second floor conference room of the Broome Library. Williamson continued with an overview of what is to come during the meeting. Williamson stated a landscape presentation, budget update, HAC committees, rules and regulations, and finally community garden information will be presented during this HAC meeting.
- b. HAC members present:
  - i. Chris Williamson
  - ii. Gabrielle Powell
  - iii. Kevin Olson
  - iv. Sandra Boyd
  - v. Tom Bokhart

**2) Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes**

- a. Williamson and Friesen informed the group of the approved meeting minutes for December 2019 and the January 2020 meeting minutes will follow shortly.

**3) Public Safety Report (CSUSI Police Department) (10)**

- a. No Police Officer was in attendance to make a report.

**4) Brightview Landscape "Revamp/Refurbishing" Presentation (30)**

- a. Brightview Landscape Team
  - i. Friesen introduces the landscape refurbishing team presentation from BrightView. Friesen continued to explain the bid process and invited the group to review the different bid sheets from all vendors in his office. Friesen suggested that UGCAM will oversee refurbishing the Common Area round-a-bouts. Additionally, Mission Hills will oversee refurbishing the Town Center area which they own.

Friesen introduced Scott Godfrey and Lazaro Ramos from BrightView Landscape Services. Godfrey stated he will present a brief overview of why and how BrightView came up with the price tag of \$738k for the landscape refurbishing. Ramos began with the logistics of the project and continued with stating BrightView will try to combine a plant pallet with what is already installed. Brightview recommends removing any dead plant life. He continued with assuring owners that BrightView will not use more irrigation water than what is already being used presently. Godfrey interjected and stated the irrigation system already installed is what will be used. He further stated BrightView will attempt to use a plant pallet that will minimize cost and maintenance. He stated BrightView will not overplant areas to make sure the that plants installed have enough room to grow. Ramos and Godfrey showed the shady plant pallet for the Apartment homes, Townhomes A, and Townhome B to the group. His Powerpoint presentation showed the before and after renderings of the planting schemes. Godfrey added that the turf will remain intact.

Simhan Mandyam asked if BrightView will continue to use mulch. Godfrey confirmed Brightview is recommending mulch be used throughout the landscape refurbishing project.

Sandra Bolger noted the renderings of the plant pallet are of mature/adult plants. She requested Brightview show what the immature plant pallet looks like, so owners know what the plants will look like initially. Ramos commented BrightView would plant one- and five-gallon immature plants. Godfrey added that it will take 2-3 growing seasons to see the plants at maturity. Bolger asked if the mulching would have to be done repeatedly. Godfrey confirmed Bolger's statement and added that to be most beneficial mulch is best done in the spring.

Melea King asked what is the life expectancy of these plants? Godfrey stated the life expectancy of the new plants would be about 10-15 years. He stated that the existing plants, in his opinion, didn't have a shorter life span. Bolger stated, per Caltrans' landscape architects, the bougainvillea has a 50-year life span. She asks whether BrightView will unearth those plants, and why? Godfrey offered that the bougainvillea plants that have been over trimmed will be removed. He stated he believes these types of plants are unsightly. He commented that if bougainvillea is over trimmed it will not be as healthy as one, you'd see "growing on the side of the freeway".

Mandyam asked what type of maintenance and how much water the new landscape will need. Godfrey replied by assuring the homeowners BrightView will work toward using the same amount of water that is currently being used. Mandyam asked about the maintenance of the new suggested new plants. Godfrey stated the placement of the plants plays a key role regarding the amount of ongoing maintenance required. He stated he anticipates the plants will need pruning once a month when they grow to maturity.

Gabrielle Powell asked about how Brightview is planning to address the tree leaf problem with the mulching. Godfrey agreed with Powell and added that the mulching should be done during Spring for that reason. Williamson asked if this new landscaping will allow the leaves to be picked up between the new plants with ease. Ramos assures that it will be much easier to pick up the leaves from in between the plants on the new plant pallet.

Godfrey continued showing the proposed plant pallet for the single-family homes. Bolger asked if there would be any planting that wrapped around the side of the homes. Godfrey stated that the plant pallet would be wrapped around the homes. Bolger asked if plants will be placed around tree roots. Godfrey agreed that plants cannot be placed on tree roots and added that Friesen and himself are already discussing what options are available for areas with a heavy layer of tree roots. One approach is to not plant new plants in the areas with many tree roots and place mulch or other ground surface cover material. Godfrey added that BrightView is considering all environmental factors before planting the new pallet.

Tina Dreiske asked if BrightView will amend the soil and regulate the irrigation before the plants are planted. Friesen stated per the meeting with Tom Hunt and Rosa Bravo, the UGCAM office will start the process of checking the irrigation and either the University or BrightView will do the diagnostic checking of the irrigation system in UG.

Friesen mentioned there will be a minimum 3-month watering period during when the new plants will need to be watered up to 3 times a week until the new plants

are established. He stated the University is aware of this important of increased watering during the initial time when the new plants become established. Mandyam asked how many times a week do the new established plants need to be watered. Ramos assured Mandyam that only when it is extremely hot do these plants need to be watered “2-3 days” a week. Friesen added the University understands it will need to allow UGCAM up to 3-days a week of watering and the UG Community through the UGCAM office will pay for the extra water.

Dreiske asked again, regarding amending the soil, she points out that she has gardening experience. Ramos agrees that the soil must be amended. Sandi Boyd is pointing out the comment Ramos made regarding watering 2-3 times a week during the hottest days of the year, she suggests we use more drought tolerant plants. Ramos suggested Brightview anticipates using the water in the most efficient way, using proper soil amendments, and using proper watering times on proper days will result in conscientious use of the reclaimed water available. Bolger suggested BrightView gather soil samples to determine the type of plants chosen.

Kevin Benn asked if the maintenance contract will be re-evaluated after the plants are established? Godfrey agreed that after the plants are established, he doesn't see a problem with revisiting the landscaping contract.

Godfrey continued to present the Powerpoint with the updated plant pallet. He commented to the group that any plants can be changed for other drought tolerant ones and assures the group that all the plants on the pallet are drought tolerant. He informed the attendees the price for the entire refurbishing is, “\$739,000 for all areas in the community”.

Benn asked if the price is for the entire square footage includes turf. BrightView agreed.

King asked if UGCAM is paying for the apartment refurbishing as well. Boyd agreed and added that Mission Hills residents pay CAM fees as well. Friesen explained the project price breakdown, \$790,000; landscaping plus roundabout, 5% management fee (because of the size of project) which is roughly \$40,000, the irrigation diagnostic, which is a quote from BrightView, priced at \$5,950.00. Friesen continues with a total of \$835,493.14. He explained there is a short fall of \$335,000 because the project's present budget from the Common Area Reserves is \$500,000. The \$335,000 shortfall is to be divided among the 600 doors--328 apartments, 200 townhouses, and 72 single-family homes.

The result would be a one-time charge per door of approximately \$560.00. He further pointed out section 20.4D in the Ground Sublease which states that because of a capital improvement the CAM office can require an up to 25% increase in the CAM fees within one calendar year. Friesen breaks down each CAM charge per type by housing type. He continues with stating that the CAM office will only charge the price at the lowest monthly CAM rate which is \$192.26. This amount comes from what the apartments dwellers pay. He continues with stating that \$48.07 will be added to the \$192.26, per door and the total is based on the 25% increase starting from the lowest CAM (\$192.26) fee which comes out to \$576.78.

Friesen further states that if everyone agrees to the 25% increase it would be approved by the CAM office and states the short fall could be assessed in order to get the landscaping done for the entire community if the community members allow it. Mandyam asks if the 25% increase is a one-time item charge. Friesen informed the group as per the Ground Sublease the increase would be a one-time

charge to complete a specific “capital improvement” project. Mandyam and Paulette Koenig are concerned that the CAM office will impose a 25% increase next year (2021) and every year after that. Friesen agreed the Ground Sublease would permit this to happen. Sandra Boyd stated that this is a specific capital improvement and these types of capital improvements are rare, so she does not foresee this occurring in the future.

Friesen added he could request that the short fall be taken care of by the Site Authority on good faith that the owners and residents have been paying into the special assessment tax required each year. Bokhart asked if there are areas in UG landscape that will not be refurbished. Friesen asked Godfrey if the pools were added to the proposal booklet. Godfrey informed Friesen that the pool area was added. Friesen commented that around the pool areas the price for refurbishing is about \$5,000.00. Friesen stated the area alongside Longrade Creek and Smugglers Cove, hasn’t been researched for pricing. The refurbishing project in this area could also include solar lighting etc. Friesen continued that BrightView has previously given him a price for that area however the CAM office hasn’t researched it further, so Friesen doesn’t feel comfortable with the CAM office spending money on that project part at this point.

He further points out that several community members are concerned about this area, but it is not included in the current landscaping refurbishing. Bokhart asked which area was in question. Godfrey assured that there are minimal pockets of areas in our landscape that need addressing. Melea King asked if the assessment charge will be requested before the project begins or would it be requested as the project is progressing and per each home completed. Friesen replied the details have not been determined as of yet because the CAM office isn’t sure if the increase will be implemented.

He further adds Mission Hills is willing to put the funds into the account so that the project could move rapidly and that the entire landscaping refurbishing should be addressed at once and streets not be left undone. Mandyam asked if the CAM office has a start date for the refurbishing project. Friesen stated the refurbishing could start very soon and the price for starting it would be at \$160,000 as of today. Friesen stated further Phase 1 is from the Rincon’s roundabout and end at the Anacapa Island Drive roundabout. Additionally, if the irrigation is done by April 1<sup>st</sup>, the landscaping would commence and would be done by June 2020. He further stated that if any of the plants do not survive it would give the CAM office a good idea to not use those for the larger part of the refurbishing project. And, with the assessment funds the next phase of the project would start at March 2021 and be done by July 2021.

Mandyam is asking how many phases the CAM office will have during this refurbishing project. King further agreed with the CAM office regarding doing a test block to make sure the plants take the soil. Friesen reiterated the phased plans, the next phase starting along Longrade Creek and the following being another section of the UGlen. Wendell Grayson asks what the entire timeline of the refurbishing project would be, without money objections, including the irrigation testing and repairs. Friesen replied by the end of May beginning of June the Phase 1 would start and the next phase would start in Spring 2021. Tom Bokhart asked why the entire budgeted amount would not be spend this year (2020). Friesen would like to see these plants work before proceeding with the entire landscaping deal. Janis Benn would like the project to move more quickly. King suggests Landing Cove or Smugglers Cove be the beta test area instead of Anacapa Island Drive.

Friesen states that one of the reasons this is a topic during that HAC meeting is because there will be a CAG meeting where this information will take place in order for the project to move forward. Wheeler agreed with King regarding making Landing Cove & Smugglers Cove be the priority instead of Anacapa Islands Drive. An unidentified woman asked if the additional cost would be greater for establishing drought tolerant plants like succulents instead of the plant pallet chosen. Godfrey informed the group it would be at a higher cost to use succulents. Williamson informed the group the Powerpoint presentation from BrightView would be added to the UGCAM website. Williamson also informed the group the trees and turf would stay in place.

**5) Initial 2020/2021 Budget and CAM fee changes**

- a. Tom and Sandy (Budget Committee, CAG/SA Liaison)
  - i. Boyd informed the group of the budget types. She stated that there are two types, one is called Operating Budget Expenses and the other is called Reserve Budget Expenses. She continued with addressing where the landscaping refurbishing project funds come out of; they will be withdrawn from the reserve budget. She addressed the reality of the landscaping project being close to \$840,000 and that the Reserve Budget only has \$500,000 budgeted. She further informs the group that the UGCAM office has been attempting to obtain competitively bid with other landscaping companies, besides BrightView, in order to stay within the \$500,000 budgeted.

Boyd continued that this year UGlen will be seeing an increase in the operating budget just as the community saw last year (2019). Boyd further states UGlen proceeded with a separate accounting system that managed the operating budget spending in hopes that it would figure out the budgeting amounts UGCAM needs to stay within. She further declares that in last years budgeted amount [2019], the trash has been a consistent amount and this consistent amount has been placed in the 2020 budget. However, when the amount was placed in the budget for 2020 it increased the trash line item by 7%, which is over the trash budget. Boyd explained that the additional trash increase has been placed in the 2020-2021 budget and will possibly remain that way for the 2021 budget once it is approved. Boyd continued explaining budget increases on the cleaning line of the budget. R&V cleaning services was given the responsibility to clean the community gyms which in turn caused the CAM office to increase their pay due to the increase in services.

Gabrielle Powell and Tina Dreiske commented regarding the gym not being up to their cleaning standards and informed the group the paper towels are typically not replenished. Friesen informed the group R&V Cleaning oversaw cleaning of the pools Monday, Wednesday, Friday and were not cleaning the gym because at that time it was under warranty cleaning through Mission Hills Apartments. He further stated that Mission Hills requested the CAM office to handle the cleaning of the gyms because the warranty ended. Mission Hills office requested UGCAM increase the R&V Cleaning services after the 2019-2020 budget, which was why the 2019-2020 went over budget. Boyd continued with stating that the reclaimed water budget, also, increased and that it was added to the 2020-2021 budget. A few of the group attendees asked if the water usage had ever been defined or itemized. Boyd stated that the Site Authority has given access to the CAM office for the water meters.

Mandyam requests that he be given the metered numbers from Boyd. Boyd stated there are reports accessible and are held by Bokhart and Bravo. Mandyam demanded there be numbers available. The group advised Mandyam to not be so aggressive regarding his demands. Boyd continued

with saying that as soon as there are clear and easy to understand reports these will be shared to the community but only with the approval of the CAM office plus the Site Authority. She further stated that it is not in her right or the right of the CAG to make these reports known unless previously approved. Kevin Benn informed the group that he requested the water usage information to be released and the Site Authorities response was that he would need to "sue" the Site Authority in order to have any reports released. Carolyn Phillips asked how much is allocated for the landscaping project in the reserve budget. Boyd responds with an itemization of the reserve budget, which she says is separated into 3 budgeted categories. Common Area: landscaping etc., Single Family Reserve, and Townhouse Reserve. Boyd also referred the group to the UGCAM CSUCI website to locate that information.

Phillips rephrased her question and asked how much percentage (%) or dollar (\$) amount is allocated for the landscaping project. Boyd informed the group that she cannot answer that question at that point. She further stated that \$14.27 is for the Common Area Maintenance, and a percentage of that amount is for landscaping, but she could not clearly state the percentage difference during that meeting. Also the CAM fees vary by the type of dwelling the owner/resident has, nonetheless she gave an example of townhomes being at \$70.50 in reserves and likewise made a point to say that it was just an example. Boyd finally, reiterated that there is \$14.27 charge for the Common Area maintenance reserves.

An unidentified man asked why there was a difference in the reserve classification for the Townhomes vs. the Single-family homes. Boyd informed the group that she needs to go through the entire presentation before she answers that question. King is asking what is causing the 7% increase in trash removal. Boyd informed the group that Mission Hills saw a greater increase last year (2019) in trash removal. Friesen clarified that there was a 7% increase in July 2019, for the Town and Single-family homes trash and recycling bins. Friesen stated that he was informed by EJ Harrison that they could no longer sell their recyclables. As of December 31, 2019 the 3-yard dumpsters serving the apartments and Town Center received a 7% increase. Therefore, when the CAM office received the trash bill, in January 2020, the increase was already in effect. King asked if EJ Harrison, as of July 2019 (TH & SFH), had already imposed the 7% increase. Boyd informed the group that King was correct in asking that question and that EJ Harrison had been charging the 7% increase as of July 2019 for the TH & SFH and that the CAM office hadn't been able to budget that increase.

Wheeler asked if there is a potential increase in the budget why doesn't the CAM office anticipate these types of increases, he gave the example regarding the assistant position. Friesen stated he is in the process of speaking with the Site Authority to anticipate this and other types of expense increases. King asked what goes into the property management fund. Friesen answered, accounting, subcategories in accounting like Rent Café, reporting, Yardi licensing and other services. Wheeler again asked about the 5% management fee increase. Friesen informed the group that the reason for the first assistant was because of the painting project and notifications that needed to be sent out regarding the pots and planters placed by owners in the Common Areas and on their Courtyards that were visible from the Common Areas. Friesen continued concerning the landscaping project, the 5% increase needs to be used to the hire a part time person to manage projects and assured the group that it doesn't need to be him and also that it could be anyone.

Wheeler recalled the management practices that took place during the Townhome painting project. Wheeler pointed out that he didn't observe the painting reps clean

up after themselves and also that they missed a lot of spots on the Townhome walls that were visible from the Common Areas, he also pointed out that these spots were marked with pieces of tape but they were never fixed. He further informed the group that a whole wall was never painted on his unit. Friesen again informed the group that there needs to be someone available to oversee that project. Mark Hewitt interjected by asking if the meeting could move forward as there are other topics in the agenda that still need addressing. Joshua Foeller agreed.

- ii. Boyd informs the group that there are open questions that are still being discussed concerning the Operating Expense budget with the Site Authority. These are, costs and possible implementation of the earthquake insurance, responsibility for sewer cleaning, budgeting unforeseen events. She explains that when there is an unanticipated event that needs to be budgeted, it is taken out of the Reserve Budget in order to balance the total contribution. She would like to see an accurate budget and have these unanticipated expenses reflected; Boyd indicates that this is a very important part of the budgeting process. Boyd continues with the irrigation budget and informs the group that there is progress being made by the CAM office to have the irrigation specialist diagnose faulty lines. She further stated that all the components for last year's budget will be added to the 2020-2021 budget. She advised the group that if the \$150,000 budgeted for the landscaping is not used in 2020 it will be placed in May's 2020-2021 budget. She further informed the group if there is a repair to a window that needs to be completed the funds would need to be taken out of the reserves.

Boyd also informed the group that the budget will be tracked with designated component areas. Boyd continues with the discussion of contribution levels to those components and what is correct. She stresses the importance of adding enough accurate funds to each designated area in the Reserve Study and Operating expense. She then moves over to the percentage of protection for insuring the outside shell of University Glen Townhomes. Boyd notifies the group of Ventura County's average reserve study; she states that according to VC's average reserves study the outside shell of these homes should only be insured for up to 75% and compares it to UC Irvin's 73%. She adds that University Glen's SFH are funded to 100%. King asks what the present funding for the Town homes is. Boyd assures King she will take a moment to discuss that question during the next few slides. Boyd assure the group that the CAG continues to discuss these topics and other with the Site Authority and that the CAG continues to seek resolutions. Boyd continues with informing the group that the Townhomes are at a range of 60% funded. Bokhart adds that at the end of the 2020 year and with the new 2020-2021 budget the new range of coverage will be at approximately 56-57% funded for Townhomes. Mandyam asks why the funded percentage budgeted is forecasted to drop.

Boyd answers that the CAM office is not replenishing the borrowed reserved funds, and this was the reason for the decline, and it will be the reason for the future declines. Mandyam, King, and Foeller all ask what the funds were spent on. Boyd answers that it was technically budgeted to be spent but hasn't necessarily been spent as of yet. Mandyam asks if he could have a copy of those line items. Friesen states that he could request it at any time from the CAM office and that he would explain the document if Mandyam had any questions. King asks if the reserves will be depleted completely with the landscaping refurbishing project [the Townhouse area landscape refurbishing is addressed through the Common Area reserve funds not the Townhouse reserve funds]. Friesen answers that it would not happen. Boyd encourages the group to look at the Reserves Study online under [universityglen.csuci.edu](http://universityglen.csuci.edu) for details. She informs the group that there are 3 separate reserve studies.

Boyd lists the 3 separate reserve study sections; Common Area, Single-Family Homes, and Townhomes. Boyd adds, each of these have components and are dictated by common practice. King requests that these details be added to the next E-Blast. Friesen agrees. Boyd informs the group of the recommendations that come from the reserve study that was created by Complex Solutions, and further stated that these are what should be done in terms of funding to get the reserves up to 100% for Townhomes for the future. She adds by 2047, give or take a year, townhomes need to be contributing \$180.00 a month. Foeller asks if this amount would be in addition to the monthly CAM fee of \$289.74. King interjects with stating \$110.00, she thinks is what needs to be added. Boyd confirms that \$70.50 monthly is presently being allocated for the Townhome reserves. She explains that an additional \$110.00 per month needs to be taken from the Townhouse owners in order to be at 100% funded. Foeller interjects and disagrees with the increase.

Boyd states the reserve doesn't need to be at 100% funded, she suggests it could be at \$155 a month, she adds the CAG and the Site Authority recognizes the significant increase. She adds with there being an allowance of up to 25% increase on the CAM fees per year. Boyd informed the group of the ethics behind selling the property and made a point to say she would be morally obligated to inform a new homeowner of this "short-fall". Boyd also informed the group that Kevin Olson, the finance committee member, had a "pay as you go" approach to the short fall. She added that if there are no significant projects in the coming years the funds that will be placed in the reserves would be for the short fall and says if there are no surprises it should work.

King asks how all of this would be accomplished. Boyd informs the group that the budget needs to be accurately forecasted, and the funds that are placed in reserves not touched for any reason. She further adds that the funds have been moved to shared insured accounts. Boyd also add that the accounts will be invested into conservative accounts in order to have a higher dividend yield. King asks who is making the decisions on those investments. Boyd answers with the Site Authority and the Chancellors office, they make the decisions for these accounts. She adds that these offices have investment committees working for them. King asks if University Glen has a second plan in case these offices do not invest the funds well. Boyd assures that these accounts are very conservative, she adds that the accounts are "already meeting the rate of inflation". Boyd also gives her opinion of accepting some risk for the accounts to increase.

King asks if the community owners and residents have any say as to what those investments are. Boyd states that they do not. King points to a scenario called "blind-faith". Boyd states that the CAG has made significant progress with the Site Authority and Chancellors office regarding transparency. Boyd states that the Site Authority does take the CAG's opinions seriously. Gabrielle Powell gives kudos to the CAG and the CAM office. King agrees. Bokhart added that the Reserve Study is a year old, and the meetings have been attentive on the Operating budget side. Bokhart said, there will be a few changes to the year-old reserve study, he further said 2 basic issues will be resolved. Also, some items on the Reserve budget will be clarified and items will be added that will increase contributions.

Finally, with Common Area reserve, some items will be taken away especially the ones that are related to the Town Center. Boyd added, the current amount being paid to the Common Area budget is \$14.27. She further added to get to the 100% funding we'd have to pay \$35.00 a month. She commented that the amount budgeted for the landscaping project is significantly lower than what was budgeted. Williamson asked Boyd to end her presentation with what are the next

steps to complete that project. Boyd continued with advising that the CAG get a line by line budget for Townhomes to have an accurate Common Area reserve budget. She also adds that the Single-Family Homes are budgeted correctly, and she doesn't see an issue with the SFH reserves. She finalized her presentation with reminding everyone that the Townhome owners will have a significant increase on their CAM fees. Williamson added that the Common Area reserve will not increase after the landscaping project is complete because all of the other amenities are new. He also added that if anyone would like to volunteer to create a specific Townhome reserve study group HAC would really appreciate the help.

## 6) Committee Reports

- a. Landscape
  - i. Due to the length of the landscape refurbishing presentation and finance committee reports this issue was not discussed.
- b. Finance/Budget Committee
  - i. See item 5 above
- c. Rules (Gabrielle Powell) (DEFERRED TO MARCH)
  - i. Open Space Plants etc. draft (Landscape Committee)
  - ii. Solar Townhouses -research started
  - iii. Compare KW rules with UG leased rules – started
  - iv. Proposal in works:
    1. Pool Behavior complaint process
    2. Roll-off bin temporary use rule
    3. Minimum landscaping requirements
- d. Community Garden Presentation, Lori Macdonald, Coordinator.
  - i. Lori Macdonald introduced the community garden to the group. Managers of the community garden are Carolyn Phillips and Lori Macdonald. Macdonald stated there are 15 plots, 13 gardeners, 1 plot for community herbs, and 1 small unconstructed plot is still available. All improvements are done by the plot holder, it takes about \$500 dollars to improve them, only organic products are allowed, and that there is a list of the 13 gardeners posted on the inside of the shed. She further adds, if any of the plot holders would like a drip irrigation set-up, they would have to pay \$20 as a one-time fee to Carolyn because she purchases the items and set-up the drip herself. She further stated, there is a waiting list of 6 people, but it is not posted on any website, and if anyone moves, she is not aware of this. Regarding the list of rules, one of the items is, the active use of the plot. She states that she contacts the owners that have not used the plot and requests if they would like to continue its use.

She further noted that most of the time the plot holder agrees that they would like to keep the plots. Powell asked to confirm if there is 1 plot available. Macdonald answered yes. Macdonald added that the cages need to be secure because of a rodent problem. Wheeler asked to confirm if the cost was associated with the maintenance of the plot and not the renting or a fee for the plot. Macdonald agreed, the cost is associated with the building and maintaining of the enclosure. Mandyam asked if the gardeners have a farmer's market. Macdonald answers with no. Olson recapped, with there being 1 plot open.
- e. Community Advisory Group and Site Authority (Sandi Boyd) (5)
  - i. Due to the length of the landscape refurbishing presentation and finance committee reports this issue was not discussed.
- f. Issues etc. to take to next meeting
  - i. Due to the length of the landscape refurbishing presentation and finance committee reports this issue was not discussed.

7) **Common Area Maintenance (CAM) Manager**

a. TOT Lot

- i. Friesen stated while he was obtaining pricing for the revamp of the TOT Lot him and Olson realized that the area belonged to Mission Hills. He inquired with Mission Hills as to whether they will revamp it, Mission Hills did not have an answer for them at the time.

8) **Budget Advisory Group (BAG) Chair Reports** (Jake Friesen) (10)

a. Topics not already presented

i. Insurance Coverage

1. Bolger stated that her insurance department is canceling with them since the trees that surround her home are too close to it. She further stated that they are lowering the threshold when insuring homes in University Glen. According to Bolger, Nationwide insurance was the company in question. Foeller added, that his wife called around to have a new HO6 insurer contracted but could not find anyone to insure the dwelling. Bolger added that, according to her new insurance company there needs to be a 15 feet clearance from her home to the tree in order for them to insure her property.

Phillip doesn't agree with the CAM office regarding adding mulch, she believes it is a fire risk. She continues with requesting the CAM office to find an alternative. Friesen states, the alternative is decomposed granite (DG) but it is 4x more in price. Bolger is requesting that UGCAM address what the owners are questioning when it comes to landscaping and not place such emphasis on the landscaping the Mission Hills area. Friesen informed her that Mission Hills residents pay Common Area fees as well. Friesen also stated that Landing Cove was added to the 1<sup>st</sup> phase of the landscaping renovation project. Olson chimed in and asked the question whether the homeowners would like to move forward with the landscaping pending the CAM fee increase. Victoria Marley suggests that the Site Authority is responsible for paying the landscaping renovation since they have not properly maintained it from the time when the community was developed a little after 2002.

Olson asked if the Site Authority only pays for some or none of it should the CAM office not move forward then? Foeller added regarding the Site Authorities negligence of the landscaping and that it should be considered and further agreed that the Site Authority should contribute all or a share. Foeller asked what Mello-Roos tax is and why owners pay it? Boyd stated the funds go towards a bond that the state of California leased to create University Glen. Bokhart agreed and stated that the tax will continue to be collected for 30 more years from this date [2/2020]. Olson stated that the bond was authorized for 50 years. Mandyam asked about the potential special assessment. Olson and Friesen's response is that it is a special assessment and it is to be divided by 12 months and the resulting amount charged to the owners and residents [regarding the topic of landscaping refurbishing protect]. Mandyam is requesting the Site Authority to pay for the landscaping. Olson stated he could request the Site Authority to pay for it fully or partly. Olson further states if the Site Authority refuses to pay for the renovation then should the CAM office move forward with the renovation?

Mandyam suggest the CAM office take a poll for the decision. Olson requests a vote from the group. Foeller points out that the CAM fees are there to maintain something that is already in existence and not for "the

creation of something so why should the funds be used to create this landscape renovation”. Olson stated the CAM fees are also to refurbish something that has been in place for a long period of time. Marley reemphasized that if the CAM office continues to request this refurbishing project to be paid by the Site Authority, because of their negligence, they will eventually comply. Phillips suggests the CAM office continue with the landscaping project and further suggests owners and residents pay their difference. Boyd noted that the CAM office will ask for a contribution to the landscaping renovation, she will suggest part of it or all of it from the Site Authority. Unidentified owner suggests the CAM office to change the plant pallet to succulents, she is aware that the refurbishing bill will be much higher since succulents cost more than the current plant pallets chosen. Wheeler agrees that the refurbishing project should not be rushed.

**9) Public Comment on Agenda Topics, in order listed**

- a. No itemized matters were discussed, various topics discussed during presentations.

**10) Adjourn to Architectural Reviews**

NEXT MONTH’S HAC MEETING: March 19, 2020.

HAC Attendees	
Owners	TH/SFH
Simhan Mandyam	TH
Cecelia Travis	TH
Alan Linnemeyer	TH
Tiina Dreiske	SFH
Carol Borecki	SFH
Steven Borecki	SFH
Tobey Wheeler	TH
Kevin Benn	TH
Janis Benn	TH
Lori Macdonald	TH
Paulette Koenig	SFH
Robert Koenig	SFH
Melea King	TH
Michelle Dietz	TH
Stephen Sfetku	TH
Carolyn Phillips	SFH
Victoria Marley	TH
Joshua Foeller	TH
Wendell Grayson	SFH
Scott Godfrey	BrightView Landscaping
Lazaro Ramos	BrightView Landscaping

**Current Homeowners:** All payments of CAM fees shall be made via UGCAM’s Yardi Payment Platform, by mailing a check, or by delivering a check to the mail drop at the UGCAM office at 45 Rincon Drive, Suite 103-3B, Camarillo, CA 93012. All maintenance requests shall be made via email at [UGCAM@kennedywilson.com](mailto:UGCAM@kennedywilson.com). For questions about monthly CAM payments or other questions, contact Jake Friesen, UGCAM Manager at 805-702-4038 or by email at [UGCAM@kennedywilson.com](mailto:UGCAM@kennedywilson.com). **For Home Sales** in the University Glen community, please contact Rosa Bravo at 805-437-8425 or [rosa.bravo@csuci.edu](mailto:rosa.bravo@csuci.edu)

**Apartment rentals** in the University Glen community, please contact Mission Hills Apartments at 805-465-0249.

Non-Emergency Number for the Police Dispatcher: 805-437-8444.