

## CLARE PARKER ASKS FOR YOUR VOTE IN SOUTH

My name is Clare Parker and I'm the one surviving *non* GLFPC candidate remaining on the South Glastonbury ballot! Originally, my campaign letter was not going to mention any of the unpleasant events surrounding the GLA Board of Directors concerning a small but vocal group of detractors known as the Glastonbury Landowners for Positive Change (GLFPC) –but the distasteful letter sent to landowners by Tim Brockett and Sally Muto on behalf of the GLFPC concerns me and has caused me to change my plan. I find Tim and Sally's letter to be hateful, biased, bigoted and replete with falsehoods. ([Read the letter at rudyparker.com/glfp.pdf](http://rudyparker.com/glfp.pdf)) Rather than grandstanding, I am running on a platform of transparency. I am concerned! And I desire to state my opinion regarding some of the questionable activities I see taking place that have hurt landowners, divided the community and disrupted GLA Board meetings.

*Dennis Riley, Kevin Newby and Mark Seaver* are the *incumbent* GLA candidates running on the South Glastonbury ballot. According to the GLFPC website's Supporting Members page, they are members of the GLFPC, a group of contentious landowners who appear intent on managing Glastonbury and controlling the GLA. I am not a GLFPC supporter and I hope to replace one of the incumbents. However, if you live in North Glastonbury, please DO vote for the incumbents: Mizzi, Ranttalo and Johnson, as their opponent is affiliated with this group. If you voted for Rakela or Haley on a South Glastonbury absentee ballot, *and didn't write in their names*, you can tell the board to shred your ballot and accept your proxy, as votes cast for them are null and void, according to the election committee, unless their names are written in.

### **CONCERN: Discrimination and divisiveness**

Regardless of one's affiliations or non-affiliations, I believe it is wrong for a board member to take the list of Glastonbury landowners and mark off the names of members of a certain group, race, class, religion or creed, as such a list can be used to target individuals and discriminate against them! I mention this because one of the above-mentioned incumbent candidates for South Glastonbury approached my husband Rudy when he was the GLA Treasurer and asked him to point out who were the members of the church. This board member had the list of Glastonbury landowners in his hand and showed Rudy how he had ferreted out the names of landowners he knew were church members. Rudy also informed me that this same board member was making the argument that any treasurer who belonged to that church should not be allowed to collect assessments from church members, calling it a conflict of interests. I saw this as demeaning and as an attempt to marginalize the board members and landowners who founded Glastonbury. Furthermore, I saw it as a move to divide the community. If elected I will keep the watch; and if I see something I believe to be discriminatory, I will speak out. I will discriminate between right and wrong, not against landowners.

### **CONCERN: Board actions taken against landowners**

I am committed to protecting and upholding landowners' rights. I have witnessed too many actions taken against landowners. For example, the project review committee convinced the board to make two landowners hire engineers before approving their simple projects, namely, a garage, and a driveway –even though it was very unusual, expensive, and not a requirement of the project review rules or the master plan. Playing upon the *lawsuits phobia* is a major manipulation tactic used against the board by this adversarial group, who are active both on

and off the Project Review Committee and Board; I believe, this is what accounts for many bad board decisions. One of the landowners hired an engineer and she prevailed decisively because it turned out to be a fabricated claim. The GLA's experience with trying to fix the issue in the past had already shown that the claim's cause was not associated with her property, but this fact was ignored by the project review committee and the board under pressure. The other landowner put the project on hold. The point is, with the present configuration of the board and project review committee, it looks as if landowners are in for a hard time with expensive micromanaging and overregulation! If elected, I will stand for project reviews proceeding in a timely manner with as little difficulty and expense to the landowner as possible.

### **CONCERN: Landowner rights violations**

I have observed how landowners' rights have been violated by recent boards. At the 2016 GLA annual election, landowner Kathleen Rakela was shorted three votes. The election committee head and ballot counters were all aware at the time the meeting began that Rakela, whose South Glastonbury ballot had been prematurely processed, had been shorted the three votes. They did not contact her and they did nothing to correct the ballot. Instead, at the end of the meeting the committee announced Leo Keeler as the winner—despite the fact that the election had been *so close*. After the incident had been exposed by the treasurer, these board members didn't want to see the vote corrected; but the GLA attorney said there had to be a recount. Rakela's three votes *changed* the outcome of the election! Now blame has been placed on the *previous voting system*, which, in the first place, had not been properly carried out. And according to election committee procedures, the ballot counter should not have processed the ballot without first checking with the treasurer. However, the fault really lies with the attitude of the board members on the election committee who knew Rakela had been shorted the votes. (They say they did their best!) Why did they think they had the right to suppress a landowner's votes? They could have given Rakela an additional 3-vote ballot without having to hire an attorney. Instead, they paid an attorney to tell them that they had to correct the error. Furthermore, the election committee refused to cooperate when Rakela and certain board members tried to find out how it had happened and why the treasurer was not given Rakela's payment until the morning of the election—even though the check had been mailed in plenty of time for it to have been handed-over to him, well in advance of the annual meeting. I consider the election committee's noncooperation to have been arrogant and that it caused suspicion. If elected, I will not let wrong-doing pass without full exposure and a thorough investigation.

It is clear to me that another egregious error was committed when the board arbitrarily removed Kathleen Rakela from the 2017 ballot for a previous minor covenant's violation. Kathleen was in good standing with the GLA when the board took the vote to remove her from the ballot, which made the issue a *moot* point; and so the vote should not have taken place. The GLFPC powered board justified their misdeed by *misusing* a date (September 13<sup>th</sup>) that the board had set as the cutoff date for candidates to become current on assessments and submit bios. September 13<sup>th</sup> is not a legal date that determines the eligibility or non-eligibility of candidates to run for election, but rather it was a date set for convenience. I contend that the date September 13<sup>th</sup> did not *abrogate* Kathleen's right to be on the ballot *after the fact*, since she was in good standing at the time the vote took place. (FYI, Kathleen did not owe the GLA any money. Kathleen, an owner of multiple parcels, had committed a minor infraction of the covenants on one of the parcels she owned. The infraction was an oversight and involved

*paperwork*.) Now a second election mailing has gone out, wasting money; and Rakela has little chance of winning, as a write-in candidate has never won an election. I regard this as an underhanded tactic to eliminate opposition, especially on the part of the South Glastonbury incumbents who did not abstain from the vote –despite the fact that their voting to remove Rakela from the ballot constituted a clear conflict of interest, which opinion is backed by attorneys, as she was running on the ballot as their opponent. Furthermore, nowhere in the covenants does it say, or is it insinuated or implied, that members in good standing can be removed from a ballot. The board makes the rules as they go along and as they please. I think this board is running amuck with some of its rules and policies!

### **CONCERN: Defamation and more landowner rights violations**

Emails have been sent defaming Kathleen Rakela. Misinformation and distortions have been circulating around the community, saying Kathleen had no right to vote in the 2016 elections because of the minor infraction on one of her parcels. It is being claimed, as if it were the fact, that with ownership of multiple parcels, if there is a single infraction or any amount due on a single parcel, *the landowner forfeits his votes on every parcel*. But covenants say that each parcel is its own *separate* membership interest. A landowner is entitled to one vote for every parcel where there is no infraction. Look out for new GLA rules and policies that will take away or violate your rights!

### **CONCERN: Disruption of board meetings**

The last issue I wish to address in this letter is my determination to have peaceful GLA Board meetings that end at an appropriate hour. The incumbent GLA President allows landowners to pretty much speak their piece throughout the meeting. This should not be happening, as this small group of antagonists tend to dominate the meetings and it interferes with the board's conducting its business in a timely manner. It is always the same people showing up and board meetings can go on till past midnight! I have had board members comment to me that there is so much condemnation and negativity hurled at them by this one group of landowners, and fear mongering about lawsuits, that they find it very difficult to think straight and make decisions. If I am elected, by God's grace, I will do all in my power to put an end to this conduct. I have a protocol to offer that should correct the situation. But, I'm afraid I will not be able to make grand strides if more landowners besides the regular group of detractors do not start attending GLA meetings and find out what's going on. It is your property and *your* community!

I, Clare Parker, as a candidate for South Glastonbury pledge to uphold the Master Plan, Covenants and By-Laws and to not use these regulations to overpower landowners when improving their property or building a new home. Micromanaging was not the intention of our rules. They are meant for the protection of all and for the preservation of property rights. My direction will be for the preservation of our beautiful land along with the peace and tranquility we share together... Therefore, I ask you to please give your proxy to Ed Dobrowski. He has served honorably on the Board before and can be trusted. If you already gave your proxy to someone you regret having given it to, it's not too late for you to change your mind. Just send the person a note to let him know you have decided on someone else to be your proxy. You could then fill out the proxy form included with this letter and mail it to: Ed Dobrowski P.O. Box 971, Emigrant, MT 59027. Feel free to communicate with Ed by phone: 406-220-5324 or send him an email: ed@wispwest.net. Thank you!

(Over)

## ADDENDUM

### **AGAIN! The Board has taken the license to remove a South Glastonbury candidate from the ballot!**

Marshall Haley is a new landowner paying his assessments in quarterly payments. The final payment was due on Oct. 31<sup>st</sup>. Unbeknownst to Marshall, his wife decided to wait until payday to make the 4<sup>th</sup> payment, which made the payment a little late. (Because the election had been postponed, she thought it wouldn't matter.) Instead of the treasurer letting Marshall know that he needed to make his payment, the board voted to *remove him from the ballot!* Having made the last quarterly payment, Marshall is *back in good standing* and owes no money to the GLA.

A landowner in good standing cannot be denied the right to run in an election. So, what does the controlling faction and the election committee do to eviscerate the opposition's right to run, and ruin his chances of winning without violating the covenants –or so they think? They say he cannot be on the BALLOT! (No such measure is outlined or suggested in the governing documents.) Then, the committee says, as in Marshall's case, "He let his people down!" and "Informing them is *his* duty." Do you see this, as I do, as being mean-spirited, punitive and self-righteous? Isn't it using board 'policy' to whitewash a sly political tactic? In addition, Marshall and a list of landowners who owed finance charges are now being denied the right to vote, which I also believe is unlawful according to the covenants. If they pay-up they should be able to vote! People paid at the door for the past 20 years and voted without a problem.

These actions taken against Kathleen and Marshall can all be challenged in court! The election committee head said they were acting on the GLA attorney's advice regarding Kathleen Rakela. When I asked the committee, "What did the GLA attorney say about removing Kathleen Rakela from the ballot?", the answer I received from Leo Keeler was, "*That is attorney/client privileged information!*" *What happened to all the transparency these landowners were demanding, and that they had promised, and were ostensibly so intent on having?* (Ironically, all of the landowners in attendance at the meeting were either members of GLFPC or they have stood alongside the GLFPC against the other board members.)

Keeler's response leads me to believe the GLA attorney advised *against* removing Rakela from the ballot because of the real possibility of another expensive, time consuming, lawsuit. It is obvious to me that they chose to do their will, and advance their own agenda, against the best interests of the community and, perhaps, advice of the GLA attorney. Landowners can demand that the GLA Board disclose everything that their attorney advised regarding Kathleen Rakela! Again, the S.G. incumbent candidates did not abstain from voting, even though Marshall was running against them and, again, it is a clear conflict of interest. GLA covenants follow state law regarding a conflict of interest. Voting where there is a conflict of interest is unlawful.

How can an election be fair when illegal actions are taken? Those who removed Marshall and Kathleen from the ballot are claiming that the board agreed there was *no conflict of interest!* – which would get them out of a covenant's violation, if it were so, but some board members say it didn't happen that way. Nevertheless, state law supersedes GLA covenants. And what the board decides upon does not constitute the matter at the state level. Two outside attorneys were consulted and what took place was clearly a conflict of interest.

**Glastonbury Landowners Association, Inc.**  
**PROXY DESIGNATION FORM – 2017 ELECTIONS**

I, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_,  
*Print name* *NG or SG* *Parcel(s) / Lot #'s*

hereby \_\_\_\_\_  
designate *Print Name of Proxy*

to cast my  Only at the Annual Meeting of the Glastonbury Landowners Association, Inc. on  
vote(s) December 2, 2017

At all meetings during the coming year, from December 2, 2017 until the Annual Meeting in November of 2018

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Your Signature* *Date*

Your phone number is required for verification \_\_\_\_\_

**\*\* This form must be completely filled out and signed by you to be valid \*\***

**NOTE:** It is your responsibility, to mail or deliver **this completed designation form to the person you have chosen as your proxy**, who will then bring it to the meeting, and vote on your behalf. The GLA will not deliver this form to your proxy or hold it for him/her to pick up. **Proxies may not be given to the Board, or to Directors.**

**DELIVERY:** Individuals designated as proxies must submit their forms in-person when signing in at the Annual Meeting held on December 2, 2017, 9:45 a.m. at Emigrant Hall, in Emigrant, MT. Proxy forms must be received prior to the voting period which ends at 12:00 p.m.

**\*\* Bylaw Article V states: \*\***

**G: Designation of Proxy.** If a Membership Interest is held by a firm, corporation, partnership, association, or other legal entity, or any combination thereof, a proxy must be executed and filed with the Association appointing and authorizing one person to attend any or all Annual and Special Meetings of the Members of the Association and thereat to cast the entire vote pertaining to that Membership Interest. If a Membership Interest is held by joint tenants, either joint tenant may attend Annual or Special Meetings of the Members of the Association and cast the entire vote pertaining to that Membership Interest, or each joint tenant may attend and cast a fractional vote. Any Member may designate any person to vote as proxy on his or her behalf. To be valid, a proxy must be in writing, dated, executed by the Member of record or legal representative of such Member and filed with the Secretary before or at the appointed time for a meeting. Such proxy shall be effective and remain in force until voluntarily revoked, amended or terminated by operation of law, until the expiration of one year after its execution or until the date of the next GLA Annual Meeting after the proxy was used at the previous Annual Meeting. The Association shall continue to recognize a proxy which has not expired until it receives notice of such revocation, amendment or termination.