



MEMBER COMMENTS:
PROPOSED AMENITY ACCESS RULE CHANGE
August 26 – October 3, 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 – October 3, 2024. A total of 95 comments were received. Comments are presented as submitted with no edits. Addresses, phone numbers, and email addresses were redacted.

I am opposed to the proposed change that would merge the Tennis Center, Marina, Trout Creek Rec Center, Pools, and Snow play Rec Fee, into the HOA Annual Assessment. I know it is more complicated to figure out fee structure, but I do not use these facilities and feel strongly that those that do should continue fund those amenities. I enjoy recreating in the outdoor.. don't what health clubs and swimming pools. The amenity fee structure should be based on making each amenity more financially self sufficient, and not put the burden of money loosing amenities on the shoulders of people who don't use them. The Association Finally made it more fair by creating 2 person Fee that is discounted vs the std 4 person, so my wife could pay fee to Access Marina for SUP if so inclined. I feel this change would be a step backwards.

If I am reading the new proposed rules correctly, I, the sole owner and resident of my home, will have no choice in paying annually for 2 and then 4 (!!) Member cards, per the Phased Implementation plan, but able to only get/use 1 member card since I am single and have no children.

Currently I do not pay for the access fee each year since I almost never use the amenities. Once or twice a year, my friends use my member guest cards to go to the pool. And I've gone to the beach a few times to join friends (other TD Members) for an evening picnic. And for those uses, I've paid a fee which was fine. But with the changes, I am forced to pay a LOT more every year for a "guaranteed" member card for 1 (me).

Even though I'll be paying the same as households with 2, 3 or 4 people. This seems fair...

And then if I am reading this correctly, my friends of 20 years, who I am closer to than anyone in my actual blood family (who all live on the east coast and will never come here and use the amenities), and who ARE my family (I am their son's godmother, we are each other's legal beneficiaries, they will in fact inherit this TD house on my death) and who come up here to visit me every holiday as well as other quieter times of the year, will no longer have use of the phased out Guest Cards starting 1/1/25 (but I do not see a date where they can be registered as "Personal Guests".) So they will only be allowed entry to any amenity if I am there with them and will still have to pay separately (even though I have paid for 2-4 member cards already.) And even then they will have lower priority access during "peak periods" or blackout dates as per your outline. To be clear - I am a fan of the rule that people should only have access to any homeOWNERS amenity with the owner in attendance. BUT, since that is not being applied to all forms of amenity users, it is then not fair to me.

Any TD homeowner will have 4 cards and can purchase up to 6 more. But not my non-traditional family. They will have to pay for access - even though I will have already paid for 2 and then 4 members.





And then every STR renter who decides to come up here will have access to up to 6 cards per home. Every time a new pack comes up to each house - they can use our amenities. Over and over and over again. New gang every weekend.

The Member Exception process will not apply to my friends as they are a family of 4 (2 adults 2 kids) and the exception is for a maximum of 2. So as an owner - I am forced to pay a LOT more than I should (2-4x), for amenities I barely use (but acknowledge that is part of an HOA.) But I now cannot have my friends-who-are-family use these amenities if it is deemed "peak" or a blackout date but I am being told this somehow benefits me?

This statement "More flexibility for non-traditional households." is in fact, not true. As a single person - I will be forced to pay double (!!) and then quadruple (!!!!) for Member access cards that I am not "eligible" to use with my non-traditional family for access to amenities. And then if I want to use the amenities with my friends-who-are-family (truly falling in the non-traditional category), it might not be possible (whether due to peak times or blackout dates) because they don't have Member cards because they do not qualify. And if they can get in, they will still have to pay an extra fee. Even though I am forced to pay for 2-4 people that do not exist under these rules/definitions.

Is this correct?

Member photo ID card age — 3 is a really young age to require a photo ID to access member amenities as a family. What is wrong with keeping the one store child process?

My wife and I DO NOT AGREE with the proposed Amenity Access change. We've been members since 1991, raised our family here, and TD has always been a pay to play resort, just like Palisades, Northstar, and other HO Associations. I think this is a big change and needs to be decided by a VOTE not a workshop! What's next, have everyone supplement and pay for the Golfers or the Equestrian Center. Thank you for your consideration.

This change seems to have the fingerprints of full timers all over it... as usual. And a solution looking for a problem in many ways. TD collects the daily guest/entry data and should use it when planning these kinds of changes. The reality is it is an issue very specific to only 2 amenities (Trout Creek and Marina) with very few actual total days a year of crowding - summer holiday weeks and summer weekends. No issue any other time. Many amenities NEED more usage to generate more revenue (looking at you golf course!). When TD needs the guest fees (incl unaccompanied by member) revenue to offset ever increasing costs to operate, the proposed changes WILL result in total lower guest fee revenue. We are part timers and will probably take the time and effort to register online daily our guests. But we also VRBO about 6-7 weeks a year. Our house sleeps 10 and so we will NOT be registering renters (daily - >\$250 daily revenue to TD with 10 renters) and the renters themselves will not want only 6 of their party to be able to use amenities anyway. They will go to the big lake or elsewhere. It will also make our rental (and many others which sleep more than 6) less attractive to potential visitors. BAD for us (trying to offset the massive cost to own now





with Calfire premium cost), BAD for TD as potentially less visitors who rent, BAD for Truckee, etc. Blackout dates and/or limited hours for unaccompanied guests on highest demand days are a much more sensible solution with a higher number allowed than 6 guests. They rarely all go at once anyway. Or dropping the daily online registration hurdle at a minimum which is a giant hassle to the actual member owners. So keeping the unaccompanied member cards or something online equivalent that is easier to do.

Could you please provide the projected increase in the annual fee as a direct result of the amenity access fees being included. I have not seen this information anywhere in all of the publications? Also, could you explain how part time owners that currently do not use the amenities benefit by paying the way for those who do. Obviously this is a great benefit for full time owners that use the amenities frequently. The majority of the members do not fall into that category!. I believe implementation of this policy will only deepen the divide between the board, full time residents and part time residents. I, like many of my neighbors, are opposed to this unfair plan!

We are a retired couple on fixed income. We live full time in the home at XXXXX Gyrfalcon, and also own the empty lot next door. We bought this lot to prevent building on it and preserve some privacy - we do not intend to develop it. Although we strongly prefer the current system whereby we purchased amenity access for the two of us, we can live with amenity access included in annual assessment. However, having to ALSO pay this additional fee with the assessment for the empty lot we own seems onerous and quite unfair - as there will be NO amenity usage associated with that lot. We strongly urge the board to add an exception to including amenity access fees in annual assessment when there are NO TD Member Cards (and hence no amenity access) associated with that lot.

If you as a board implement the socialist policy of making everyone pay for the full time homeowners to have free amenity access, I will sell my home and move to an area where they still respect individual responsibility for your actions! Not only is this an obvious ploy once again for full time owners abuse of the current system, it will also increase the already overcrowding of amenities as members who are forced to pay an inflated annual fee will now use the facilities due to the fact they are forced to pay annually when they would not use them otherwise!!! Shame on you and your woke policy!

I am really growing tired of the Board continuing down the path of penalizing those who rent out their homes. Whether I am there personally or rent it out to someone, there should be NO difference in fees charged. It's ridiculous that you will allow 3 "families" of 4, making 12 people total, to use all the facilities endlessly at the absolutely cheapest rates possible just because they bill themselves as "owners". It should be based on a MAX of 4 passes/people to a home. PERIOD. ALL additional passes/people over 4 per home, whether "owner" or not, should have to pay. I've personally seen people calling themselves "owners" when there are over 12 "family" members all crammed into a home!! Somehow you people think





that's ok. NO! It's stupid!! Over crowding is based on the NUMBER of people using the facilities REGARDLESS of whether they are an owner or a renter! But the easier path is to blame the "renter". Rather than base it on the NUMBER of passes per home! ANY additional pass over 4 per home, the FULL HOA assessment/fees of \$3317 should be paid PER EACH additional pass. I guarantee overnight the "overcrowding" would end! This is what you should be looking at but yet nothing is being done which makes me think the current Board members are not the SOLE owners of their homes! And they are the ones benefitting at the cost of everyone else.

The members voiced a strong opinion(resoundingly) to have the opting of a 2 rec fee pass which was implemented recently. Losing this as an option will upset many, many members. Please add this back at a slightly higher fee which the many folks who never had the Dec fee will opt for since they never max out their use enough to have paid for it in the past.

The new policy seems to be an effort to create a reliable funding stream for our amenities, which makes sense financially. I hope the Board can also find a way to limit use of the Beach Club Marina to Owners and "accompanied" guests only. Too many of our members are not able to use this facility due to overcrowding during height of the summer months. Owners who subsidize our amenities really ought to have the right to use the Beach Club Marina.

I would be in favor of raising the cost of the short term rental guest passes much higher than the cost of the owner guest passes. I also think you should address the parking at the TD beach lot. It might make sense to provide owners parking stickers (not transferable) that would be adhered to the bumper of the car and easily checked while in the lot. The owner could "register" their car or cars similar to getting their rec passes. The STR users should park outside of the TD private lot. I know there are currently signs that say "parking for members only" but I have never seen the lot being checked and if so, how would the employees know.

I do not think I should have to pay for amenities which I do NOT use. That is like asking me to pay for dinner at the Lodge which I did not order or eat. I pay for skiing at the Downhill already and do not need to pay for any more amenities. Also the amenities cannot support the use by ALL the members. It is a ripoff. The Board appears to just be money hungry. Why?

After scanning the new policy, I see no reference to the assessment associated with these new policy changes. How will they affect the yearly assessment? Is it going up?





We have owned in TD since 1992. We are now in our 80's and on fixed incomes. For reasons of age, health and driving distance, we are unable to take advantage of the amenities and have not used them for several decades. Thus, we suggest that there be a senior exemption that allows us to pay a reduced HOA-amenity's fee. Then in the unlikely event we wanted to use an amenity, we pay a per-diem fee the same as an outsider.

We have been properly owners since 1997. We have used the amenities & pass over the years. Now our family has out grown most needs, but we feel it's important. We support a charge for all to open up total usage. It's for the greater good and hopefully affordable for all. Thanks

I don't understand the need for all of these changes. In all of the time we've been owners, we have never once experienced the kind of overcrowding that is illustrated here with the exception of the period during the pandemic when we had to make reservations to use the beach club marina or pool. I think the Short-Term Rental Tenants rules are ridiculous and would significantly impact owners' ability to rent out their houses. There should be NO blackout dates and the limit and prices required to purchase the passes is crazy. I also think it's ridiculous to charge an additional administrative fee if owners want to give access rights to long-term tenants. We already pay such high fees and this all seems like it will cost us owners a lot more without creating any discernible benefits. The town of Truckee already makes it extremely difficult to rent out a vacation home and as owners, we only do 30-night minimum rentals and always abide by the rules. Why add more layers of confusion and even higher prices for renters?
Who asked for these changes? Is there really a large "black market" in which people are selling / renting out their passes? What is the percentage of people who own their home in Tahoe Donner and live there full time vs. rent out their home occasionally?

We do not use any of the listed amenities, that was always a choice for us to pay for, and now feel that we're being forced to pay for something we don't use is unacceptable. Many of our fellow neighbors agree that there should be a member vote on this and not just in the hands of 5 BOD members- basically mandating this extra cost on all of us if passed, especially to those of us who do not use these amenities. Single or double residents, should not be forced to pay for something we don't use.

Hi,

I have submitted my opinions on this amenities topic on the normal suggestion form multiple times. I do not think members who are single or do not use the amenities should be forced to pay the rec fee. I believe this policy should be put up for a member vote. Please consider a member vote before making any changes.

Thank you,

Marlo Studley





My husband and I support much of what is proposed for the Amenity Access Rule Change. However, we do not support eliminating the Annual Recreation Pass or the Member Daily Access fee by rolling them into the annual assessment. This seems like a way to increase the Annual Assessment at the expense of many members who will not use the amenities more frequently than they do now.

First, it is hard to see how this move will reduce crowding at the amenities, especially at peak times of year. Second, we are perfectly fine with the “pay per use” system which is the one I/we choose to use. When we were spending more time up here we purchased the Annual Recreation Pass. I think it is a positive move that over the past year or so a reduced price Annual Pass option was made available to members. It would be interesting to know how many people have selected this option. I only use the Trout Creek Rec Center about a dozen time per year so paying \$12 per visit is perfectly acceptable. If I wanted to use the Trout Creek Rec Center more often I would have selected one of the alternative Pass options.

Third, we believe the Annual Assessment should already cover the cost of maintaining/improving the various amenities. It is increased annually to keep up with inflation. Requiring an additional payment when we will not increase our use of the amenities is a cash-grab and we do not believe we should be subsidizing those who could purchase one of the Annual Recreation Passes if they want to use the facilities more frequently.

This should be a decision the membership votes on, not simply the decision of five Board members.

Regards,

Laura Hoke & Graeme Armstrong

We bought our lot in Tahoe Donner in 1986 and built on it a few year later. We are now elderly and are on a fixed retirement income. My main difficulty with the proposal is that I can't control my costs. Currently, by not using the amenities, I can save on expenses by opting out of the recreation fee. If you're just going to wrap the fee into the ever increasing yearly assessment, I have no control of shaving some expenses off of the yearly assessment. This means increases in the assessment on top of the inclusion of the recreation fee as mandatory creates a great difficulty for us on our retirement income. My original yearly assessment in '86 was \$250. Now it is becoming unmanageable for us.

Thank you for considering our thoughts.

(I have misplaced my unit and lot number)

I appreciate all of the work and effort that the Board and TD staff have put into updating the homeowner's association amenity access policy. I also support the Board's efforts to reduce overcrowding at the amenities. However, I am a solo (and single) homeowner with no blood or legal relatives of any kind within 2000 miles of Tahoe Donner. Therefore, I am limited to 1 member card. I do have a close social network of friends that I have known for decades, and they are, for me, my immediate family. As a result, I pay the same homeowners' association fee, even though I have much more limited access to the amenities.

I understand that Tahoe Donner's original organization was founded to support the enjoyment of families buying property in Tahoe Donner. However, over the approximately 50 years that have passed since then, the common definition of "family members" has changed to include all sorts of relationships that do not





include blood or legal requirements.

To address the overcrowding problems that have sparked concerns, I recommend that, in the spirit of HOA fees that are equal across all lots, I recommend that each lot be allocated 4 member cards at no charge, each assigned to the individuals designated by the property owners(s). These cards would be non-transferable and for use by the designated people only, with the property owners able to change their designees once a year in coordination with the due date for the annual HOA fee.

At the same time, homeowners could purchase additional cards to designees, on the same basis, for an annual fee, with a maximum number of cards per lot (e.g. 4 at no cost and 4 for the extra fee. The cost of the extra cards would be set to cover the approximate cost for the HOA to support the additional users. Guests of members can enter for a daily fee, if accompanied by a member. I believe any additional use of the amenities would be minimal or zero.

As it stands, my homeowner's fee will increase, and I will see no increase in homeowner services or benefits.

Thank you for your consideration.

Meg Meal

While I believe that this change is an overall improvement to the current policies I feel that a 4 card issuance is of more benefit to those families of 4, or perhaps more. Our property is a 2 member household and have not purchased the rec pass for several years as there was little perceived value to our household. While there is no way to make every member in TD happy, and for some almost impossible, I believe that there are ways to make this policy more equitable for all. As one commenter stated this can be achieved with a baseline of 1 access card with all additional being purchased per that households needs and the other being 4 access cards per household with which the members can provide to whomever they choose. The latter potentially causing more amenity congestion. In and efforts to modernize and make positive changes the phrase "this is how we've always done it" should never be spoken, as it is the death knell to change.

I do not approve of the following proposed change to the Amenity Access Rule Change.

- 1) I do not agree with charging every lot for access to the amenities when all of us do NOT use the amenities. Why should we pay for what we do NOT use?
- 2) The amenities included in this new overall charge CANNOT handle all the members using these amenities. A Reservation system is NOT fair if ALL of us are paying for access to the amenities.
- 3) Only charge those households who want access to these amenities and leave the rest of us alone. I use the Downhill Ski Hill and I pay for access to that hill only. I do NOT want to use any of the other amenities and I do NOT think it is "just" to make me pay for what I do NOT use.

Please don't make the recreation fee mandatory. We rarely use the related amenities. Generating more revenue to expand on the services would be of no benefit to us.





We are a 2 person household. For many years, we did not get a rec pass because we were essentially paying for 4 people. You FINALLY allowed us to pay a fair price per person for our 2 person household, and we bought a rec pass this year. We are extremely resentful that you are now proposing that you FORCE us to pay a rec fee for a 4 person household. It seems that this should actually be illegal. We don't use the facilities to really warrant even buying the 2 passes that we bought this year. If you are going to force members to pay for a rec pass, at least be fair, and make it per PERSON so that a 2 person household isn't paying twice as much for their rec pass as a 4 person household!!! Stop this unfairness!!

I have no faith that any member comments sway board members, but here is my input. Requiring that everyone pay the rec fee for a household at an eventual 4 member rate is certainly not an equitable solution to funding shortfalls to operating costs for amenities. A more fair proposal would incorporate the true cost of each use in the form of an individual pass for each household member that wants to use the amenities, with increases in fees commensurate with true costs. Forcing non using members to pay for the use of amenities that they will not use is equivalent to taxation without representation, as we are not allowed to vote on those proposed changes. Please consider that every member already pays assessments meant to maintain our amenities, The question is to what level/standard are the amenities maintained at. Certainly I as a full time resident do not expect to go into a "resort" every day, nor do I want to pay for that level of service. I want value for my assessment \$. That means that the amenity should be clean, and well maintained, not staffed at a concierge level of service as some members want. Operating costs to maintain that level of service have soared in the last 4 years, and that was something that should have been planned for, instead of now being solved via what is essentially an assessment increase for all members without stating it as such an .increase. Continuing as we are without really managing and looking at each amenity as a cost center and requiring at least a break even for the cost basis does all members a disservice. But we cannot and should not penalize those who opt out for financial reasons. If you use a cost basis for member use price elasticity will make visitation go down on those amenities that do not break even, and market forces will force changes to services offered.

Dear BOD, I am a single homeowner owning in TD since 2016. I've never bought the rec pass since there was not a single person price. I'd be overpaying for what I would get. I am adamantly opposed to the rec fee becoming mandatory as part of the assessment. The assessment already includes maintenance and utilities. It is not clear what problem this proposal is attempting to solve. This proposal just seems to be more about raising revenue.

There is a problem with over-crowding from what I hear from friends and neighbors. This is the problem that should be addressed. How will this proposal not lead to even more crowding? If we are forced to pay for amenity use, then no doubt more people will use them since they are paying for them.

The proposal also not equitable. Each lot is allowed one vote at elections. A rec fee pass should be on a per person basis. If 1 person is included in the dues assessment, then any other members need to purchase a





rec pass. Simple, straightforward, and equitable.
Please reject this proposal.
Thank you.

Dear Board of Directors,
Sorry I forgot to mention in my first comment, Using one person as the baseline (rather than the proposed 4) for the private amenity fees is the equivalent of our governing documents allowing only 1 vote per residential property because it provides Equal representation to all HOA members. Why should this be any different? Although I still believe staying with Pay to Play is the better choice (just change it to allow purchase from 1 Rec-Fee to whomever many). I know a majority of the BOD voted against it so I didn't want to waste a lot of energy fighting against it but Pay to Play is the better option.
Thank you for your consideration.

Dear Board of Directors,
First, I would like to address the Major issue with the Member Photo ID Cards Part C.1.d.ii.1 and .2 which states:

ii. Starting on January 1, 2026, and as determined by the Board through the annual budget process, a minimum of two (2) and a maximum of four (4) Member Photo ID Cards shall be allotted per Residential Parcel and included in the annual assessment. No later than January 1, 2027, four (4) Member Photo ID Cards shall be allotted per Residential Parcel and included in the annual assessment.

1. If an Owner's Family members number less than the number of Member Photo ID Cards allotted per Residential Parcel, no additional Member Photo ID Cards shall be granted for relationships not ordinarily qualified under this rule, except as provided for by the Member Photo ID Card Exception Process.

2. If an Owner's Family members number more than the number of Member Photo ID Cards allotted per Residential Parcel, the Owner shall be entitled to purchase up to six (6) additional Member Photo ID Cards annually.

In the explanation of the changes, the Associations writes the following (emphasis added):

It will also clarify the Equality of member rights and duties. That Equality includes both the Equal right of all members to use and enjoy the private amenities and the Equal duty of all members to provide for the common expenses associated with operating the private amenities.

The key wording in the explanation by the Association is "EQUALITY of member rights and duties".

Part C.1.d.ii.1 and .2 of the proposed new policy Are Not Equal for members. Explanations have stated that the majority of members have a 4-person household which is why 4 was selected as the Baseline number. However, then the Association allows some members in Part C.1.d.ii.2 to purchase 6 more-member photo ID cards, but restricts some members in Part C.1.d.ii.1 from obtaining the same base allotment of 4 photo ID cards if they have a small family.

The Board of Director and Staff have failed to recognize the elephant in the room, which is there is a number that applies to All 6473 members and that is the number 1 (one). The Baseline number that Equally represents 100% of the Association members is 1. The BOD needs to change the policy to reflect the





Baseline is 1. Members may then purchase additional cards at the 1-member price up to the allowable number determined in the policy.

This makes things very simple. If the amenity rate is determined to be, as an example, \$125 then the annual assessment is \$+\$125 for 1 card, \$+\$250 for 2 cards, \$+\$375 for 3 cards, \$+\$500 for 4 cards, etc. etc. This is a solution that provides for equality of members rights and duties.

I would be interested in hearing any arguments against the logic of this change. I do not consider staff work to process the cards a legitimate argument as the HOA may hire more personnel if needed to process the assessment. Upon full implementation the vast majority of assessment paperwork will remain the same year over year and will also be in the electronic system thereby reducing staff time back to normal levels. Now, if the BOD and Staff are dead set on 4 photo ID cards per member, then the solution again is easy so the rule has equality. Each member lot receives 4 photo ID cards, regardless of relationship to the owner of the residential parcel, however any ID cards beyond 4 must provide documentation of the required relationship. Clearly changing it to this rule would vastly increase the number of users which would undoubtedly increase the strain on the amenities, however does provide for Equality to all members. Thank you for your consideration.

Thank you all for your work on the amenity access policy update. We own a vacation home in TD and RARELY use the amenities. It would be great if those who use the amenities regularly could pay access fees accordingly. Those who never or almost never use amenities should not be required to subsidize the use by full time residents. Thanks so much for your consideration.

With all due respect: the way I look at it is that, since the owner pays for the user ID cards, he should have the right a to use these cards as he so designates. Any one person per card should be admitted to any one private TD amenity. That's the only equitable rule. Regardless of who that person is. The difference between "member" and "owner" should, once and for all, be eliminated. It was ill-advised from the onset, and the Board has full power to re-instate what is right. In fact, it has the responsibility to do so. The owner pays, and the owner should be able to decide who may use the cards. The only limitation that is arguably legitimate is that an owner may not sell his card(s). No other way is equitable.

I agree with the proposed changes, I think many of my neighbors are forgetful of the volume of homes in Tahoe Donner. As one of the largest HOAs in the country, this proposal makes sense for the community as a whole. It may not make sense for a few outspoken individuals, but it will improve our neighborhood, community, and facilities. The broader picture is what matters here, not the handful of second home owners who don't want to pay a fee. Especially considering the fee is unbelievably low for the value of the amenities. If anything, I think this change has come too late and that it will vastly improve quality of life in TD.





My Wife and I are 82 years old and have owned our TD home for 35 years. We do not and will not be using any of the amenities offered at Tahoe Donner. As we are on a fixed income that becomes less valuable every year, I can not understand why we should have to pay for something we will never use. Really, should we be supporting the younger, more affluent members of our community?

Is the following statement accurate? "We will be mandated to pay the recreation fee that has always been an option."

Change is clearly needed and yet no solution will make every TD owner happy, so I appreciate and support the thoughtful approach taken. I am hearing some loud voices of complaint on social media, so I want to add a note of support such that the passionate voices of dissent aren't the only you hear from. I feel the proposed changes create a reasonable balance across all stakeholders while addressing key pain points. My family and I used the Rec Center when the trial reservation system was in use earlier this summer and the experience was far better than in previous years when the amenities were over capacity during peak periods. Integrating the Rec Fee into the overall HOA dues makes sense to simplify the process and I would be happy to have this change, but I can understand some TD homeowners not wanting to pay for amenities access if they never use the amenities. Overall, the phase-in plan overall seems reasonable but I would suggest you further evaluate the practicality of the approach for managing access for children 3-6 years old during the phase in period. Specifically, the phase-in plan calls for a requirement that Short-Term Tennant cards be issued for all children over 3 but residents will continue to have access for their children aged 3-6 without requiring a card. I anticipate this will cause confusion at the amenity access points and put your front-line staff in a challenging position having to explain the differences to frazzled parents of 3-6 year olds. My recommendation would be to align the age limit requiring an access card across all categories by either issuing photo ID cards free of charge to member children aged 3-6 during the phase-in period or waiting until 12/31/2027 to adjust the age cutoff from 6 years down to 3 years for all access categories. Thank you again for the work that has gone into this proposed change - it is well thought out and I believe it will be a significant improvement.

As a single homeowner, an increase in assessment to cover amenity access is a hardship for several reasons. 1-just me. I would be happy to pay for an owner/family member access punch card or access for just me. 2-other family members visit only twice a year. A pay-for owner punch card for any family member listed would be perfect. 3-Currently I am also an employee so it does not cost to enter. I would have to pay an increased assessment for something I get for free?

Our amenities are important and need to be kept up and in working order. Owners/family members who use it the most should cover more of the cost. Come up with a reasonable per use fee for homeowners. Provide an online, paid for, punchcard, any identified owner/family member can use it. Once the reasonable amount of uses are used up, that property must pay for reloading the card. Maybe start with a 10 or 20 use card, that does not expire.





I like the separation of guest and STR uses.
Holidays are always crowded, as a homeowner I do not use the facilities during holidays.
Thank you, Lauralee Hyde

Paying for amenities should be optional. End of story.

this is disgusting. i do not want to use this facility and find this BS from a 5 person group that is out of touch with donner a major mistake. this needs to be up filtered via a vote of the members.

This is totally a money grab to have second homeowners pay for the use of all the locals that live here. This is totally unacceptable. We did not use the amenities either. This is wrong.

I just wanted to say that getting rid of the Rec Fee will be one of the best things our HOA has ever done. I don't currently pay it because I somewhat think its cheaper to pay as you go. This change is actually bad for me financially. But like any 'season pass', once you have paid for it, you tend to use it. I might think about going to Trout Creek and using the pools or the gym, but then that \$10 or so fee for members pushes me off from using it. I would rather restore the community feel, get all members involved in all amenities, and have the community recognize that we support all of our amenities, not just the ones we prefer. Thanks for bringing more of our members into the amenities.

One thing that should be changed is one price for all amenities for guests (at least for the pickleball/tennis courts) or at least some type of surge discounts for when the facilities are underutilized. Note that it can cost a foursome \$72 to use the pickleball courts when they would otherwise be empty.

It would be helpful to state (if true) the estimated increase in the annual assessment is not as much as the current rec fee. In other words, when everyone pays into this, the additional cost will be less. This hopefully will reduce some member concern. Thanks!

Should we still be using the term "card"? For members we moved to a virtual card, right? Thinking of the future, it seems a bit antiquated to call it a "Member Photo ID Card". Maybe remove the word card (and photo) and just call it a Member ID. All Member IDs require a valid photo. Just like a driver's license is called an ID (no reference to a physical card), maybe we can simplify and do the same. Or, are we really going to issue all members new physical cards? That's what the term implies. On the other hand, we may





need physical cards for non-members, guests, etc. Maybe it boils down to this: the new policy should identify the use of physical cards or not. Thanks!

I see no mention of TD employee access to the amenities (as a benefit/perk). Seems like it should at least be mentioned as a category of non-members who use the amenities...who could potential impact crowding. It would make this policy more all encompassing.

We support limiting the Amenity access to members only or with their guests with members present. We do not believe it is fair to all the owners to have renters use the amenities. We have been owners since 2000. It makes no sense to expand amenities to serve renters. In the alternative, the guest fees for renters need to be \$100 per day per person.

We oppose this new Amenity Access Rule Change to each property by adding/mandating this extra expense as part of our annual dues. WE DO NOT USE ANY OF THE AMENITIES LISTED AND WILL NOT PAY EXTRA for things we do not use.

This is outlandish and wrong. Are you, the BOD, implementing such costs onto our yearly HOA fee to offset the over budgeted and over sized ski lodge? We feel you are not looking out for the best interests of ALL TD HOA Members that like us, do not use the amenities listed to justify paying a fee for things we do not use. We do agree on you finally separating STRs and private guests into categories to be properly charged and to be put in categories so homeowners have priority to our amenities. It's about time this has been addressed, but DOES NOT JUSTIFY THE MANDATE FOR ALL TD HOMEOWNERS TO PAY FOR SOMETHING WE DO USE. When are you going to start charging the public to use our trails? You could probably offset this cost you are trying to push on to us for yet another amenity being over run by public use for free... also addressing the speeding issues on Alder Creek rd by these public users speeding up our roads only to turn into the the parking lot of ACAC with at times 4-6 bikes on their cars. START CHARGING THE PUBLIC TO USE OUR AMENITIES TO OFFSET OUR COSTS

This should be a vote by the entire HOA and not 5 people sitting on the BOD... Put this to a member vote! And bring back the Sat morning Board meetings so people can actually attend, not as they are set now during the work week when most people are working so they can afford these outlandish costs you keep pushing onto us, and also not at 5:30 at night during the week days when most are just getting home and getting dinner ready.

I am not seeing the problems with the current guest policy system. I no longer can go to the pools or beach w extended family who come to town from time to time since it might cost over 100 to bring them in for an hour or two. I recommend , which dollar point did after a lot of trial and tribulation - of with a member can bring in guest for \$5.00 each up to some number of gues (4-6?) . They do 8 for free and zero guest use without a member . We don't need to do that - but w a member the guest fee needs to be cheaper. Without





a member leave it at a higher cost like you have. But we need to be able to have members bring extended family without an exorbitant cost. Or - Maybe a few free guest passes per year per member? That would allow the occasional family gathering and not at a cost of over a 100.00 dollars. Thank you. Difficult topic I know.

I've been a member for over 20 years. For years I paid the extra fee on top of the recreation fee. I've enjoyed many years of classes until the recent change making classes free with rec fee paid. At first I thought that's great I don't have to pay more! Now I wish I had to pay the fee. Classes are stupid full!! I'm afraid if the rec fee becomes part of our hoa dues the same thing will happen. Maybe not but think about it? The amenities are busy enough. Thanks

Please see comments below.

Use of Private Amenities by Renters

We rented homes in TD in the early/mid 1990's. Neither our choice of homes nor rental price were affected by access or non-access to amenities.

In 1998, we were fortunate enough to purchase our current home. We ski leased and increasingly made the home available for STR. During this period we utilized the services of several different property managers. In no case were we informed that access or non-access to amenities influenced either the suitability or potential rental rate of our property.

Our experience suggest that concerns that access or non-access to amenities might affect potential rental income are exaggerated.

Limiting use of private amenities to owners and owner-accompanied guests would go a long way toward achieving the stated objectives of addressing overcrowding and ease of administration.

Admittance of owner-accompanied guest could be based on a combination of purchased passes and/or daily use fees.

Number of Passes per Property

The proposal to issue (and base pricing on) 4 passes per property appears arbitrary. Consider:

Smaller households with a small number and/or infrequent visitors

Landlords with renters ineligible for passes (see above)

While we agree with the concept of including the recreation fee into the regular HOA assessment, we suggest that a per pass charge for 0 to X number of passes would be more equitable.

Age Requirements

It is not clear what objective is achieved by lowering the "no charge" age from 6 to 3.

(OLD COMMENTS BEGIN HERE, EXCEPT ONE ADDITION USPS AT THE BOTTOM) 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 off 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 25 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





Proposed Amenity Access Rule Change

I am a homeowner in Tahoe Donner and I have some serious concerns regarding the Amenity Access Rule Change that has been proposed.

- Tahoe Donner is a diverse community made up of singles, couples, families and retirees. As such I do not believe that the approach of one size fits all homeowners is a fair approach.
- Mandating that all homeowners purchase 4 Member Photo ID cards as part of their annual assessment is not an equitable approach for owners with less than 4 people. This policy discriminates against any household with less than 4 qualifying members making it fair for some but not for others.
- On page 4 of the September Tahoe Donner News it states that the proposal would reduce the overall cost for private amenity recreational access by roughly 50%, I would like to see the calculations on that since the homeowners that do not currently pay the recreation fee and do not use the facilities would have a 100% increase in their Rec Fee dues.
- Changing the policy for purchasing Member Photo ID cards from discretionary to mandatory takes away the freedom of choice for all homeowners in Tahoe Donner.
- Lastly if, according to your website, there are approximately 6500 homeowners in Tahoe Donner, under the new rules there would be 26,000 amenity access passes issued per year. Many owners who have not purchased access passes in the past may now begin using the amenities since they are now included in their dues. This has the potential to lead to more overcrowding of the amenities. A reservation system, that has been implemented in the past, appears to be a more prudent approach to the overcrowding issues.

