



Board of Directors

Charles Nunes – President & Park Maintenance
Fernando Da Silva – Vice President
George Johns – Secretary (Absent)
Mark Schieber – Treasurer

John Watkins – Rules and Regulations
Brenda Critzer – Public Relations
Brien Carlson – Park Use
Tom Barcellos – Collections
Lorena Lemus – Management

Members Present – 44

Meeting called to order at 10:00 am by Charles Nunes

Flag Salute by Roberta Duffey

President's Address

1. Please turn off all cell phones.
2. This meeting is restricted to members only.
3. This is a volunteer Board. No one is paid for their time. Board members are reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses.
4. Discussion of issues can become heated and emotional, but everyone deserves to be treated with dignity and respect.
5. All meetings of the Board are open to any members of the Association. Members who are not on the Board may not participate in any deliberations or discussions unless expressly so authorized by a quorum of the Board of Directors.
6. Members may participate in the meeting during the Member's Comments section of the agenda.
7. Questions, comments or suggestions will be referred to Board member, as appropriate or taken into consideration by the Board for research, review and discussion, and placed on next month's agenda.
8. Holiday RV Park's meetings and procedures are governed by our bylaws, CC&Rs and rules adopted by the Board.
9. Charles Nunes informed the audience that there would be a discussion about the recent construction loan voting process under "Old Business."
10. George Johns resigned from the Board last week, for personal reasons. The Board will accept the 4th place winner of the annual election as a Director to fill that vacancy.

Mary Halberg (Locker 661) made a motion to accept the minutes of the March 9, 2019 meeting, seconded by Kim McKenzie (Locker 107).

Certification of Quorum – Lorena Lemus

Yes, we have a quorum this year. The results of the election will be announced shortly.

Correspondence – Brenda Critzer

I relay messages and feedback from our guests each month, mainly from our online survey responses. We continue to receive excellent scores on the Park's cleanliness, maintenance and ease of reservations. I would like to thank our staff for working hard to keep our guests happy!

February 2020 Guest Survey Comments: *Please refer to the attached comments at the end of this document.*

Committee Reports

Financial Report – Mark Schieber

Park Accounts	Balance (12/31/19)	Annual Comparison	Jan - Dec 2019	Jan - Dec 2018	Difference	% Change
Mechanics Bank–Operating	\$126,237.03	Income	\$1,277,401.08	\$1,129,850.68	\$147,556.40	13%
Mech. – Laundry	\$8,362.45	Expense	\$1,024,389.58	\$962,104.59	\$62,284.99	6%
Mech. – Dues	\$20,289.97	Net Income	\$253,011.50	\$167,746.09	\$85,265.41	50%
Mech. – Emergency Reserves	\$100,353.13					
Mech. – CIM Reserves	\$213,616.50					
Morgan Stanley Dean Witter	\$161,648.84					

As you can see on our balance sheets moving forward into this year, our reserve accounts continue to build, which is exactly what the Park needs. Our net income is strong over the previous year, but we are beginning to invest money into maintenance improvements like new electrical panels to mitigate the amount of regular revenue spent each month to repair outdated facilities.

Joyce Aldrich (Locker 440) made a motion to approve the annual financials (profit & loss and year-to-year comparison), seconded by Darlene Nunes (Locker 543).

Management – Lorena Lemus

I wish to thank the members that are supportive of the Board; we put a lot of our personal time into these positions and I also appreciate each of my fellow Board members for their support. Of course, I must thank our staff as well, we would not be a successful business without them!

Collections – Tom Barcellos

Before yesterday, there was \$8,440 left outstanding from assessment dues and late fees. There was a public auction of 3 foreclosed shares yesterday, which substantially lowered that debt to \$6,791. My next moves are to contact 2 more members that owe a significant portion of our remaining balance, and there will be more liens and foreclosures if they do not pay in a timely manner. We are enforcing the rules as written; it's been long overdue.

The auction went very well; the shares sold for \$9,000, \$8,600 and \$8,500. Every debt and cost associated with the foreclosure process was recovered, the Park suffered no loss.

Park Use – Brien Carlson

The Park's annual occupancy remains consistent; 78% last year and 77% in 2018. Rental revenues were up nearly \$150,000, which is very encouraging to see. Our employees are doing a great job of keeping us booked by following the newer directives on reservations issued by the Board.

Park Maintenance – Charles Nunes

In the past year we purchased brand new washing machines for the laundry room, along with new floors, fresh paint and tinted windows to improve the look and usability of the facilities.

There was an accident this week with a golf cart hitting the door to the laundry room and bending the frame a bit, so until further notice I would appreciate if guests refrained from parking their carts upon the cement or in proximity of the laundry building.

We are also in the process of replacing nearly every electrical pedestal in the Park with new equipment; this work will continue into 2020.

Lastly, I would like to thank the Beach Social Club for donating the wonderful LED welcome sign to the Park last year. Please give them a round of applause!

Rules and Regulations – John Watkins

As Charles mentioned, the staff will be enforcing new rules for golf cart usage around the laundry area. Otherwise, you have received the new rules with your annual packet, let's be mindful in observing those.

Public Relations – Brenda Critzer

I would like to add to the appreciation for the Beach Social Club; this is their second year hosting the annual luncheon, which has helped to save the Park thousands of dollars previously spent on dinners and renting large social halls. I've been watching them shop, chop and cook all week and the amount of work put into their activities is remarkable.

I recently attended a Pismo Beach Chamber of Commerce function and learned some exciting news about the construction on the pier area, which should help bring more visitors to the Park when completed in May.

Manager's Report – Julie Hill

I introduced everyone to Roberta Duffey in January, but just to remind you she is one of our new employees in the office and she is catching on very quickly. However, today we have another new employee, Shani Bronson, and today is her second day actually! Shani comes to us from Coastal Dunes RV so training should smoothly.

I know that nobody wants to talk about it, it's the elephant in the room, but I feel like I must talk about the Coronavirus. We have been hearing some serious news in the recent weeks, and I have begun posting some general information about avoiding illness from the CDC, please try to follow these guidelines. I really don't want you or the staff to get sick, so let's do our best to stay well.

Once again, thank you to the Beach Social Club, for everything that you do. I truly appreciate your dedication and how much you give back to the Park!

Reportable Actions – George Johns (Absent)

Nothing to report.

2020 Election Results – Lorena Lemus

Before I announce the election results, there are a few things I would like to share. As we expected, there were some loan ballots that were mailed back in the wrong envelope and opened yesterday evening, 6 affirmative votes. 4 regular elections votes received were not valid.

There was a member that wrote on their ballot, "voting for 1 candidate only, poor selection of people." Let me make this clear; we are all volunteers, we signed up for this. Board members are taking time out of their work and family lives to be here, putting mileage on their cars, etc. To whoever wrote that, I am calling you out, please step up to the plate and run for the Board next year!

- 1.) Joyce Aldrich – 518 votes (33.60%)
- 2.) John Watkins – 302 votes (19.58%)
- 3.) Mark Schieber – 270 votes (17.51%)
- 4.) Fernando Da Silva – 250 votes (16.21%)
- 5.) Kip Hayes – 202 votes (13.10%)

Comment from Charles Nunes – As I mentioned during my address, the 4th runner up is elected to the seat left vacant by George Johns’ resignation. That position will be a 2-year term because George was already a year into his tenure when he resigned.

Old Business

1. Construction Improvement Committee – Loan Ballot Results and Discussion – Tom Barcellos & John Watkins

Comment from Tom Barcellos – As you may have heard, the loan ballot did not pass by a *narrow* margin, 18 votes. That number is even lower, 12 votes, thanks to the 6 ballots discovered in counting the election ballot last night. I would like to talk in generality, please do not take anything I say personally, but there were 205 members that did not vote whether it was for or against the loan. There are enough of those 205 members in this room right now that could have made a difference, one way or another. Some of those persons have been approached and asked why they did not vote, and the reasons vary. Everyone has a right to their opinion, but a common reply was “I wish I would have known ‘that’; I think I would have voted ‘yes.’” However, some stated “I would have voted ‘no’, so I did not vote instead.” That’s not right. You should vote regardless of whether you support the loan or not.

We must move this Park forward, so in order to do that there will be another special assessment like last year. If the loan ballot had passed there wouldn’t be a need for special assessments. We will continue to research financing and get better data to present to the members later to get approval for some kind of loan. It is our responsibility as a Board to protect your interest and the value of your investment, so we are not going to stop moving forward. This Park is a business, your business, in fact. Some members found the information presented in the loan proposal confusing, so there is clearly more work for us on communication. We are looking for you to ask questions, get answers and help spark discussion; it could create positive change for the Park. If you have an opinion or thought, please share it. Even if you disagree with the Board, let’s have a civil discussion about these improvements.

Comment from Kimberly McKenzie (Locker 107) – My husband, John, did a bit of math and figured that you do not need a loan for construction. We have 875 shares owned by us, simply take a loan from the shareholders. Many localities already borrow money using this practice. Send members a request for a loan of \$1,000 per share for the Park to pay for capital improvements. Give each member a time limit of 60 days to respond whether they wish to participate in the loan or not. Pay back each owner along with a 10% interest rate within 5 years. \$875,000 should be more than enough finance all the capital improvements we need. If the Shareholder does not respond to the request or provide the \$1,000 within 60 days, the remainder of our money needs can be resolved in the form of an assessment. It is worth a try; we are not going to lose anything. As we know, some of our members are very wealthy and we can acquire the resources without going into the commercial banking business. We need to think outside of the box!

Response from Tom Barcellos – Kim, I would suggest that you put that proposal in writing and submit it to the Board for analysis. Based on my own research into the matter, I estimated that the Park could acquire a business loan with an interest rate of 3 – 4%. I’m not sure how many members are willing to pony up \$1,000 per share, but that is a discussion that we should have in the coming months. That is exactly what I’m asking for today, thoughts and ideas.

Response from John Watkins – Outside of the box thinking is what we need, and I also appreciate Kim’s thoughts. As Tom said, we must move forward. Last week the State of California came to the Park and officially shut down the elevator; there is no elevator. While the elevator remains an issue, in my mind the priority is the restrooms. We are running on borrowed time until those facilities become unusable. If there’s a major sewage or water leak, then we are shut down. Literally close the Park and remove every trailer until the State of California says we can open again. I welcome and encourage ideas like Kim just brought to the table.

Comment from Holly Phillips (Locker 163) – Has the Board determined what the assessment per share would cost now that the loan did receive approval?

Response from Tom Barcellos – The amount of money the Board can issue on a special assessment per share without a vote is limited to 5% of the Park’s gross expenses on the yearly budget. Right now, that is estimated to be a special assessment of approximately \$114 per share this fiscal year.

Comment from John Watkins – We are pushing our architect to get the plans resubmitted to the Department of Community Housing and Development ASAP so that we can get more refined estimates on construction costs. With the amount of improvements that we have planned, the share values should increase dramatically. There won’t be shares sold at auctions for under \$10,000. That’s what we are working so hard to do; increase the value of your property, protect the infrastructure of the Park and make up for lost time.

Comment from Mark Schieber – When I reflect on the special assessment proposal in 2018 that *barely* didn’t pass, and the loan proposal that *barely* didn’t pass this year, I think there is not a denial of the need for improvements but rather a disagreement on how we will pay for it. We thought that the loan made sense for the members that did not want to be burdened with a special assessment, but yet again, we didn’t get the support required by the slightest of margins.

New Business

1. 2020 Operating and Capital Budget – Mark Schieber

Covered under Committee Report.

Darlene Nunes (Locker 543) made a motion to approve the 2020 operating and capital budget, seconded by Bill Couchman (Locker 784).

Member’s Comments

Kimberly McKenzie (Locker 107) – I’ve worked with the Board on ad-hoc committees before, which is something that I believe makes other members willing to approach me with their questions for the Board. There is obviously still a fear of retaliation from the Board that prohibits members from speaking openly at meetings. However, these people will call me and express their concerns.

One of these concerns is about the plans for the clubhouse remodel. I was asked the question, “is the second story of the new building, marked for office or storage use, even necessary?” Building a single-story clubhouse could save the Park money, and there is plenty of storage in the maintenance shop. We could even purchase a shipping container and store it behind the mobile home for much less money.

Next, there are members that are deeply concerned that we have some people in our Park living “rent free” because they own 9 or more shares. This kind of abuse is a loophole of the Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions. If 2 persons have 9 or more shares between them, they should have to rent 2 spaces. The Park is not made for persons to be able to use more than 5 shares in a single space.

Moving on, I know you brought this up already Tom, but if people did not vote for or against the loan that is their right as shareholders. You mentioned speaking with some of them, but if a ballot initiative does not pass, we must move on. People do have a right not to vote, and repeated elections on the same issue only delegitimize the previous results.

Furthermore, the rules and regulations for vehicle parking are in dire need of enforcement. People should not be allowed to park their cars in any empty space they choose without paying the daily \$5 fee that is outlined in the rules. The Park is losing valuable income every day.

Lastly, there are people working on cars and possibly their motorhomes while staying in the Park. There are sites in the Park that are looking trashy, that stink, and that *need* to be cleaned up. Bark should be considered for the dog run; cedar works best. It is easy to replace and helps to keep the smell down much better than the granite.

Well, that’s all the concerns that the members gave me. I would like to say that I am proud to be a part of this Park, but rules are rules, and loopholes should be closed.

Response from Fernando Da Silva – I need to get clarification on something you stated; are you saying there is an owner that owns 9 shares?

Kimberly McKenzie (Locker 107) – I try to avoid gossip around the Park, but someone told me about a member that, together with their spouse or significant other, owns 9 shares and occupies a single space year-round, essentially rent free. They are not a Monthly, nor a Snowbird; they only pay their assessment dues.

Response from Fernando Da Silva – The CC&Rs prohibit a member from acquiring more than 5 shares, but if 2 members own 5 shares each then they are entitled to use those days. As far as being able to use the days in the same RV, same space, that is something that the Board can look into. I'm glad you brought this to our attention, we will clarify that as a Board; it's a unique situation.

Leroy Laird (Locker 252) – As a previous Board member myself, I won't criticize the work that you do. However, I do have a question for the Board and Julie about the continuing electrical improvement project that was restarted after a years-long hiatus. The electrical panel at my Monthly space was replaced with a new 50/30-amp pedestal, but when I try to run several appliances at once using my motorhome's 30-amp cord, the breaker gets tripped. Can I use an adaptor to plug into the 50-amp outlet instead?

Response from Mark Schieber – You can use an adaptor, but if your RV has a 30-amp service then you won't draw more power from plugging into a 50-amp outlet. The 30-amp plug is missing a 3rd prong to draw additional electricity. There may be a very slight difference, but nothing close to gaining that extra hot lead for power.

Steve Scottish (Locker 39) – Are the electrical upgrades a continuation of previously incomplete conduit installation done by the Park staff about 2 years ago, or was that additional work stopped because it was not needed? Second question; is the permit for construction improvements complete?

Response from Tom Barcellos – The construction plans were returned from the Department of Community and Housing Development with 8 comments for us to address and then resubmit. Some additional engineering work is needed, so we will get those plans back to HCD once the comments are addressed.

Response from Charles Nunes – To clarify what Steve is asking about, the Park staff trenched a portion of the road and laid down new conduits for electrical and utility cables and pipes. This was done in anticipation of electrical upgrades. However, it was brought to our attention by the electrical engineers after we started that sufficient cabling and conduits were installed by a previous contractor years ago when the initial electrical improvement project began. Now there are additional conduits around the middle and back section of the Park in case it's needed in the future, but it turned out to be unnecessary for the ongoing electrical work.

Charlie Weeks (Locker 7) – I have some concerns about Park construction, loans, funding, etc. The members received a presentation for a loan, but the loan itself was never defined. I saw no investigation on the Board's part about getting a loan because it's believed that cannot be done until we receive a voting approval. That is not actually correct. You can find what is available, how much we can get, that would not affect an outcome of a vote. Lending institutions are going to want to know what we have in our bank and how much cash we put up in advance to secure a loan. I do this for a living, I work with business like us all the time. We should be presenting a solid loan proposal from a bank to the Association, then people can make an informed decision. No one knew much the loan is for, or how much the buildings were actually going to cost...everything was too vague. That bothered an awful lot of people; hence many people did not vote or vote against the loan. Explain to us, what the heck is this all going to? I really don't think you have the answer.

After the January meeting, I sent an email to Julie offering my services to the Board and the Construction Improvement Committee. Did the Board receive that?

Response from Tom Barcellos – Yes, we did.

Charlie Weeks (Locker 7) – If you guys don't need the help, I'm okay with that. It's free, but if you have the background in construction and the knowledge of what its really going to take to build these facilities, then I will back out. But from the sound of things, the comments and the direction things are going, you don't. You don't have the background in this, and I am afraid of members being stuck with one of the worst albatrosses ever seen if we start construction without the

funds up front, a security deposit set aside, etc. This is going to turn out really bad. You already mentioned things going poorly if a sewer line bursts. Really? Start tearing down the restrooms and watch yourselves not be able to rebuild them correctly or find something worse than a sewer leak. We will bleed money out of this place. The projection of funds for contingencies is not there, and that is why people don't follow through with a vote of confidence in this. We hear that Tom Barcellos is working on the plans...great! All we see is schematics; I have been working in this side of things my entire career, with *actual* plans. In addition, you talked about trying to get the plans approved for the "2019" codes. Building codes are reevaluated every 3 years, so we are really talking about the 2018 codes...again, not the correct information. Some members actually know about these things, but they don't want to stand up and voice it, so I get to do that instead. Even if the plans are approved, we're not ready to build anything. I've heard it said that once the plans are in order it's a year and half... a year and a half to what? To start? To finish? Yet another ambiguous statement to the people. What exactly does that mean?

Response from Tom Barcellos – I have stated that if we stopped working towards the goal of construction, shelve the projects, it would take the Board a year and half to get back to where we are right now. That is a generalization.

Charlie Weeks (Locker 7) – I see. I may have misunderstood you when I heard that comment, I was simply reviewing my notes and came across it. Let me rephrase my question, once the plans are approved how long will it take to secure funding for construction?

Response from Fernando Da Silva – We talked about this during the January meeting; the Board wanted to issue a ballot to receive approval for a loan, and yes, we did not have more detailed information available to present as part of that because the Board did not want to speak with financial institutions about a loan without first receiving approval from the members. I can assure that the entire Board is looking at how to finance construction improvements properly. Yes, you are correct that we cannot begin construction until funding has been accounted for. I understand your concerns all too well; I have owned an accounting business for 22 years. Both Tom Barcellos and John Watkins are business owners too. We understand the importance of what we are doing. Since a loan was not approved by the members, the next step is to evaluate how we can build revenue to finance this project. We are talking about every option left available to the Board at this point: special assessments, cutting expenses, etc. This may take several years; it's all dependent on the Park as a business now. Again, you are correct, as of this moment we are not financially ready to begin construction. Because the Board traditionally does not attend to regular business at this annual meeting, we look forward to dissecting the finances during the next regular meetings and seeing what the reality of the situation is. No, we cannot give you an answer today.

Charlie Weeks (Locker 107) – At the same time, we have Board members saying we are moving forward on the plans. What is the status of the construction plans right now? Are these plans at final approval yet?

Response from Tom Barcellos – The plans are at our architect's office in Arroyo Grande. We have completed engineering work as requested by HCD's comments and the architect is due to revise the plans using that data. Once revised, he will send those plans back to HCD. They are extensive plans, comprising a large roll of papers.

Response from Julie Hill – If you have questions, please come and ask the Board and me. It's not like we are not being forthright; just because you don't hear about what the Board is working on every single second of every day doesn't mean that no one is doing anything. I don't have time to email or notify each member of what is being worked on between meetings. Every month we present summarized reports at the meetings, and there are detailed minutes available if you cannot attend. The Board and I have been discussing this project for nearly 2 years. If you want more information please ask but coming here making accusations is very difficult on all of us, to be honest. You can ask questions, but accusations, gosh...I'm the paid employee and I work really hard. The Board is *not* paid, do you know how many times I day I call them? This is a hard job that they have to deal with, and they are not resting on their laurels; the Board is continually working on improving the Park. Sorry if you don't get to see the daily work that goes into it, but that is my 2 cents.

Response from Mark Schieber – Another facet to this issue is the fact that the Park used to have what I've named the "Julio construction." When I first joined Holiday, I was surprised to hear remarks about how he was not qualified to work on many things that he did, or that he "worked cheap." I would listen to other members that were licensed contractors, plumbers and electricians ask why the Park directed Julio to repair everything around here. To this Board's credit, they made a conscious decision to move away from forcing our maintenance staff to work on jobs that demand the expertise of professionals. Furthermore, we are allowing licensed contractors, plumbers and electricians to provide the Board their

experienced opinions, and we respectfully take their advice into consideration. If you have a question, let the Board know, and we're going to ask the professionals what the answer is.

Comment from Charles Nunes – Larry, is there something you would like to comment on? I see you approaching the microphone...

Larry Kindell (Locker 23) – Well, I'm addicted to the microphone; I sing karaoke here at the Moose often. You want to have a good time? Come down here on Friday nights and sing with me!

♪ “Hey, hey, good lookin’, whatcha got cookin’” ♪ “How’s about cookin’ something up with me” ♪

♪ “Hey, sweet baby, don’t you think maybe” ♪ “We could find us a brand new recipe” ♪

Don't I sound a lot like Johnny Cash? Anyways, I just wanted to tell you how much everyone around the Park appreciates the you guys and your time. I know the responsibility you guys carry, and I know all the bullshit you have to contend with. I want to congratulate each and every one of you for what you do, we have to keep moving forward.

If I have a contention, I think that if you recognize that the average age of our members is probably 50 or so, it makes sense to have a single-story clubhouse in the Park, not a two-story. I like to drink...and we were upstairs in the clubhouse last night, and I fell down myself, thankfully backwards and not forwards. I would love to see to see a nice, 5-star facility like they have at Pismo Creek RV Resort next door to us. It's my dream to have a beautiful, ground level clubhouse at Holiday, and if you want to charge me \$5,000 a month for it, I'll write you a check today. I don't want no damn two-story facility though, because its just ridiculous to keep the stairs or an elevator when we don't need it. Anyway, thank you for putting with me, my wife is giving me the look that says it's time to sit down...we love ya'll!

Response from Julie Hill – Larry, you have to keep in mind that Pismo Creek RV does have a 3-bedroom loft above their clubhouse that is rentable. So, it technically is a two-story building too, just putting it out there!

Ed Aldrich (Locker 440) – Larry, thanks for some levity, I think we needed that! In looking at the construction plans, it appears that the Board is locked in to doing things a certain way. I wonder, why there can't be room for alternatives? Sometimes it seems like we have a champagne taste but are on a beer budget.

Response from John Watkins – The reason that the Board and the Construction Improvement Committee considered the second story for the remodel was because we needed the storage space up in the front of the Park and not in the maintenance shop or the back. Our intention was never to use the upstairs level as an office or a publicly accessible facility, the architect mislabeled that diagram. The new clubhouse will have a bottom floor recreational area, a brand-new kitchen and it will be bigger than before. We need these kinds of improvements to our aging facilities, its our lifeblood to keeping this place open. Because of the elevator being closed, we have a lot of members that cannot easily use the clubhouse. We're going to analyze our finances, see what we can do, and continue to have joint discussions with you about it. Many times, we don't hear about what is wrong with something until *after* our decisions have been made, so please take the opportunity to speak with us. In my view, based on the loan ballot and our revenue, I don't see the clubhouse remodel happening before the restrooms are taken care of. Not having an easily accessible clubhouse will lower our value until that gets rectified.

Ed Aldrich (Locker 440) – I agree with you that the restrooms should be our priority, especially since ADA-compliance remains an issue. Why not set a budget for that project, and a completely separate budget for the clubhouse? I know it would cost the Park more money to shelve the clubhouse project for now, but it might the only way to accomplish anything.

Response from Mark Schieber – We are discussing that reality as a Board right now; a loan was not approved, so we don't have another means to quickly finance both projects anytime soon. Alternate directions are being considered, but I think the big takeaway from today's meeting is that everyone has a very specific opinion about how our Park should improve, what the clubhouse should look like, etc. We have heard a lot of opinions on this over the last 2 years, but it reaches a certain point where the Board can no take more opinions into consideration. Ultimately, it is the Board's responsibility to make decisions. If you look at the percentage of votes cast for the loan proposal, most members were in favor of what was

being presented, as is. I think that speaks well for the direction that the Board has taken; people are largely onboard with what we're trying to do.

Leroy Laird (Locker 252) – I think our biggest problem is trying to make everyone happy; that large percentage of members that voted for the loan was not a show of favor for the plan itself, it was all of us showing our support for the Board. A lot of us are getting close to 80 years old, and we won't be comfortable with a 10-year commitment. We might disagree a little bit over some of the details, as we have today, but we need to support the Board and find an easier way to get things done around here. I know a lot of people that support the Board, along with me, that is why we're here today!

Response from Tom Barcellos – Thank you for your support Leroy, I greatly appreciate it. Truthfully, all of us have made business decisions before in our lives. We've bought homes and decided what we did or didn't like about the house, talked with our spouse, and figured it out. As a Board, we have to speak with 875 people. Everyone has an opinion, but we were elected to make decisions and do our best to educate people as to why. I know that people are getting older and big plans can seem worrisome, but the Board is trying to increase the value of your investment, or your children's investment if you pass your deed on to them. Other shareholder parks in our area cost more money to buy in, or more money to stay at...are they really worth it? I think our Park *is*, but you can go somewhere else and pay 3 times as much if you want to. We have a lot to offer already with our friendship and location, but we want to beautify the Park in a big way. There's no realistic means to take spaces out and make them wider, so instead we have to offer the best facilities that we possibly can.

Board Member's Comments

Brenda Critzer (Locker 166) – Thank you to all those members that stepped up to the mic today and commented with feeling. Kim McKenzie, I would like to say that I appreciate you addressing the Board with your notes. I am always concerned when I hear the word "retaliation," because I don't think you are speaking to *this* Board when it comes to that word. We have certainly had some difficult decisions put before us in the last year, but there has been no retaliation. I want to give my sincere sentiments to everyone that you can come to us in confidence, because we are part of you, elected by you to work on everyone's behalf. The Board is always surprised when you don't have input during a meeting, so please feel free to speak openly and help us move our improvement efforts forward!

All Motions

Mary Halberg (Locker 661) made a motion to accept the minutes of the March 9, 2019 meeting, seconded by Kim McKenzie (Locker 107).

Roll Call: All Members present unanimously voted yes; motion carried.

Joyce Aldrich (Locker 440) made a motion to approve the annual financials (profit & loss and year-to-year comparison), seconded by Darlene Nunes (Locker 543).

Roll Call: All Members present unanimously voted yes; motion carried.

Darlene Nunes (Locker 543) made a motion to approve the 2020 operating and capital budget, seconded by Bill Couchman (Locker 784).

Roll Call: All Members present unanimously voted yes; motion carried.

Ed Aldrich (Locker 440) made a motion to adjourn the annual meeting to executive session, seconded by Dale Critzer (Locker 166).

Roll Call: All Members present unanimously voted yes; motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 11:40 am

Respectfully Submitted,

Joyce Aldrich

Board of Directors – Secretary

Cc

Aaron Cartwright

Senior Reservation Agent

Guest Survey Comments from February 2020:

- “Love this Park - staff are always so very helpful and polite.”
- “Men's restroom needs remodeling... Sites are pretty tight...”
- “Great helpful and friendly staff, great RV Park. Recommend it very highly.”
- “My only suggestion would be to have the showers scrubbed a little more often. Otherwise it was a great stay.”
- “I noticed a man in the spa one evening smoking a cigarette and drinking a can of beer. I know there is supposed to be no drinking of alcohol beverages but is smoking allowed? Didn't notice a no smoking sign.”
- “On Saturday leaving our site our car battery was dead we called the office and maintenance came straight over and jumped our car. Thank you for such prompt service and helping us get on our way.”
- “We love this place. We will always use this RV Park. My wife's sister lives next door and we plan on visiting her several times a year.”
- “Parking is always an issue... the staff is awesome!”
- “Appreciated the accommodation on short notice. Very friendly and helpful.”
- “We were at the back of the Park and Wi-Fi was nonexistent”
- “The check-in process is easy, and the maintenance guys are the best with helping you get into your spot. I love it.”