

THE HOMESTEAD AT SNOWMASS ASSOCIATION
BOARD MEETING

April 15, 2013

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mike Estes, President of the Association, called the meeting to order at 12:02 PM. Board members were present via conference call were Bob Campbell, George Hartnett, Bill Devers, and Malo Harrison. A quorum existed at all times during the meeting. Barton Craig and Mike George of Snowmass Lodging Company were also present. Frank Rudecof, Fire Inspector for TOSV also joined the meeting during discussion of the fire panel bids.

2. PROOF OF NOTICE OF MEETING

Mr. Craig presented proof of notice of the meeting, which was via email.

3. READING AND/OR DISPOSAL OF UNAPPROVED MINUTES

Mr. made a motion to waive reading the minutes of the Board Meeting of November 8, 2012.
Mr. seconded, and the motion was approved by voice vote. The minutes were approved, as written.

4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Discussion of Holiday Lights

Michael Estes opened for discussion whether the LED lights that lights the Pines Trees at the upper and lower cul-de sacs should be turned off for the summer, or left on. They were installed as Holiday lights to be run on timers at night during the winter. The Board members agreed that they provide a welcome light source in otherwise poorly light areas and should be kept on from sunset until midnight, year round.

Discussion of Proposals for Fire Alarm Monitoring of Buildings A and D

Per previous Board instructions, Management has obtained three bids to add fire alarm monitoring in buildings A and D.

Vision Security bid is \$16,062-This system will have smoke detectors in every bedroom and also one in the common areas on each floor that communicate with a fire panel. If one smoke detector in the house is tripped, they will all sound their alarms and it will automatically dispatch the fire department and trip audible alarms in the entire building. We can program the system so that if only a kitchen smoke detector is tripped it will not ring alarms in the other units of the building, but the fire department will still respond. This system would likely result in the most false alarms, but the Fire Department is OK with this system because it also offers the most protection. Another advantage of this system is if we invested another \$1,050 in equipment we could monitor all 4 buildings at a total cost of \$100

per month, which would be a savings of about \$100 per month (\$1,200 per year) over other proposals. Although this is the most expensive bid, over time it could be the most economical. Although it may result in the most false alarms, it is also the most protective in terms of how quickly it will dispatch the fire department.

Pro Guard bid is \$13,828-This system would have smoke detectors in every bedroom and in a common area of each floor tied to the fire panel. If one smoke detector is tripped in a unit, then they all sound their audible alarm. However, smoke alarms will not result in a fire department dispatch. There will be one heat sensor per floor. It is only when a heat sensor is tripped that a fire department dispatch will occur. At that point, alarms would sound throughout the entire building.

Apex bid is \$9,800 but does not include a total of 31 plug-in smoke detectors that would be needed to satisfy the Fire Department recommendation, which would bring the total cost to \$12,000, still the least expensive. In this bid, the smoke detectors would not be attached or communicate with the fire panel at all. They are simple plug in devices similar to the CO detectors that we have plugged into every home now. As a matter of fact, the devices are combination smoke/CO detectors so we could remove the existing plug-in CO detectors. The main difference is that they are able to communicate with each other within a unit so that if one detector is tripped, they will all go off within a unit. This would satisfy the Fire Department requirement. There will be one heat detector per floor which would need to be tripped to result in a fire department dispatch, at which point alarms would sound in the entire building

Mike Estes asked Frank Rudecof of Snowmass Fire Department the following questions: What is the current code for fire monitoring installations for new construction in Snowmass Village, what is the importance and best way to deal with notification of all occupants of a building in the event of a fire alarm, and a comparison of heat sensors versus smoke detectors as devices to trigger fire alarms and fire department dispatches.

Frank Rudecof noted that for residential buildings fire codes are vague and leave a fair amount of discretion to local entities. In general, any fire panel that is installed is required to be monitored. Exactly what type of alarms result in a dispatch are a matter of choice. The Fire Department recommends that in any residence that is a short term rental that smoke alarm activation result in Fire Department dispatch. In second homes, it is more acceptable and common for the Fire Department to dispatch only for heat sensor or sprinkler activation. The Fire Department allows 3 false alarm dispatches per residence for free each year. After that they charge on a sliding scale, however there are never charges for false alarms that are created by actual smoke. Charges are only incurred if there are mechanical or design issues with the system that create multiple false alarms.

Frank Rudecof noted that all occupants within an entire building should be notified via alarms if more than one smoke detector is activated in a unit, or if a heat detector is activated. It was noted that in buildings B and C (the buildings with fire sprinklers and

alarm panels) that there is no audible notification within each unit or building in the event of a fire, as it was not required at the time of construction. Frank Rudecof noted that while alarm notification would be an added benefit, in homes with fire sprinklers they are not as necessary and given the fire walls that separate each unit within a building, notification within the entire building is not as critical, but that installation of a notification system would definitely be a benefit to the occupants.

Lastly, Frank Rudecof noted that in the vast majority of cases a smoke detector will activate before a heat detector and, therefore is a preferred device to notify the fire department. The Fire Department would always like to respond sooner versus later to a fire, even if it means that there are more false alarm dispatches. He closed by thanking the Homestead Board for being pro-active in taking steps to improve fire safety at the Homestead.

There was discussion among the members about the pro and cons of having a system that dispatched the fire department based on smoke alarms. Malo Harrison commented that in her experience it is common that smoke alarms are set off from cooking in the kitchen/living room area. The other Board members agreed. Frank Rudecof noted that if the smoke detector were placed closer to the short corridor in front of the upstairs bedroom that it would probably decrease the number of alarms created by cooking.

Mike Estes instructed management to follow up with Pro Guard to see if their proposal could be modified so that it could dispatch the fire department based on smoke alarms instead of just heat sensors. He also instructed management to inquire with the Aspen Fire Department about their experience with the DNP panel bid by Pro Guard, as there are none currently installed in Snowmass Village.

5. NEW BUSINESS

No new business was discussed.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. moved for adjournment, Mr seconded, and the motion was carried. The meeting was adjourned at 1:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

, Secretary