

**DBLA BOD Meeting
July 28, 2017 – 10:00AM**

Minutes

Call to Order: 10:00AM

Roll Call:

Leaseholders Present: 24

BOD: Kate Higgins, President

Kosha Long, Vice President

Char Schulz, Treasurer

Linda Enger, Secretary

Lynn Brem, Director at Large

Staff: Melinda Dewey, Office Manager

President's Opening Statement

I want to talk a little bit about things that have been going on this week and how we've been reacting, including myself. I find myself reacting, and I have to remind myself to breathe before jumping to judgement. I'd like to remind all of us to do that, extend a little bit of grace and avoid jumping to conclusions about someone's motive. As close as we all are, and as many people that are in the park, I think we all need to step back and think before we react to an issue.

Secretary Report

- Motion to accept the BOD 06/23/17 Meeting Minutes
- Move – Linda Enger
- Second – Char
- Vote – Unanimously Approved

Treasurer Report

- The Money Market reserve Account has \$61347.08 in it.
- Purchased \$25,000 CD for 24 months at the rate of 1.70.%. That brings the balance to \$36,347.08.
- We will be depositing our Monthly Reserve Contribution of \$4477. in the next 2 weeks bring our total to \$40,826.08 in the Reserve Account.

Office Manager Report

Attached

Committee Reports:

- Activities – Jackie Cairns
 - Report Attached
- ALRC - Lin Makela
 - No big report today. The meat of my report will be done at the Annual Meeting. We meet every Tuesday, anyone who would like to join us is welcome
- Document Review
 - No committee yet. Please think about signing up for it.
- Election
 - The Election Committee will oversee ballot counting for the DBR Board of Directors at Radclyffe at 9am Friday, August 4th. All are welcome to observe silently. The results will be made public at the Annual Meeting.
- Finance
 - No report today – report will be made at the Annual Meeting

DBLA BOD Meeting
July 28, 2017 – 10:00AM

Minutes

- Green Team – Jackie Lanum
 - Report Attached
- Long Range Planning – Susie Thrune
 - No report today – Report will be given at the Annual Meeting
- Pet Committee – Kelly Gorley
 - Will report at Annual Meeting
- Safety – Mary Harrison
 - Report Attached
- Web Site – Lynn Brem
 - I'm speaking for our outgoing Web Committee Chair as the BOD Liaison. 562.90 earned on Amazon Affiliation.

NTI Work

- Status Update
 - I completed and mailed a letter to NTI. We received a bill which we will not pay until we hear back from them.

Revised ByLaws

- Vote to determine next steps
 - The BOD did vote to approve the proposed revisions and send them out to the community
 - We would now like the community to vote on them at the Annual Meeting
 - As a board, we need to vote to accept them as they are now and put them out for a vote
 - MOTION – approve the bylaws as they currently are, and put them out for a vote at the Annual Meeting
 - Move – Linda Enger
 - Second – Char Schulz
 - Vote – unanimously accepted

Pet Committee Complaint

- Appeal from CJ Stevens - Pet Committee compared CJ's complaint to the current DBR Pet Rules, and found that no infraction had occurred. CJ is appealing this decision.
- 3 separate things to address:
 - the original complaint about dog barking and the Pet Committee's ruling
 - We reviewed the complaint and the current HOA rules. You can only make rulings in terms of the rules that are in place at the time of the alleged offense.
 - Motion – the BOD supports the findings of the Pet Committee on the complaint of June 30, 2017
 - Move – Linda Enger
 - Second – Lynn Brem
 - Vote – motion carried unanimously
 - the proposal to revise our rules to conform with Jeff Co
 - We have always tried to keep our rules in line with JeffCo so we are not misleading our leaseholders. There have been times when our rules fall behind and we are always chasing to catch up. I propose that we simply put in our rules the verbiage "in accordance with Jefferson County" so people can look up the law and go from there. This way, we as an organization are not constantly in non-compliance. As an issue comes up, the committee will research the current Jefferson County Law

- I think the other piece of this is to require the complainant to present positive proof that a JeffCo rule has been broken.
- We are trying to be loving with each other and live in community.
- How do you prove it? What kind of documentation would be practical and adequate?
- I think that is up to the committees to decide
- If a park model is within 2 feet of another building, that is obvious. Other infringements like speeding, nuisance noise, etc. are less obvious
- MOTION: The BOD will direct Committees to review the rules for which they are responsible and where applicable, change the verbiage to read “in accordance with Jefferson County ordinances”, without further detail.
- Move – Char Schulz
- Second- Kosha Long
- Vote – carried unanimously
- the most recent complaint is that the Pet Committee and BOD liaison did not follow the correct process
 - The Pet Committee did not follow 12.11 because that rule applies to “an altercation between dogs”.
 - While all specific comments were not captured, there was a lot of discussion among the directors about the clarity of the rules.
 - *NOTE: multiple attempts from the gallery to engage in discussion were met with the reminder that this is not a work session and discussion is limited to BOD Members.*
 - If we need more work on the rules, we need to do that. We can only deal with the rules that we have right now.
 - If a complaint is to be handled the best way, perhaps the grievance procedure must come in at some point.
 - We have delegated authority and responsibility to the committees for the development of the rules so that issues are handled at the lowest level possible. Right now, the question before us is: did the Pet Committee and BOD Liaison follow the wrong process for a barking dog? They followed 12.7 and not 12.11.
 - Kate read aloud Rules 12.7 and 12.11
 - The Pet Committee used Rule 12.7
 - Kate read aloud the complaint
 - When I read 12.11, I count two dogs. This was not about two dogs and I think it doesn’t apply
 - I’m sorry, I read it differently. I believe the resolution of conflicts should have been followed regardless of how many dogs were involved.
 - I believe that there is ambiguity with the way the rules are written.
 - I appreciate that the JeffCo rules were brought up. A leaseholder had a conflict and I believe we should have followed the conflict resolution rule
 - I believe the Pet Committee was following the rule they best felt applied in this instance. I don’t think we need to launch into conflict resolution when there is a simple investigation about a complaint. Perhaps we should ask the Pet Committee to go back and look at their rules.
 - I appreciate that we have ambiguity in the rules but at what point does it get elevated to conflict resolution
 - I don’t think we use conflict resolution when someone doesn’t clean up after their dog in the meadow.

**DBLA BOD Meeting
July 28, 2017 – 10:00AM**

Minutes

- When things get elevated, what process should we follow?
- I will recuse myself from the vote but I will say this; I believe that the complainant filed the complaint, appealed the decision of the BOD, and when she knew she would lose the appeal, went after something else to complain about, and ginned up as much conflict as she could.
 - This comment was met with a groan of disagreement from part of the audience
 - The President admonished the Secretary: "that comment is inappropriate and not germane to this discussion. We need to agree on a motion regarding the Pet Committee's decision to follow 12.7 instead of 12.11"
- MOTION: 12.11 was not followed because there was a conflict between two people, and it should have been followed. In the future, barring any change in the rules, the Pet Committee should follow 12.11 if there is a conflict between two or more people.
- Moved: Kosha Long
- Second: Char Schulz
- Vote: 3 AYE, 1 Recusal

Proposal from leaseholder Barb Gilger

- Extend or remove our current rules regarding term limits for BOD members.
 - We need a sub-committee to look closely at the proposal and flesh it out
 - I think Barb brought this up at a really good time because it is early in our terms
 - MOTION: I move that we put it out to volunteers to serve on a committee to research this proposal and make recommendations to the committee.
 - Move: Kosha Long
 - Second: Char Schulz
 - Vote: Carried unanimously

Long Term Planning Committee Proposal

- In the process of reviewing items from the 2015 leaseholder brainstorming list, The LRPC members realized there may be two very important and critical items that need to be addressed in the next Board meeting on July 28, 2017. DBR's perimeter fence is not complete. Some areas have only partial wire fencing, or none at all. Barb has informed us that she is in the process of beefing up some of the perimeter fencing where there are holes. After much discussion, the Committee feels that wood fencing should be completed along highway 101, as well as on the west side of our property. Because of the vandalizing of our equipment last winter, the Committee also feels that a security camera could easily be placed near the front gate, to monitor potential "ner-do-wells."

Therefore, the LRPC requests that the DBR Board of Directors approve fully extending the perimeter fence along highway 101 and along the west side of the property, using sturdy wood fencing. We also request that a security camera be purchased and mounted on the office building, to monitor incoming/outgoing traffic through the park gate. The costs for these new items can appropriately come out of the Capital Improvement Fund. Barb will have an estimate of those costs in time for the BOD meeting next week. The LRPC believes that by approving these requests, the BOD will be better ensuring the security of DBR, while reducing possible liability.

Thank you for considering our requests, Susie Thrune, DBR LRPC Chair.

- Technically, we need Barb to submit a Staff ARLC Request to make this change
 - Where will the fence be on the west side?
 - Down the full length which is a heck of a lot

**DBLA BOD Meeting
July 28, 2017 – 10:00AM**

Minutes

- There is a different type of material on the west side, and it has been repaired in the past
- MOTION: Approve the concept as stated, and have Barb send this to the ARLC Committee for approval
 - Move: Kosha Long
 - Second: Char Schulz
 - Vote: Accepted Unanimously

Requests for Action:

- From Anne Lizborne and Gail Young to disallow male visitors in the swimming pool area
 - MOTION: I move that we continue to follow the guidelines we passed last fall which includes male visitors accompanied by the Leaseholder.
 - Move: Kosha Long
 - Second: Char Schulz
 - Vote: Carried Unanimously
- From Michelle Beixedon (widow of Irene Weiss) to approve the gift and placement of a memorial bench near the meadow
 - Motion: Accept the gift from Michelle, and the placement approved by Barb Gilger
 - Move: Char Schulz
 - Second: Kosha Long
 - Vote: Unanimously approved

Request for Variance to ALRC Rule 5.3 from CJ Stevens and Skye Surges

- "... requesting variance so that I can have an antenna up to 19 feet, 8 inches from the ground ..." "... asking that I be able to have an antenna on my lot equal to the height enjoyed by park model owners."
 - MOTION: Approve the variance requested by CJ Stevens and Skye Surges, and recommend to the ARLC Committee that the antenna maximum length rule be changed to "no greater than 19'8".
 - Move: Linda Enger
 - Second: Kosha Long
 - Vote: Unanimously accepted

Bona Fide Offer on Lot 79

- Motion: That we not exercise our first right of refusal on Lot 79
- Move: Linda Enger
- Second: Char Schulz
- Vote: 3 Ayes, 1 abstension

Motion to adjourn: Char Schulz

Second: Kosha Long

Meeting Adjourned: 12:23pm