



MEMBER COMMENTS:  
PROPOSED AMENITY ACCESS RULE CHANGE  
August 26 – September 19, 2024

*Below are comments sent in for the 45-day member notification and comment period for the proposed Amenity Access Rule Change. Comments were received between August 26 – September 19, 2024. A total of 48 comments were received. Comments are presented as submitted with no edits. Addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses were redacted..*

---

Note my Tahoe Donner property is a vacant lot. My residence is at XXXXX (Redacted) Prosser Dam Road in Truckee. On August 1, 2024 I signed a ski-lease rental agreement with ski-lease renters for that residence for the term Nov. 24, 2024 to May 1, 2025. Each of the four years that I have rented to these renters, including this year, I have included my two Tahoe Donner guest cards, each for four guests, in the rental and the privilege of access was included in the rent. Additionally, my renters have always paid the guest fee at the time of their entry. My renters thus are expecting to use those guest cards as stated in our legally binding rental agreement.

I read in the Proposed Amenity Access Rule Change document under “Phased Implementation Plan” on page 15 that all existing transferable guest cards will be deactivated Jan. 1, 2025. Therefore, the guest cards I will give me renters will no longer be usable after that date. This is unacceptable per the terms of my lease.

I have always considered my renters to be “Personal Guests” and not “Short-term Tenants” as their tenancy is not physically on my Tahoe Donner property.

Does this mean that I will have to purchase 8 guest cards? And there is little way I will be able to verify in advance in the registration process my relationship to each guest. It is probable that the son of the renters may have a school friend or two up for the week-end and will want to use Trout Creek or the renting couple may have different houseguests on different dates. wanting to use Trout Creek. There is no reason for me to know about these guests in advance or at all.

I don't think deactivating existing guest cards on Jan. 1, 2025 is practicable or fair this late in 2024, as many TD owners already have signed long-term and ski-lease leases at this date which incorporate the old guest cards.

Please do not deactivate the existing guest cards until Jan. 1, 2026, at which time proper notice will have been timely given.

Julie (Julia) Vietor

---

This proposal penalizes homeowners who do not use the amenities. It forces us to subsidize those who do and I'm not sure why the board thinks this is a fair and reasonable solution. Second homeowners are already penalized in many other ways including subsidizing utilities, etcetera. Tahoe Donner is becoming less and less desirable for second homeowners. Ultimately property values will fall.



---

This proposal penalizes homeowners who do not use the amenities and ultimately forces us to subsidize those who do. It is unfair to force these costs on us. The amenities should be paid for by those who use them.

---

We would like to comment that childless couples are not mentioned in the new rules. We are sorry to hear our nieces/nephews will no longer be able to have member cards. We will be paying the recreation fee with minimal benefit since we will be able to have only 2 member cards.

---

I have two comments:

1. Limit # of uses per property. A more equitable way to handle the proposal at a lower cost would be to limit the number of uses per property per year at perhaps 100 amenity visits. Members could pay more for an unlimited visit card for any household member or per-use for the various categories of guests. In addition to lowering the cost of the proposal, this would help address the problem of occasional users subsidizing the "super-users" of amenities.
2. Address Covenants "Delegation of Use" provisions. The Tahoe Donner Covenants (Article II Section 3a) allow owners to delegate their use of common facilities to a tenant/lessee. Although the sections are not as artfully drafted as they could be, it is clear that tenants (including vacation/short-term renters) have access to amenities. The proposal is testing the boundaries of what might or might not be allowable under the Covenants by providing unequal access protocols for sub-classes of Tenants even though the Covenants (Article II Section 1a) require everyone within the classification "Tenants" to be treated "fairly and equally." It is further testing the Covenants by not allowing owners to delegate their own use to any tenant. One way to address this concern might be to allocate a certain number of uses per property to be used at the discretion of the owner (as described in #1 above).

Thank you for considering my views.

Michael Paparian

---

How will access be handled if your TD house is owner occupied but enhanced with an ADU or one or more of your bedrooms is rented to a tenant, both of which are encouraged by regional housing programs and the State of California? You wouldn't want to relinquish your rights to a long term tenant as you would if your entire house was rented out, but assuming you had room in the 4+6 card limit, how can you add these unrelated tenants on your property?

---

I object to the proposal to eliminate the optional rec fee and to replace it with a permanent increase in the mandatory annual assessment. My family chooses not to pay the rec fee because we rarely use any TD



amenities. If this proposal is enacted then we will be forced to subsidize the recreational activities of other members. All operating expenses should be paid by the users of each recreational amenity.

---

Although we read through the entire (repetitive and seemingly endless) Proposed Rule Change you mailed to us, we never saw an actual dollar amount. One paragraph in the recent T-D News says, "For the average T-D household purchasing the current Rec Fee, the proposal would reduce the overall cost for private amenity recreational access by roughly 50%." This sounds like you are going to attach to the annual assessment 50% of what the rec fee cost! That is fine (and generous!) for people who live there and are able to use the amenities; we who live in the Bay Area are not there often enough to make the annual rec fee worthwhile, so when we're there we've always just paid for an amenity individually that day. Your new proposal, charging us all 50% of the old rec fee, is yet another example of out-of-town owners subsidizing the year-round residents! Along with garbage collection costs, water costs, local taxes, etc., here we go again.

Our family has always supported Pizza on the Hill and the Lodge often while we're there, feeling they would appreciate as much business as possible. Now that you'll be unfairly reaching into Bay Area pockets yet again, I doubt we'll feel generous anymore. Kings Beach restaurants, here we come.

---

Dear President Don Koenes and Tahoe Donner Board Members,

We've read and appreciate the effort all have put into the proposed Amenities Access Rules Changes.

We would like to suggest changes to the proposed rules in the following ways:

1. Date of implementation: Currently on January 1st, 2025. We Suggest moving the implementation date for the Guest and STR Passes to the far-less busy mid January time frame. This avoids chaos and confusion during the busiest time of the year for owners, guests, and renters.
2. Priority Amenity Access: The statement "use and enjoyment of the amenities by members" is subjective and not functionally useful. A chart showing usage versus time-of-day is useful for planning and clarifies what "overburdening" means.
3. Preventing non-member crowding: Be specific about thresholds, limits, and management tools for regulating usage, and share that with owners.
4. Reservation System: Regarding On-Line registration. The website for registering was confusing and not user-friendly. Both user and staff trying to implement this website encountered multiple problems.

We are 25-year Tahoe Donner owners and appreciate your consideration of our concerns

Thank you, Evor S. and Peri L. Vattuone

---

You're trying to make this public for investors at our expense. Assessments and fee structure is already not fair to actual homeowners. Many homeowners rarely even use the amenities - is it fair to charge them regardless of usage? TD operates like a Timeshare where owners have to pay large annual assessments, but



yet, renters get to use the facilities free of extra charges. This proposal will make it worse with the public usage impacts. Most HOAs allow homeowners access to facilities without an additional fee. We have two people and access should be free with ID. A fee should be assessed for extra cards and there should be a limit, of, say four. We are part time and already have to subsidize the full time owner usage, and everyone's guests. This proposal will not fix anything, rather it will allow more public usage of the PRIVATE member amenities. That is a conflict of interest by using owners to subsidize the public, who overrun everything with too many people, extra wear and tear, maintenance and replacement, plus more law suits that the general public may inflict. We should not have to make a 'reservation' or pay more unrealistic dues that will continue to escalate every year. The proposal won't save us any money, or prevent overcrowding.

---

I do not think that amenity access fees should be required for lots that do not have homes on them if the owners don't use the amenities and no ID cards have been issued. I own two adjacent properties: 03/458 and 03/459. The second property is undeveloped. I have only two members in my household and we have only two member ID cards. I urge the board to consider a fee exemption for property owners of more than one property (on the second property) whose families consist of 4 members or fewer when the second property is undeveloped. I understand the rationale for asking my 2 person family to pay rec fees even if we don't ever use the tennis center, trout creek, beach club, pools, or snow play (which I do not). It is unfair to charge me twice for these amenities if I only have a two person family and one of the two properties I own is undeveloped. Vacant lots for which ID cards have not been issued should be exempt from these fees. Are you going to require developers like XXXXX XXXXXX (redacted) who own multiple vacant lots to pay rec fees for every one of the vacant lots he owns?

---

I do not think that amenity access fees should be required for lots that do not have homes on them if the owners don't use the amenities and no ID cards have been issued. I own two adjacent properties: 03/458 and 03/459. The second property is undeveloped. I have only two members in my household and we have only two member ID cards. I urge the board to consider a fee exemption for property owners of more than one property (on the second property) whose families consist of 4 members or fewer when the second property is undeveloped. I understand the rationale for asking my 2 person family to pay rec fees even if we don't ever use the tennis center, trout creek, beach club, pools, or snow play (which I do not). I do think that it is unfair to charge me twice for these amenities if I only have a two person family and one of the two properties I own is undeveloped. Are you going to require XXXXX XXXXXX (redacted) to pay rec fees for every one of the vacant lots he still owns?

---

We are opposed to this new proposed change to the amenity access rules. We are just one of what is probably many household who are less than 4 household members. The proposed plan of automatically adding 4 member passes to the assessment fee does not make sense, as our household will be paying for 2 extra rec fees we cannot use or allocate outside of a family member. We are also long term owners who



have paid for our rec fees as additional usage fee, this on top of the current \$1186 allocation to amenities operating fund, 40% of our current \$2907 assessment, which by official budget report is \$1000 increase since 2018. .You state that the current policy is outdated as it was implemented 3 decades ago when less than 50% of lots were sold, today we are almost at capacity, that additional revenue has certainly been a big revenue generator for the operating fund and amenities that are essentially the same, of course outside of the new very expensive DH ski lodge? Your main issues the board calls out is in management of increased usage, not lack of funding, how exactly will the proposed mandatory increase of adding 4 full amenity fees to each assessment correct the current management failures of managing more usage. How will this increased assessment rec fee revenue be allocated?, how does this benefit a less than 4 member household, or those households who don't actively use all amenities on a regular basis. It would be interesting view a breakdown of homeowners house size, full time/part time ownership as well as qty of STR's

---

I am not in favor of the proposed changes to the amenity access rules, as I do not feel that it provides an equitable funding and pricing system. By eliminating the optional annual recreation fee, the annual assessment will need to increase. This means that all members will financially support the amenities equally, but not equitably.

Tahoe Donner was designed and built largely as a vacation home community. While there are a number of permanent residents, the majority of properties are still used as vacation or second homes. As such, usage of the amenities varies widely; many full-time residents use the amenities weekly, or more, whereas many second home owners may use amenities a few times a year.

Understanding that the amenities provide a benefit to all members, in that there is a positive impact on property values, the cost of supporting and maintaining the amenities is heavily based on usage. It does not seem equitable to me that a heavy user, under the new proposed system, would be paying the same amount as someone who only uses the amenities a few times a year, or perhaps even not at all. The current system seems to me to be much more equitable, where all members provide some funding to amenities through the annual assessment, and members who expect to use the amenities on a regular basis pay more with the optional recreation fee.

Perhaps to help understand the impact of this significant policy change, it would be useful for the association to provide an analysis of the expected impact to the annual assessment based on this change. I would have expected to see this type of information in the notice that was sent out. Perhaps this could be included in a future communication.

Thanks for considering my comments.

---

#### Tahoe Donner Amenity Access Policy

##### Summary:

1. Each eligible member is entitled to a free Photo ID card.
  2. All benefits and products should be separate from an ID card.
- The proposed policy (Section C.d.ii.2.) states that "the Owner should be entitled to purchase up to six (6)



additional Member Photo ID Cards annually.” It also specifies, “No access or discount shall be granted at any Amenity without the presentation of a valid Tahoe Donner Card” (Section I.2.a.).

What is wrong with the proposed policy?

1. Tahoe Donner offers various products for sale. A Member Photo ID should not be one of them. Historically, it has never been treated as a product. Saleable products include rec passes, golf passes, private amenity day passes, or food items sold at POTH, etc. The photo ID has never been the pass required for accessing amenities or benefits. For instance, you can visit the tennis center or rec center without a card, provide your name, and the attendant will verify your identity and access privileges through the system.
2. The card lacks an expiration date, and it should remain that way, except for cards issued to temporary employees (which should be separate from Member IDs).
3. A Member Photo ID certifies membership based on ownership status, family relations, etc. Requiring members to purchase an ID discriminates against those who opt not to buy one. This is especially problematic concerning benefits publicly announced for all members, such as discounts at food venues (e.g., BOGO at POTH) or retail stores (e.g., discounts at DHSL). It also discriminates against members trying to show their card outside of Tahoe Donner, such as when showing it to Caltrans or the Highway Patrol to indicate they are a local resident, not a transit traveler.

How to fix the policy:

1. Treat the Member Photo ID as a local identification document, not a product for sale.
2. Recognize that purchased benefit items are recorded in the computer system, not tied to the physical photo ID.
3. Clearly define benefits as products that either require an assignment after payment of the assessment or a separate purchase. Also define general benefits.
  1. Annual prepaid access to the three Private Amenities. Follow the Phased Implementation Plan’s assignment schedule. Allow additional purchases per Residential Parcel. Available to members, permanent tenants, and employees.
  2. Season passes to Public Amenities. Golf, Downhill Skiing, Cross-Country Skiing, Bikeworks, and the Equestrian Center, should have distinct pricing for Members and the general public. If needed, limit the number of Member passes per Residential Parcel.
  3. Daily access passes to Private Amenities. Members may receive discounts (e.g., member price vs. guest price).
  4. Daily passes to Public Amenities: Golf, Downhill and Cross-Country Skiing, Bikeworks, Equestrian center, Snowplay, and Campground. Members may be eligible for discounts.
  5. General discounts and benefits related to marketing campaigns and non-monetary policies, such as retail shop and food discounts, booking priorities, and participation in Tahoe Donner governance.

Why this fix is better:

1. It resolves the conflict of treating the Member Photo ID as both an identification card and a discount card.
2. It eliminates the inconsistency between publicly announced general member benefits (e.g., BOGO offers) and the requirement to purchase a “valid” (i.e., paid) Member ID card, which is not currently enforced but has been announced.



3. It removes the contradiction between the "annual purchase" of an ID card and the fact that these cards do not have expiration dates.
  4. It avoids discrimination against members from larger families when showing a Tahoe Donner ID outside of TD.
  5. It addresses the issue of legitimate members who, having not purchased a new ID this year but holding an "old" card, are denied access to a Private Amenity unless they have a guest card.
- 

I suggest a technical change that the Board might consider. Section A.10 defines owner as a person with a 15% or greater interest. Section D.2.a. treats a partnership or corporation as an owner, and section D.2.b. treats as an owner's family officers, directors of a corporation, or partners in a partnership. A partnership may have unlimited numbers of partners. The officers and directors of a corporation may not necessarily be the owners of corporate shares, or at least may not be the appropriate persons to address. I suggest that the definition of an owners family be written to include shareholders of a corporation who hold 15% or greater interest in the outstanding voting stock of the corporation and partners of a partnership who own 15% or greater of the partnership interest in partnership capital and income. These definitions would be consistent with the multiple owner provision.

---

We are vehemently opposed to having the majority underwrite and subsidize the minority of homeowners who use the amenities. We believe the most equitable approach is to have user fees. Even the current policy provides a significant subsidy to people who elect to pay for the yearly access fee. At a minimum, we are in favor of keeping the current policy. If all homeowners who are required to pay the access fee really used the amenities, they would be overcrowded and requiring homeowners to involuntarily pay this will lead to a higher incentive to use the amenities to "get their monies' worth" leading to overcrowding.

---

Hi. We have been going to Tahoe donner for more than a dozen years taking advantage of the many amenities that TD offered. Because of the amenities and the great community feel (was much cheaper and many more free events like the fall party and the summer concerts years ago), we decided to purchase our home in 2015. We still love the amenities but find that the policies each year have only gotten more expensive and have offered less making the value much less. Now there is a new policy that will hurt homeowners like us whose kids are getting older and find less time heading up due to busy schedules and soon to leave the house. To that end, we have been renting our home when we aren't using it as we were fortunate enough to rent homes for years before we were able to buy. The charm of TD is the ability to use the amenities and what differentiates itself from other homes in Truckee. The new policy hurts homeowners like us and guests and short term renters who cannot afford to buy but want to experience the benefits and who may eventually be homeowners. I understand the need for managing crowds and to have a prioritization system but it still seems like it is



unfair to only allow 6 total passes for STRs from 8. Many guests do come in groups together and would like to all go together. I am not sure how reducing the number really matters if there is a priority system anyway. If you keep the number of STR passes to 8, it allows for groups to come in and enjoy and gives priority to them over the public.

Why not allow TD more of an opportunity to make more by allowing 8 instead of 6 especially during times that aren't peak times. Utilization is key to a strong budget and if you have a limit and a priority process, then increasing the number from 6 to 8 should not affect overcrowding anyway.

Finally, I do not like the idea of forcing members to pay when the HOA has continued to increase each year. The HOA is becoming quite unaffordable especially for older homeowners.

Please consider the value that you are offering homeowners and guests with the charges as it continues to feel that the value is decreasing each year.

Kindly,  
Karen Chin

---

We are opposed to the arbitrary number of 4 family members for all regardless of the size of the immediate family size. If some families have the ability to buy up, why do we not allow the ability to buy down? Being forced to purchase 4 without the ability to utilize is not right and an unfair burden. You are forcing smaller families to supplement the cost of larger families, this financially unfairly burdens smaller families.

For full transparency we have my cousin and his wife listed on our account however due to their infrequent use and our ability to purchase amenity passes for my wife and me, for 2024 we have only purchased the two option.

In closing, we urge you to reconsider the arbitrary number of 4.

---

What is the annual access fee? Why wasn't this mentioned in the booklet we got in the mail? How do you expect people to approve changes without knowing how much it will be?

---

Our niece XXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX (redacted) has been one of our approved cardholders since we purchased our property. Since she has a single mom without much money, her visits to our Tahoe Donner home often constitute XXXXXX's (redacted) only vacation in a year. XXXXXX (redacted) has enjoyed Horsemanship Camp, the Trout Creek pool, the Northwoods Pool, and the Beach Club Marina. We only have 5 amenity access cards associated with our property which would be under the proposed 6 card limit. Even so, the new amenity access policy proposes removing XXXXXX's (redacted) access to our amenities because her relationship with us is "difficult to validate". How is XXXXXX's (redacted) relationship to us as a niece more difficult to validate than a grandchild's domestic partner? Since they write that they care about non-traditional families, why should Tahoe Donner be at all involved in validating whether or not a family relationship is legitimate?

Please do not remove our niece's access to amenities she enjoys and that we pay for. Please do not validate





family relationships when attempting to determine access. Please limit access to a strict number per property and trust homeowners how to control that access.

---

Thank you for all the work the committee has put into revising the access policy. I expect that it is quite challenging trying to satisfy such diverse needs and opinions. I sat in on a recent Zoom session, which was quite informative. I did however come away with a couple of questions:

1. Regarding the policy proposal of children ages 3 and up requiring a member card-am I understanding correctly that these cards would be available as one of the 6 extra "to be purchased" cards? If so, is there some type of reduced rate for these child cards? It doesn't seem equitable that a three year old would pay the same as a full adult when they don't have access to all the amenities-they're unable to book a tee time, can't reserve a tennis court etc. A child also puts less strain on an amenity as they must accompany an adult yet do not tend to have guests accompany them who are not members.
2. Regarding the extra cards available for Short Term Rental tenants. If the goal, as stated, is to "Prioritize, promote, and protect personal use by members" then I don't see how giving extra cards to members who rent their property enhances that goal. I understand that the short term tenant cards will be an additional purchase, but in reality it does give up to 16 potential access options to someone who rents their property (4 member cards, 6 additional member cards, and 6 short term tenant cards). Theoretically, an owner who lives locally, or even in the Sacramento area or Bay Area, could be using amenities, especially the beach club or ski resort, at the same time as their short term tenants which puts an additional strain on amenities. It seems to me that at maximum, a property listed as a short term rental should only have as many access options as a member property who does not rent.

One option would be to allow access on any given day to either members or to their short term tenants, but not to both categories. Another option would be to allow rental owners to designate a portion of their 10 member cards to their short term tenants. If the goal is as stated "to ensure member priority" then allowing additional benefits to owners who rent their property does not seem supportive.

Again, thank you for all your work continuing to make Tahoe Donner the community we love!

Sincerely,

Nancy Hines and family

---

I am in favor of the new policy, but wish to make a suggestion regarding admittance to amenities without presenting a card.

It has always been a policy that members or guests must present a card before being admitted to an amenity. However, I have personally observed occasions at TCRC when arriving persons have simply stated that they forgot their card and were then admitted. It is my opinion that front desk employees do this in order to avoid possible conflict, but it may be leading to abuses.

As a solution, I suggest that it be part of our policy that front desk employees be specifically prohibited from allowing entry without a card, and that in such instances, only the on-duty manager may authorize such



entry, and then report same to the Operations Manager so that it may be tracked.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Fred Zapponi

10/291

---

We own three lots and wondering if we will have to pay the amenity fee for all three lots once it's incorporated into the assessment. Will there be any consideration for this since we barely use what we pay for now! Also, I don't see any mention of what the amenity fee additional cost might be. Do they know. Most of the recommendations make sense to me but we aren't members that have over used the amenities! Thank you.

---

We are opposed to the new amenity access proposal. We currently do not use the amenities and feel it is unfair to have to pay for access to them through our annual assessment. The Downhill Ski Hill is too small for our family. We don't go to the gym. Don't use the pools or beach. Basically you are forcing us to join a gym or rec club! The recreation fee should remain in place. If members want to utilize the amenities, then they should pay the rec fee. For the members who do not use the amenities, they should pay nothing. If you are going to force the homeowners to pay for the amenities through the annual assessment, then you should give access to all the immediate family and not require the 5-9 cards be purchased yearly. We have 3 children and our 3rd child never got a membership card due to the expense. It seems like the association is just trying to figure out a way to increase the annual assessment dues to help offset the budget problems. The next problem will be how to implement this new amenity process - how will we get our new membership cards when we can only come to Tahoe Donner on the weekends? Seems like the process will be a huge inconvenience. Hopefully you reconsider this proposal. Thank you.

---

Overall I am in favor of the proposed changes. My one concern is making up the 44% of revenue that is generated from the rec fee. Would we expect the annual assessment to increase to cover this? If so, how much should we expect this to be? Thank you.

---

I would rather keep the rules the way they are. I would like the amenities to be managed in a way that maximizes revenue and keeps the annual assessment lower. If the amenities are crowded it means that a lot of people are enjoying them, which is a good thing. I don't want members to be prioritized over non-members more than they already are.

---



My wife and I (owners of the property) like the policy changes, especially that the policies emphasize property owners and their families, and the ease of using the amenities without having staff to constantly check if fees were paid, etc.

---

Hi, How will this influence the annual assessment?

---

We are in favor of these changes because they are efficient, clear and more equitable. Thank you for all the work!

---

We strongly oppose the propose rule to include the private amenity access cost in the annual assessment. For the most part, we are summer residents, (from May to September) and have not used facilities for a number of years. It would be our preference to keep the current system in place whereby we pay as we use. The annual assessment fee has increased substantially since we became Tahoe Donner residents and it does not seem equitable to force residents to pay the private amenity access fee in the annual assessment if its rarely used.

---

Hi,I am writing to request more flexibility in determining who is an "owner" of property in Tahoe Donner. In my case, for historic reasons, while I am the only person listing on the title, my brother owns a 1/3rd interest (that I have legal paperwork to support) and he has a son. Thus, can you add a qualifier to the definition of who is consider an owner that the board or other designated individual can determine on a case by case basis.

Thank you.

Greg

---

I want to keep the current rule regarding the annual recreation pass. I am not in favor of adding it to the annual assessment for two reasons:

- 1) I like the optionality of choosing not to pay for the recreation pass cost if I don't intent to use it.
  - 2) I just started renting my home and have transferred ownership rights to my tenant. He is not responsible for the annual assessment, but he pays the recreation fee directly to TD. I would rather not mix things up.
- 

Thank you for the new information. Our comments are limited to proposed new annual assessment fee increase as we are mostly ambivalent about most of the proposal. We are 'off hill' residents and well into our late 80s and have not used the amenities in several years. With our deteriorating health will not/can not



use them again. The proposal for including amenity fees in the assessment is grossly unfair to those of us who cannot use the amenities for health reasons, as they provide no real time benefits to us. The cost of the ski lodge replacement, which we can no longer use, has already stretched our vacation budget further than necessary. Please figure out a different way to pay for this proposed cost increase. We are undoubtedly not the only residents in this situation.

---

Thank you for the information and flyer that you mailed. I strongly support the policy of removing the recreational fee, and rather tying the annual assessment to the privileges assigned to the member IDs. However, I believe the inclusion of children 3-6 years old and limitation to 4 automatic cards is a step in the wrong direction for Tahoe Donner. Tahoe Donner remains a family oriented community and this inclusion of very young children, and limitation to 4 automatic Member IDs will exclude many families. Although members are allowed to purchase up to 6 additional passes, this will leave many families making additional purchases, which goes against the entire reason for including the recreational fee in the Annual assessment. I would strongly support increasing the automatic Member ID cards to 5 per family and raising the age that IDs are needed to 10 years old. Thank you for your time,  
The Valone Family

---

I strongly object to the proposed Amenity Access Rule change with respect to abolishing the annual recreation fee and including the recreation fee in the annual assessment. My husband and I do not have children so there are only 2 in our household. This past year I went to Trout Creek maybe 2-3 times (and paid the day use fee) and never used any of the other private amenities; my husband did not use any of the private amenities. Requiring members that do not use private amenities to subsidize the use of the private amenities by others is neither fair nor equitable. Those that use the private amenities should be the ones that pay for the use, not all of the other property owners. However, if the Board does decide to make all property owners pay for private amenities (whether or not they use them) then property owners should be allowed to sell the rights to use of the private amenities. For example, if a property owner is assessed \$500/year for use of private amenities (and are "given" 4 cards), then they should be allowed to sell their cards.

I am in agreement with the proposed rule to limit both accompanied personal guests and unaccompanied personal guests during peak times, and having owners delegate amenity access rights to long term and seasonal tenants with administrative fees being charged.

---

When the final decisions are reached with respect to the Amenity Access Rules, can TD send out a summary in an easy to read format so people can understand it better? Maybe just address the changes that affect most residents.

---



I support the proposed Amenity Access Rule Change.

---

I disagree with removing niece and nephew from "Member Photo ID Card Family" -- niece and nephew are as much as part of a family as brother and sister, and are just as easily validated. My brother and his 3 boys, my nephews, are delighted to be able to utilize summer camps and other amenities. I am delighted to have them stay in Tahoe Donner and be part of the community throughout the summer. Please consider keeping niece and nephew within the definition of "Family".

---

You are pricing vacation home owners out of their TD homes. We have been homeowners at TD for 43 years. We use an amenity maybe once or twice a year because that's how often we come up. We have never paid the recreation fee for that reason. Now you are going to REQUIRE us to pay for the amenities we do not use IN ADDITION to our annual TD fee. We already despise TD for making us take down so many trees and now this! It hurts. It hurts a lot and may force us to move away after 43 years. P.S. I note you carefully do not let people know that their TD cost will now be in excess of \$5000/year whether they use amenities or not. Nice going!

---

We support rule change which is identical to the way Del Webb Palm Desert handles amenity access for a common ownership development of similar size to Tahoe Donner. Thanks.

---

I do not agree with the recreation fee being folded into the annual fee. This is just a way for the association to make more money and force people out of Tahoe Donner who are on a fixed income and are getting priced out, I looked for what the increased cost would be and could not find it on this page as stated in the pamphlet that was mailed to my house. Please respond with cost increases.

---

Could you please send a copy of the notice with the new rules. This is an explanation of the process and objectives rather than the new rules. There is a reference to exhibit A but no link.

---

I want to request a per person rate for the annual Recreation Amenity fee. I am a single person condo owner. I do not have family in the area. I have lived in Tahoe Donner 7 years and do not purchase the Amenity access because it is discriminatory that I must pay the same rate a 4 person household pays, and can only possibly receive 1/4th the value that a 4 person household receives for the identical fee. I propose that the single person access rate be equal to the "additional person" add on rate that larger families pay per person. I have written my supervisor for District 5, My State Assembly representative, and both Senate and House



representatives for our area to report this discriminatory practice and requested that they look into the situation, possibly propose legislation to ban such discriminatory practices, or other suitable remedies or action. I respectfully request you revise and propose a new rate structure for the coming year with appropriate charges scaled to accommodate different sized families. Thank you. I will look for a response from the General Manager and or the Board in the near future. Your prompt response will be appreciated.

---

Since my family always purchases and uses the 4 member passes I am OK with the new policy. I do feel for those who do not want to pay for four passes when they only use one or two so I would be ok with some modification to the policy similar to what was done a few years ago to allow two passes to be purchased instead of only four.

---

Board of Directors, after reading the proposed amenity access rule change I am somewhat confused and definitely opposed if I am understanding it correctly. It appears that they want to place the cost into the annual fee in what I believe would be a Socialist move to make many people pay the cost for the few members that live here full time! The only way you could cover the lack of fees from annual passes and daily fees is by raising the annual fee to cover the debt! The last survey I saw had the majority of the members were opposed to this. The people who actually use the amenities should be the ones who pay for it, there should be no free ride!! There are currently 85 homes for sale in TD, values are dropping rapidly, mainly due to a lack of fire insurance and the high cost if you can obtain it. The increase in the annual fee to cover costs for others will only result in more homes for sale and lower property values. I hope the board does not let this happen as it will only deepen the divide that already exists between full time owners and part time owners. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. I also want to thank you for your service on the board as I feel you do an excellent job!

---





Tahoe Donner Association  
Attn: Patricia West  
11509 Northwoods Blvd  
Truckee, CA 96161

Mailing Address

Tahoe Donner Address

Dear Patricia,

September 6, 2024

As per our phone conversation on September 3, 2024 I write this letter for you to forward to Miguel and to the Tahoe Donner Board as I do not have email or internet at either of my houses, about the proposed amenity access rule change.

My husband and I appreciated the 16 page information booklet the association sent out on the Assessment Covenant change. We have been out of the loop on this because of our lack of internet. After reading the booklet numerous times to make sure we understood the proposed changes it only raised more questions for us.

First -bff there was no mention



of fees so how can members make an informed decision to give feedback without fees?

Second, there was no mention of the cost to the annual assessment and yearly increases going forward. How will this be decided? If it is a set cost on our assessments how is this equitable and fair for a 2 card family compared to a 10 card family?

Third, we understand that amenities increase property values but that had no influence on why we bought in TD 28 years ago or why we stay, so what about members who do not use the amenities?

Fourth, we wonder if this new assessment fee is subsidizing something else like the downhill ski lodge?

Once again we feel we are being penalized for being a 2 card, non amenity using family.

Thank you,





Patricia West  
11509 Northwoods Blvd.  
Truckee, CA 96161

### Proposed Amenity Changes

Hi Ms. West.

I have read the information package regarding the above and I basically agree with the rule changes.

However, one subject that was not mentioned was the Employee Free Passes. It is my understanding that Tahoe Donner Employees and the families and guests receives passes for all the amenities free of charge. I have been told that Tahoe Donner HOA has up to 1000 employees, so that can amount to quite a bit of visitors to the amenities.

Please let me know 1) if the above is correct and 2) why it was not mentioned in the information material and #3) what are the new proposed rules for the employee passes.

My email address is:

Best Regards,

Kent Heibel