

# MINUTES of the Green Circle Service Corporation Board Meeting of July 20, 2006

Board members present: Helene V., Annavene B., Rose A., Jerome L., Chester J., Hein V. and Marqui B. 24 residents attended. 11 people turned in Straw Ballots- (Results are included with each issue.)

Before the meeting was called to order, Annavene B. stated that the handout (which had been delivered to all homeowners) did not come from all the Board Members. (Although Helene had e-mailed all Board Members to read the documents and contact her with any concerns they may have, none had responded until they received the handout.)

Asha commented that the document was well done and showed a lot of hard work.

Helene called the meeting to order and began in our usual way of having all present introduce themselves by name and house number. She then read the meeting guidelines.

Helene said it had been suggested that it might be helpful to use a straw ballot as a guide to assess the main concerns of all present to focus our discussion time on the most pertinent issues. Sue said, "That's ridiculous!"

Annavene said that Board members make the decision. She had already talked to 4 Board members who were willing to vote to sign right now.

Rose said the meeting was an opportunity for the Board to have some community feedback and this was an important consideration for some Board members for deciding how to vote.

Sue said that the documents were not open to discussion. There were many fallacies (in the handout) and it represented nothing. "TTCl won't change anything," she said.

Helene stated that the issues included some of huge importance to the community and the members of future GCSC Boards and deserved a community discussion.

Attention turned to the **minutes of the previous meeting**. Rose moved to approve the minutes of the June 26, 2006 meeting. It was seconded by Chester. The Board voted to **approve the minutes**.

Helene asked if there was any **old business**.

Jerome asked if the **TTCl minutes giving approval to the plans for house #47**, which he had asked for at the May 11, 2006 community meeting (which Sue had requested be held), had been received. None had been received.

Sue said this had nothing to do with roads and trash. Jerome said, "I don't appreciate your ridicule. Let's have it clean."

Sue said she thought it had been a "rhetorical question" and a formal letter requesting this should be sent to Ruth. Marqui said she would write one.

Marqui reported another **light check** had been done on July 19, 2006. Just 16 lights were not working. Last time it was 22, so that was better compliance with the insurance request to do frequent light checks to assure adequate street lighting. People from 2 homes had asked for the small bulbs to repair their lights.

Having the parts readily available seems to help. Also, Christina P. said that Lazlo Farkas (# 29A) had indicated he would be willing to assist people in fixing their lights.

The meeting moved on to **new business** and the **discussion of the concerns** regarding signing of the

leases and deeds of the final settlement. The straw vote papers were handed out and Helene began to briefly explain the issues of concern and the suggested solutions. Residents were encouraged to mark their preferences and note any suggestions for improving the documents, Chester asked if we could discuss after each one. Asha asked that we go through the whole document first. Helene decided to give an overview of the concerns.

Sue W. left as "she didn't want to be read to like a child" and asked to be called by cell phone when the discussion began.

Gloria and Jerome said they appreciated the effort that had been put into the Updates and Concerns. Helene explained that since she and Marqui were the ones who were required to actually sign, they felt a responsibility to the community and future boards to scrutinize the many documents and bring forth their concerns for discussion.

After Helene completed going through the document, Sue W. was called and soon returned to the meeting.

Discussion of the individual concerns followed:

### **Leased Premises Gazebo**

1. This repair issue was settled at the June 26, 2006 meeting when the consensus was that the issue should not prevent signing and the GCSC Board voted to fund fireproofing the roof and fixing loose boards.

2. The issue of the 3 year lease and increasing the days it could be used was considered. Some felt the lease should be rewritten or match the lease for the trash area. Chester said, "Nobody cares that much about the Gazebo. There is always an option to renew a lease." (The history of community effort to fund and build and create the garden for the gazebo was not considered at this time by those attending this meeting, but this does mean a lot to some who were involved at the time and to some recent neighbors.) Chester said, "It doesn't matter. It doesn't concern trash and roads. I'm going to point out the things that in my opinion don't matter."

Vivian asked, "Do you pay 100% of the insurance (for the 16 days) or is it shared?" GCSC is to pay all of the insurance. It was mentioned that use of 4% of the time, but paying for 100% of the insurance seemed unfair. "Any lease can be extended," said Laura C. "It is a concern that we are paying full insurance for a structure that we don't own, but this issue should not hold up the signing." It was also suggested that it would not be worth extending the lease under these conditions after 3 years.

Straw Vote: 1 vote no change; 9 votes agree with suggested solution.

### **The Trash Area**

1. Most neighbors are aware of the overflowing trash and recycling bins and supported the re-written words which Sue W. and Chester had proposed to read: The size of the trash area and/or location may be changed in the future provided both parties agree on all such terms concerning relocation, change in size and costs incurred.

Straw Vote: 1 vote no change; 10 votes agree with the suggested solution. One wrote: "but not too important. Vague language works for both parties."

2. The issue of GCSC being responsible for 50 % of the taxes related to the trash area was raised. It was asked how much the taxes were. It was thought to be about \$75.00. Chester and others felt \$37.50 was not worth quibbling about. "A limit could be stipulated," was another suggestion." Also, taxes never stay the same and they probably will go up." "There is also the option to terminate a lease or not renew it in the future". Sue was asked to look up the amount of the taxes and inform GCSC. Sue stated the GCSC half would be \$53.43.

Straw Vote: 3 votes no change; 8 votes agree with suggested solution. One wrote: "but not important if only \$75.00 a year." (Sue said half was \$53.43 so the full bill is \$106.86.)

### **Fees of Renters**

The treasurer and secretary would greatly benefit from a procedure to notify the GCSC Board that a vacancy has occurred or that it has been filled. Some felt they should just "knock on the door". (In practice during the past year it is not easy to kept up with changing names & addresses of renters and new owners - especially of rental property--and this would make a more cooperative and effective procedure for future Boards if put in place and applied to all rental property owners.)

2. Some felt that renters should pay the quarterly fees. Some felt the property owner must pay. Most seemed to agree that the homeowner was ultimately responsible. The property owner can make and agreement with the renter. (Some TTCI/Manor House properties have not been required to pay in the past, although renters use the roads and trash, which is why we would like to have this new procedure. GCSC has no other source of funds, as TTCI/Manor House does to pay bills, and we do not wish to be forced to sue to collect fair funds which the CC&Rs state is the Owners responsibility . It would be preferable to have a fair policy in place.) It was suggested that any homeowner who has not paid the required fees NOT be allowed to vote.

Jerome agreed that the "property owner has the responsibility."

Sue W. said TTCI would not accept any changes. She said that in the past it has been homeowners, not renters who have been in arrears for not paying their required fees. "Some homeowners owe thousands and thousands of dollars. And maybe that was why they wanted amnesty in the release. You cannot stop anyone from paying the fee. Ultimately clearly the home owner is responsible. This is a non issue. It makes no sense." Rose pointed out that that 7 people had left owing fees. Also in the house next to yours people come and go and haven' been paying any fees. She had been doing the billing with Katherine C. and they still don't know who to bill. Sue said, "This is the business of the people who collect the money.

u as a group decide how you are going to get so and so to pay. It is your responsibility."

Laura suggested calling or writing the home owner and say that we're having a problem here

Jerome asked why were renters paying instead of homeowners, and Rose said because we are inheriting it that way. Bill the residences. Helene pointed out that the GCSC can consider this and may decide on a new policy in the future.

Vivian asked who would collect the unpaid fees, and thought it would be fair to have TTCI be responsible for past uncollected fees. Sue responded that they had lost the point of collecting past fees of thousands of dollars from homeowners and in the settlement the new group is given this task and how they do that is up to them."

Eric recommended, "Bill the homeowner. Then you cut down all the people coming and going. You can send it to the residents, but ultimately the homeowner is responsible." Chester said, "Let's get down to some more meaty issues. But we have some some flexibility. If someone has lived here for 20 years...we know who they are, but if we find some house that is being rented over and over without paying, bill the homeowner. Ultimately we all agree that the home owner is responsible. "

Bill P. suggested to assess fees by parcel, as some parcels have 5-8 people others have just one person. .

Straw Vote: 1 vote no change; 10 votes agree with suggested solution. "Property owners must pay." "Homeowners are responsible. "" Renters should pay/Homeowners responsible."

### **Voting for GCSC Board Members:**

1. Bill said he would like to limit the vote of Republicans in that way. It is a difficult issue, but he was inclined to say one parcel one vote.

It was pointed out that the 1977 CC&Rs originally gave TTCI one vote. (Part I, p.3, # 12) "Each household is entitled to one (1) vote only, and Taormina by virtue of its ownership of land shall have one vote only." Sue said, "that part had been struck out."

Jerome said, "I believe it should be one vote per owner, to avoid being inundated by their will... I don't think it should be based on riches or wealth. It should be one owner one vote. Otherwise we'll be swamped by their viewpoint. What's the point of having GCSC if we are to be inundated by their viewpoint."

Jan asked why is the vote limited to homeowners? If you are trying to have a *community*, why not all residents? Maybe not transient residents, but specify a period of residence to vote. It isn't a feudal system. Secret ballots and a ballot box can free renters from feeling pressured for their voting choice by the owner of their property. Have the resident not the home owner be the voter. Perhaps a vote of ½ to the renter and ½ to the owner could be considered.  
(Secret ballots and a ballot box were used in last years' election of the GCSC Board. Proxies are available to renters IF the owner of their rental home agrees.)

It was pointed out that owners have more at stake because of their financial investment in their homes, than renters, who might object to needed road or trash projects. Maintenance of rental units has been a concern to some resident owners, Ralph pointed out.

Chester reminded everyone that we were voting on issues concerning trash and road only. If anyone is worried about the big corporation coming in to require 5 speed bumps instead of 3— well, just keep it in perspective.

Sue pointed out, "If you are arguing financial interest, the larger the more you have to lose." Also it is not fair or legal to take away people's votes."

Christina suggested 2 votes, one for the owner and one for the renter.

Allan liked her suggestion and felt it would be more democratic to allow renters who had lived here a certain length of time be allowed to vote. Perhaps just residents should vote.

Annavene pointed out that a renter might not be as interested in maintaining the roads or trash area and let them run down.

It was asked if we had any control over the CC&Rs and who is in charge of them." Annavene said, "anyone can enforce the CC&Rs."

"I mean who is in charge of the CC&Rs?" "TTCI" said Helene.

Sue said, "Let me clarify this. Those CC&Rs are enforceable by anybody in this community. Because city codes are enforceable by anybody in the community. The problem is enforcement. If it is not a city code and if I don't like what you are doing, I would have to file a lawsuit against you," she added. "Everybody can file a lawsuit against anybody else. That's the only legal recourse."

"Then," Eric said, "the CC& R's aren't necessarily enforceable?" "Oh, they are enforceable," said Sue.

"But you's have to do it through a lawsuit."

"As far as changing or altering them, that's not possible? Only TTCI who is over us is able to make changes? That's not something this group (GCSC) does? This is just trash and roads."

"That's right," Sue replied.

"But you could vote to change them?" asked Eric.

"You could," said Sue. "But the vote requires 75% for passage." (At this time TTCI/Manor House and their family members and agents/beneficiaries have a block of 28-29 % of the votes.)

Marqui mentioned that in Sept. the Board had met with a lawyer who had highly recommended that the CC&Rs be updated to be clear and enforceable. She also pointed out that in the CC&Rs it states that TTCI is not required to be consistent in enforcement:(CC&Rs, p. 5, Part V, Section I-Enforcement: "TTCI shall have the right to enforce by any proceeding at law or in equity, all restriction, conditions, covenants or reservations. Each Owner and /or Buyer of a house or lot in Taormina shall re required to sign a copy of the attached document stating he(they) agrees to abide by the provisions set forth in these CC&Rs....Violation of CC&R's ... shall give TTCI 's Board of Trustees the right to bring legal action.....Failure of the Taormina Board of Trustees to enforce any covenant or restriction herein contained shall in no event be deemed a waiver of the right to do so thereafter." ) This makes it really capricious for anyone to enforce,

and I would hope at some time in the future there will be an opportunity to look at this issue."

Also at the May 11, 2006 meeting the community expressed strong appreciation for the historic ambiance of Taormina Lane, so it might be useful to look at dropping the CC&R's which seem irrelevant and unenforceable and develop instead some basic Architectural Guidelines that reflect some of the original



points in the CC&Rs that create the ambiance residents and owners appreciate and wish to preserve and that are consistent with city codes.

"If we are here just for roads and trash, how can we get involved in CC&Rs?" Jerome said.

Chester said, "I agree 100%. Let's move on."

Jerome said, "No, it is an issue that has to be addressed. Perhaps we need to expand our mandate and look at all the issues in the community. How did we get just roads and trash?"

Helene explained that the mandates extend from the terms of the final settlement.

Jerome pointed out that "the rest of the community was not a party to the settlement."

Sue, "The whole business about the CC&Rs were drawn up when this was thought to be a planned community. This is the real key issue that people don't understand. It is not a planned community. So really in a sense the CC&Rs are really defunct, because they apply to the situation when it was a planned community, and it was never was registered and there was a lawsuit that eliminated the planned community, eliminated any democracy..... they are really moot and irrelevant. "

Helene said, "Except for the street lamps, the road, the fees, ....."

Sue continued, "The road is a separate thing. That is why we are now separating the road from the CC&Rs. The only reason the lights are in there is because the insurance company wants it that way."

Helene added, "and we don't have city lights."

"The only real CC&Rs are the ones that are city codes that they can enforce. The city is what really rules like any other community," said Sue. "This is not a planned community any more."

Someone asked could they paint their house purple. Sue replied, "Yes, they could."

"Why did the corporation insist on keeping the CC&Rs?" asked Bob.

"I don't know... My personal opinion is that Ruth has a personal attachment to those," said Sue.

"Ruth owns so many houses she is strip mining this neighborhood for her own good," Bob said.

Annavene asked what he meant. He said, "Look around at your properties, they are falling apart."

"We built these properties," said Annavene.

Bob said, "I'd look what you are starting to build," he said. "You know, Sue, you do a really good job of fixing up homes. If you could get some money from Ruth to fix up the rest of her properties it would be really great because you have that skill..."

Sue replied, "We'd like to do that if we didn't have to deal with lawsuits and waste all our money on that kind of stuff."

Ralph wondered how they could be discussing changing the vote that was agreed to in the lawsuit. People who disagreed should have joined into the settlement. I didn't agree with that vote either.

It was agreed that it was time to move on to the next issues.

Sue asked to speak to this issue. "You can raise all the questions you want. But GCSC is a product of this settlement. When you ran for office you saw the settlement agreement and if you disagreed with all these issues you really shouldn't have run. This group is a product of that settlement agreement. If you don't sign it, it goes back to court. I think the judge will probably just say bring in an outside person to manage your roads and trash, because these people can't seem to figure anything out."

Laura pointed out that parties in a contractual agreement can agree to go back and make changes. After it is signed it is a done deal. Laura said you couldn't really go back now, and encouraged moving forward to finalize the agreement. If there are issues still outstanding resulting from the settlement that are still a problem, the parties can always go back and amend the settlement to add terms, to change terms, there can also be a separate agreement to change things. "Contractually the settlement agreement is done. It is signed. I don't believe it is GCSC's role at this point to try to make modifications to that agreement." I think you need to accept what is there. Sign the deeds. Get those deed documents done. Take care of the issues at hand. Then later, if there are still issues arising the parties to that agreement can always go back and make a contract."

Sue said that in the future the gazebo lease might be changed.

It was asked, "What about the voting? How are we ever going to get a change?"

Sue said, "Well, you are not. You're not. That's the way it is." There are a few things we have agreed to

change, but basically they are just sort of because of the insurance issue or a technical thing, but concerning the lease or things like that, if you don't agree and if you don't sign it just goes back to court." Annavene commented that if a majority of the Board voted to sign, it would be signed.

"In a way it is fine to have all the discussion, but it is really a waste of energy," said Sue. "Unless TTCI is willing to go along with the changes, forget it. It is just not going to happen."

It was stated that people thought they were bargaining (trying to implement the terms of the settlement) in good faith. "This is not about bargaining. We already went through a whole legal process," said Sue. A lot of these issues were already raised by the litigants. It's the same old story. We're not going to do it all over again." (The settlement does state that the parties will agree to implement the terms IN GOOD FAITH.)

Marqui suggested that if there could be more good faith and cooperation in making a more fair document then there will be less reason for Ruth to worry about future lawsuits.

"Do you expect TTCI to give up all their votes? If you were a corporation, you wouldn't do it." said Sue. "It would be absolutely absurd!" Everybody has their opinion of what is fair. ... It seems very democratic because every property gets one vote. The other side took out allowing tenants on the board. That wasn't in this document.... This is settled. It's done. Its finished."

No strong support was expressed for changing the number of votes TTCI/Manor House which now has (10 houses = 10 votes), 3 duplexes (3 votes), plus family members' houses (4) and agents/beneficiaries(2) - which is a total of 19 out of 66.

(It is noted that a vote of at least 75% of "all such residents" or homeowners(?) is needed to change a by-law and a block of 28-29% of the votes, makes any future changes extremely difficult.)

Joan asked, "Are you saying that no request for change will be accepted. Or, that there is no opportunity?" "No, I said no reasonable request for change. We looked through and decided what was reasonable and what wasn't."

Could you consider ideas- reasonable or unreasonable, or are we just talking?"

"We considered them seriously with a lawyer, said Sue.

Chester pointed out that this is still a Green Circle meeting so we are deciding whether or not any of these suggestions will be incorporated into the final documents.

"If we are only roads and trash can we even discuss these issues?" someone asked.

Eric said, "We can discuss, but we have no power over it. We can ask TTCI if they will talk about it, but they can say no and not even look at it or just put it in the trash."

Straw Vote: 1 vote no change; 6 votes agree with the suggested solution.

"1 vote per homeowner regardless of number of homes owned." "Mixed feelings, but would like to see each homeowner - 1 vote only." "If trying to build a Taormina Community, then ALL residents should have a vote. This would eliminate the problem of multiple property owners. Tenants could not be pressured in voting if by ballot box." "Do candidates &/or elected Board Members have to be residents of Taormina Lane?"

### **Assessment Fees/Duplexes**

1. Someone asked how many duplexes are in our community. The duplexes are:

39 & 39 A, 77 & 79, 81 & 83, 87 & 89, 91 & 93. That is 5 duplexes with a total of 10 residences.

None are under divided ownership. Now the owner gets 1 vote and pays 1 fee, although each residence of a duplex usually has at least 1 car, and use our trash facility. All but one are currently occupied.

Not receiving fees from 5 occupied units, when all other occupied units pay \$25 per month/\$75 quarterly, seems unfair and means a loss of \$1500.00 to GCSC and an additional burden for the other residents.

(In addition 104 has a small rental unit, and several homes have remodeled or use part of their home as a rental space which affects trash and traffic but at no extra charge.)

Straw Vote: 1 vote no change. 8 votes agree with the suggested solution. "Occupied units should pay fee as trash and roads are used." "Fees should be paid by parcel." "A fee should be paid by all occupied units."

### **By-Law Changes**

The documents says "a vote of at least seventy-five (75%) of all such **residents**" are required to change a by-law.

Sue said, "If there is an inconsistency it would mean who the normal voters are as defined in the by-laws and follows throughout."

In the discussion it was not clarified whether this mean all residents or all property owners.

Sue said it was another example of "nitpicking" to clarify this and not worth it to revise the whole document.

Straw Vote: 1 vote no change; 9 votes agree with the suggested solution. "Who votes on by-law changes?"

### **2 & 3 Filling Vacancies on the GCSC Board:**

According to these by-laws a special election must be held after 90 days to fill a GCSC Board vacancy. (It was pointed out that incidents that occurred this year on our board indicated the necessity of having a simpler solution to fill a vacancy or consider replacing a member who cannot be present at most meetings.) It was suggested that many times a Board simply picks a replacement.

Picking the next person in line from the previous election in terms of votes respects the interest of a person to serve and the support they received from property owners in votes.

Annavene suggested it could be changed later.

Helene asked how it could be changed later, with the 75% required to make any changes.

In the discussion there was no clear mandate to change the procedure at this time.

Straw vote: 1 vote no change; 10 votes agree with the suggested solution. "No strong opinion."

### **the Road : Quitclaim Deed and Agreement**

#### **Section 1**

1. It had been suggested to add to "Green Circle shall have no right to change or affect any property owner's existing easements of record "except as permitted or required by law."

It was not clarified in the discussion that this should be added.

Straw Vote: 1 vote no change; 9 votes agree with the suggested solution. "No strong opinion."  
"should not hold up settlement."

#### **Section 2 - #1**

The date of beginning the responsibility for any lawsuits or accidents regarding the road was unclear. Laura explained that the date when everything takes effect is the date of full execution.

Straw Vote: 2 votes no; 7 votes agree with the suggested solution. "No strong opinion, inclined to agree with suggested solution."

#### **Section 2-#2**

A comprehensive list of any existing claims or suits ..... should allow for time for the GCSC Board to have the documents looked over by an attorney before notarizing and signatures.

The verbal consensus seemed to be that the Board should go forward with voting to sign the documents.

Straw Vote: 1 vote no; 8 votes agree with the suggested solution. "No strong opinion."

Section 3. GCSC has the right to collect all fees related to road maintenance and trash service (CC&Rs) and the right to maintain and repair....

Sue agreed that TTCl would accept the change. Although the insurance has required us to make frequent checks of the Taormina Street Lamps, the lamps are the property of the property owner and their responsibility to maintain them. GCSC can encourage and attempt to enforce maintenance, but the actual maintenance/repair is the responsibility of the owner. Discussion agreed that the maintenance was clearly the responsibility of the property owner.

Straw Vote: 1 vote no; 8 votes agree with the suggested solution.

#### **Section 4. #1 Mutual Release**

Laura explained that mutual release statements are often misunderstood, but that in reading this she felt the release related to the issues raised in the lawsuit. Those issues are only concerned with fees, the roads and the trash.

Laura asked how GCSC could release- when it was not a party in the lawsuit.

TTCl released for \$8,000 it claimed it was owed, and the TLCA released on issues raised in the lawsuit. The transfers of funds and leases for the trash area and gazebo and transfer of the roads are subject to the new corporation agreeing such release and to the other terms herein."

"This doesn't preclude other issues," said Sue.

Straw Vote: 1 vote no; 4 votes agree with solution #1 (list items from which to be mutually released. 3 votes agree with solution #2 (release shall not apply to TTCl/Manor House Corp. "regarding gross negligence, willful mismanagement, fraud, or criminal conduct."

"The GCSC needs legal input. Mutual Release issues are pretty standard, but are easily misunderstood."

"The GCSC has very limited responsibilities and was not a plaintiff in the lawsuit. Agreements between TTCl and TLCA are quite distinct from agreements between the TTCl and GCSC. I would be open to any combinations of proposed solutions.

#### **PROBLEM: Open Meetings**

was suggested that wording be added to Directors Meetings, pp.4-5. #6. All meetings of the directors, without exception, shall be open to the residents of Taormina Lane. "After all, this is only an organization to take care of trash and roads. Annavene agreed that as a non-profit organization, all meetings are open meetings. Chester pointed out that we could have some meetings that aren't official.

Straw Vote: 1 no vote; 8 votes agree with the suggested solution. "No strong opinion." "Open meetings are very, very important!"  
Whewwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwwww

Annavene was eager to have a vote to sign, and wanted to call for the vote.

Trina pointed out that the road deed was just received recently, not months ago with the other documents.

Sue said the one thing they felt was pertinent and would change was the change in wording about the street lights - that GCSC could enforce maintenance by owners, but could not repair the lights without owner permission. All the other points were minor or they were issues that there was just no way they would agree. That's just the way it is. We'd go to court over that. This is what you have in front of you. Discuss it. Take a vote instead of keep drawing this out. I'm leaving town and I won't be here next week. No more emotional turmoil. Discuss it and make a decision."

Chester said that each board member can speak. I am prepared to make a vote (now).

"Was it announced that there would be a vote?" asked Jerome. " I think it is fair that they be notified."

Annavene said that we have a right to bring it up now. My vote would be to sign the documents.

Three board members , Annavene, Hein and Chester, voted to vote now.

Others wished to have a few days to digest the comments of the community and reflect on the matters.

Chester agreed it would be reasonable to take a little breather and call a meeting in less than a week.



**It was decided to hold a GCSC Board meeting on Tuesday, July 25, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. at the Gazebo.**

Jerome asked to see the letter or e-mail from the insurance company requiring the lights be kept in working order. Helene agreed to show it to him.

Laura C. said that although she too had disagreements with many issues in the documents we were concerned with, she was amazed it had taken over 15 months to resolve this as the focus is stated to be the trash, the gazebo and the roads. It was time to sign and move on and actually deal with the roads and trash. There are always ways to deal with other issues of concern.

Laura C. recognized the limited focus of the responsibilities of the GCSC, but suggested that after scheduled GCSC Board meetings the opportunity for a Community Meeting could be held where any issue of concern from the community could be considered and discussed.

Marqui Bury, GCSC Secretary July 23, 2006

A letter has been written asking Ruth Mathews to provide Helene Vachet, president of GCSC with the minutes of the TCI Board meeting regarding approval for the building of #47 as required by the 1977 CC&Rs as requested by Board Member Jerome Landfield at the May 11, 2006 Community Meeting.

Following the meeting it was noted that the agenda of the July 25, 2006 meeting needs to include the forming of an election committee, the discussion of estimates for signs of the trash/recycling area.