

Glastonbury Landowners For Positive Change

*The mission of the GLFPC is to foster a landowner's association,
Of the people, by the people, and for the people of Glastonbury,
To create a harmonious and inclusive community and to enhance property values.*

This Summary/Interpretation of the GLA's Board meeting on February 13, 2017

is offered as a volunteer service by the GLFPC.

Your suggestions are welcome, should there be oversights or errors.

Key Points

- *A landowner queried why committee meetings were now moved back to Liberty Hall after it was announced at the previous month's board meeting that, "WE are no longer wanted at Liberty Hall." And why are we now being charged to have meetings where we were told we were not wanted, when we were offered a meeting place at no charge.*
- The 2017 GLA Budget shows that 60% of it is allocated for roads. The other 40% is for administration and overhead expenses. *(Why is an association of fewer than 400 members spending \$48,000 on administration and other overhead expenses?)*
- Though promised months ago, there has been no action to install a landline phone at Emigrant Hall for better reception and ease of participation by the non-resident treasurer and interested landowners.
- Per research by Leo Keeler, GLA's liability insurance only covers GLA when it services GLA roads. This raises questions about whether GLA should continue paying to snowplow non-GLA roads, such as Dry Creek (a county road) and the roads leading into and through Golden Age Village (GAV, a private subdivision, which is not part of GLA). Fact-finding will continue.

Meeting Summary

Project Review Committee Report

For the quite some time, the committee has been carefully developing a comprehensive Project Review Checklist that is given to those landowners who are constructing new buildings. The form is filled out and completed beforehand. The members of this committee are doing their best to assure that each building project meets established criteria, that surrounding neighbors

are considered and with the goal to preserve everyone's property values.

Following, was this question: Does GLA have any jurisdiction over a private subdivision's covenants? Verbal consensus was that GLA has no jurisdiction whatsoever. Applicants are responsible for being in compliance with their own private subdivision regulations, which are completely separate from the GLA covenants.

Next, was a heated controversy carried over from the previous month's meeting precipitated by board member and contractor Ed Dobrowski, hired to do a project in SG that hit up against board policy and procedures.

Chaotic discussion followed when Board President Dennis Riley requested to have on record that he warned Dobrowski, as a director, to be more cautious. Riley stated that board members need to operate on a higher standard to avoid potential lawsuits, and that he [Dobrowski] should have bent over backwards to check all the facts before installing a "walkway" without permission from the landowner. As it turned out, the project was wrongly installed in a neighboring subdivision without any of the landowners knowing anything about it.

Then, Vice-President Dan Kehoe added, "When someone asks you to put in a 10 ft. wide walkway for a wheelbarrow that will support the width and weight of a car, you need to think twice that this is not really a walkway." "Then are you calling me a liar?" asked Dobrowski. Kehoe retorted, "Yes".

All in all, it was unclear whether this warning to Dobrowski would be included in the official minutes. (Among many issues, a conflict of interest stood out.)

Treasurer's Report

Poor cellphone reception made it virtually impossible for Treasurer Mark Seaver to field any questions about his 17-page treasurer's report. Though it was fairly easy to hear Seaver speak from his fulltime residence in Maryland, he said he could only hear about one in 20 words spoken at this board meeting.

Seaver said there was not much to report because he was still receiving payments for the first quarter assessments in 2017. Additionally, he had not yet prepared the necessary list of members who are delinquent in paying their assessments. However, it was noted that though some past due collections are coming in, the total of unpaid assessments continues to grow. To date, the amount of past due assessments is over \$238,000.

As prompted by Secretary Charlene Murphy, the board unanimously approved the final 2016 Financial Reports, the January Financial Reports (disregarding errors pointed out by Regina Wunsch) and the 2017 GLA Budget of about \$141,000. This year's budget shows that 60% is allocated for road maintenance, while the other 40%, approximately \$48,000, will be spent for administration costs and other overhead expenses.

Murphy reported that she has assigned GLA's paid administrative assistant a portion of the treasurer's duties, because of his physical absence for most of the year.

Financial Committee Report

The Financial Committee continues to wait for the legal determination of who really owns two

NG parcels—CUT or the lessees. Accordingly, collection of about \$20,000 in past due assessments remains stalled.

Road and Weed Committee Report

Next on the agenda, was the question of whether non-board Road Committee snowplow coordinators in both North and South Glastonbury could dispatch the snowplow contractor? Most directors agreed that this delegation of power was inherent in the coordinator's job. Two directors, Dobrowski and Paul Ranttalo, said only board members are authorized to spend GLA money. A vote was taken and it was passed overwhelmingly.

Not so readily resolved was a two-part snowplowing question: 1.) Is GLA taking a liability chance when plowing Dry Creek (a county road) and also the roads leading into and through Golden Age Village, a private subdivision, not part of GLA? Kehoe agreed to research and fact-find and the 1979 agreement which purportedly states GAV would pay a fee to GLA for road maintenance and snow removal. 2.) To deal with legality of working on the county road, the board voted to secure a permit from Park County to snowplow Dry Creek Road, when deemed necessary.

GLFPC Note: *Since this meeting, GLA received an official permit application from Park County to plow snow on Dry Creek. Only after signing the contract, was it discovered in fine print, and clearly stated, that GLA is fully accountable and liable for any and all damage claims on this county road. This is one more situation where landowners are potentially put at financial risk.*

Legal Committee Report

The initial topic of discussion involved a case dating back many years. To this day, it remains unresolved and ongoing. This landowner contends that the GLA Board did not follow through with any of his significant complaints. It is a legally complex situation and will take time for this committee to examine and reach a consensus as to how to proceed.

Then, the discussion focused on the “confidentiality stamp,” which is automatically printed on ALL board emails, even the most basic ones from landowners. Both the validity and practicality of this procedure was brought into question. (The question is does this constitute a closed meeting?) It was decided to seek a legal opinion on the matter. On another front, it was reported to the GLA that a NG landowner had posted a larger than allowed “For Sale” sign on her property. This was cited as a violation of the governing documents.

Governing Docs Report

Chairman Leo Keeler presented his report about how this committee has been developing an amendment proposal for a covenant change regarding the current interest rate. Here are the reasons for this proposed change: Bring the wording into compliance with the law and to relate it to the law, and to have an effective date of 1/18/18. That way a vote can happen during the GLA November Election. In the interim, a letter is being sent to Atty. Rick Landers for the advice needed to tie down the interest rate/covenant change to one of three existing state laws.

Intervening, Charlotte Mizzi asked, “What, there is no retroactivity in this?” The answer was that, basically it is not worth the money to pay the accountant to do more recalcs, because there is not that much savings for landowners overall, the committee reasoned. Also, people won’t take us to court for a difference of thousand or so dollars.

Election Committee Report

“There will be another committee meeting on March 20th, in Liberty Hall,” announced Murphy. Among the various topics that had been discussed at the previous Election Committee on February 10th, were the proxies that were singled out. “Our Covenants require that we keep track of who is appointed to vote as a proxy for a landowner, and those [proxies] have to be confirmed on an annual basis. We want to make sure that everyone votes,” uttered Murphy.

Ombudsman discussion

As this segment of the meeting opened, Mizzi’s agenda item was about, and for the two ombudsmen to receive all board emails, be bound by the confidentiality agreement and act in an advisory capacity. In answer to her ideas, Kehoe proclaimed, “That the ombudsmen would have NO access to any board emails. An ombudsman is NOT a mediator. Their job is to bring complaints to the board, PERIOD!” Supporting his statement, Keeler pointed out that, “The purpose of an ombudsman is to represent or bring landowner’s cases to the board.” The matter was abruptly dropped.

Jan 16th Board Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes from the January 16th GLA Board meeting were approved, as amended.

Landowner Input

The very first landowner to speak during the final member input period addressed Dobrowski directly. She wanted to know why he was being argumentative at every meeting and wasting at least a ½ hour of meeting time. After she brought up numerous instances so he could further understand his own behavior, she asked, “Could you please be more conscientious of this?” He countered her request by flatly refusing to curb his conduct. A number of other landowners articulated a similar view.

Shortly thereafter, the meeting adjourned at 10:40 pm.

[Glastonbury Landowners For Positive Change](#)