

bbwilbur@frontier.com

From: "Dustin Frederick" <dustin@local519.org>
Date: Monday, December 10, 2012 9:03 AM
To: "Suzy Palmer" <suzy Palmer1@me.com>; "Bob Wilbur" <bbwilbur@broadstripe.net>
Cc: "Ed Delahanty" <whshed@live.com>; "Gwyn Staton" <gwynstaton1@msn.com>; "Chris Hendrickson" <Hendrickcj@gmail.com>; "Fred Salmon" <pheffy@aol.com>
Subject: RE: Motion in Draft Minutes

Well---how did it go? Am I on a committee or in exile? Did they agree to the amended motion passed at the annual meeting?

Dustin

From: Suzy Palmer [mailto:suzy Palmer1@me.com]
Sent: Friday, December 07, 2012 10:16 PM
To: Bob Wilbur
Cc: Ed Delahanty; Gwyn Staton; Dustin Frederick; Chris Hendrickson; Fred Salmon
Subject: Re: Motion in Draft Minutes

I think Karen is the only one holding the original lists. I will ask for a copy. I know some people who signed up for the pool list. I think I will ask to see them after the appointments are made. Let's see what happens.

There will also be lots of minutes to be approved...can make changes at that time.

See you there tomorrow,

Suzy
 Suzy Palmer
 195 Perry Dr.
 Coupeville, WA 98239
 Cell: (847) 902-4922
 Home: (360) 639-6050

On Dec 07, 2012, at 03:28 PM, Bob Wilbur <bbwilbur@broadstripe.net> wrote:

Hi Suzy and Ed,
 Just to refresh (albeit fresh does not seem to be the best word choice here) your memories and like me not to keen on returning to this, well then, "Merry Christmas."

That said, the stuff below seems to point to a need to try to get the draft Annual Meeting minutes to comport with the revised approved motion changes, which I think we all agreed need fixing. I'll be at the meeting but looks like the ball will be primarily in your court.

Chris, Dustin are you planning to attend? I know Gwyn is unable to be here.

HoHoHo...bob

From: Bob Wilbur [mailto:bbwilbur@broadstripe.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2012 4:39 PM
To: Dustin Frederick; Chris Hendrickson; Gwyn Staton; Suzy Palmer; Ed Delahanty; Sid Iverson; JoAnna Weeks; Carol Del

Subject: Re: Motion in Draft Minutes

Dustin I am assuming that minutes, if not unanimously approved by the Board, could be challenged by a board minority in some way. Just wondering if Roberts speaks to such options. Does anyone have a recent copy of Roberts?

The changes Karen effected don't on their surface seem too significant in some ways, but they do weaken the motion by dilution and by making work bureaucratically messy.

Also, Ed and Suzy (and Bob P), since you were not involved in determining committee number and personnel, but are required to have been per the bylaws, do you think it best to let that slide by or to challenge, especially if there is a new list of committees and members that tilt badly for us. Do either of you have the original sign-up lists or just Karen?

bob

From: [Dustin Frederick](#)

Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2012 11:24 AM

To: [Bob Wilbur](#) ; [Chris Hendrickson](#) ; [Gwyn Staton](#) ; [Suzy Palmer](#) ; [Ed Delahanty](#) ; [Sid Iverson](#) ; [JoAnna Weeks](#) ; [Carol Del](#)

Subject: RE: Motion in Draft Minutes

I agree---thanks Bob. I'll get back to you with my thoughts if they won't agree to the changes.

From: Bob Wilbur [<mailto:bbwilbur@broadstripe.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2012 9:00 AM

To: Chris Hendrickson; Dustin Frederick; Gwyn Staton; Suzy Palmer; Ed Delahanty; Sid Iverson; JoAnna Weeks; Carol Del

Subject: Motion in Draft Minutes

All,

I have reviewed the motion portion of the draft minutes and found some problems, which Maria (among others) interprets that all committees are working together on the 3 tasks. Red text I believe inaccurate and green text is needed to correct red text deficiencies. Do you all agree? If so, I suggest that Chris copy this to a new email to be sent out to all board members as her corrections. She should copy the rest of us, and we can send the board individual notes of concurrence. Or do you see other better ways to handle and Chris are you okay with my suggestion? Finally, Dustin/Gwyn, do we have any recourse if the Board fails to make these changes?

The last paragraph of the draft Annual Meeting minutes under the Member Forum section, reads: “Dan suggested the ad hoc committee be required to work with/as the existing committees, this allows all or any members to participate.” That should be corrected as follows: “In place of the ad hoc committee in the original motion, Dan suggested the ad hoc committee be required to two **standing committees be substituted: work with/as** the existing **Pool Maintenance and Improvement and the Long Term Planning** committees, this allows all or any members to participate. (see * below)

The modified motion should read as corrected here:

By November 10 2012, Pool Planning by members of the Pool Maintenance, Long Range Planning and Budget Committees** will work with a nonresident facilitator, as an ex-officio team member and may consult with legal counsel as warranted. All legal counsel expenses and other costs will require prior approval from the Board of Directors. Under the overall objective of having the pool open as soon as a funding and construction schedule allow, the committees shall have three (3) tasks to complete by February 28, 2013, or sooner:

(1) To identify ... (agreed)

(2) Investigate and develop ...(agreed)

(3) Upon completion of tasks 1 and 2, the committees shall submit the findings to the Board and subsequently work with Board as appropriate to prepare an appropriate assessment ballot. The Team's findings shall be included, in full, with the ballot.***

*Changes comport with the November 2, 2012, post of Dan Jones on Next Door: "The motion provided that the chairs and members of the standing committees, Pool Maintenance and Improvement committee and Long Term planning committee, are to be appointed by Nov. 10, 2012 AD with specific instructions to work together on the pool project. They are to have a decision by February 28, 2013 AD."

**As reflected in * above, the Budget Committee was not included in the revised motion, just the Pool and the Planning committees.

**Some of the original language in Task 3 was deleted (i.e., "...Unless approved by 5 of the 7 Team members, the ballot shall comport, unaltered...") but the green text was not removed. Note in the draft minutes there was no record of discussion to removal this portion and to have such removal as part of the friendly amendment.