

Winslow Farm Community Association, Inc.
Board of Directors Meeting
Tuesday, January 11, 2022
Via Zoom

Board Members Present: Joan Freeman (Laurelwood), Marc Wagner (Olde Mill), Anita Douglas (Moss Creek), Sandy Martin (Moss Creek Village) and Ted Boardman (Moss Creek)

Homeowners: Jane Layer, Beckie Owens, Sandra Bate, Dee Wykoff, Steve Ensmenger, Mary Beth Price, Gary Wiggins, Terry Halloran, Jackie Junken, Brad Hoggatt, Janis and Randehl Stevenson, Jane Perry, Martha Fitzgerald, Susan Ashburn, Joan Lewis, Nancy, Sharon Wilson,

Management Agent: Carole Damon for Capital Realty, Inc.

- I. Call to Order: 6:05 p.m.

- II. Minutes – the minutes from the December 14th meeting were reviewed. A motion was made to approve the minutes as written.
Motion – Marc Wagner Second – Joan Freeman Passes

- III. Financials – the year-end 2021 financial reports were presented and discussed. A motion was made to approve the financial statements as presented.
Motion – Marc Wagner Second – Anita Douglas Passes

- IV. Election of Officers – the following slate of officers was nominated and approved:
President: Sandy Martin Vice President – Ted Boardman
Treasurer – Anita Douglas Secretary – Marc Wagner
Officer – Joan Freeman

- V. Exterior Alteration Requests:
2222 Bent Tree Drive – request to install a black chain link fence in the backyard.
Motion to approve the fence with the stipulation that it must be vinyl coated black chain link and cannot exceed four feet in height.
Motion – Ted Boardman Second – Marc Wagner Passes

- VI. Pond Report:
 - A. The galvanized steel pipe that comes out of the overflow box has developed some holes. This is allowing water to come out of the pipe and erode the ground beneath it. We are getting bids for the repair.

\

B. Second Pond Survey

Events occurring between the December and January Board meetings:

- a. An announcement was made at the Tuesday, December 14th WFCB Board meeting that a second pond survey would be distributed.
- b. The three newly elected board members submitted responses to the 2021 Board requesting that the second pond survey be postponed for review until which time the new members were seated.
- c. The distribution of the survey and the submission of the objections crossed paths and the surveys were in residents' mailboxes by Friday, December 17th.

January 11th Board meeting:

Sandy Martin described a challenge to the validity of the second survey. She urged that to ensure impartiality, since the deadline for the submission of the second survey was quickly approaching, that it was imperative that the issue be addressed immediately before any knowledge of the number or types of responses were made known. A discussion followed.

- a. Those speaking in favor of acknowledging the second survey provided the following:
 1. The two board members who served at the time of the decision to repeat the survey provided their rationale in support of their decision:
 - i. A second survey would give every homeowner a chance to respond so their voice could be heard, allowing additional input from homeowners who either did not select one of the two options or did not return their original survey.
 - ii. They reiterated that the exercise should be viewed as a survey rather than a formal vote.
 - iii. A second survey would provide a better return rate. The more participation a community can achieve the better the overall outcome will be for everyone.
 2. Several homeowners in attendance provided additional input and objections to the challenge. The essence of those remarks are as follows:
 - i. Due to the confusion related to the purpose of the first survey, homeowners should, after a better understanding of the exercise, be provided the opportunity to submit a more informed response.
 - ii. Many people who did not respond to the first survey should be provided the opportunity to have their opinions heard by the Board.
 - iii. A question implied that the challenge to the second survey was based in the fear the results would be overturned.

- b. Those speaking in favor of invalidating the second survey provided the following:
1. Sending the survey a second time betrays the trust of those who took the first survey. It generates a suspicion that the real intent was to garner more support for the option that did not receive the most responses.
 2. The letter accompanying the first survey was clear as to the two choices. While considerable online resources had been made available as to the options.
 3. Using the democratic model, if all participants are provided the opportunity to make their opinion known, then the results are typically acknowledged without asking for a second opportunity to “vote”.
 - i. All WFCA homeowners had been given the same instructions and had the same opportunity to participate. When a person elects to provide a “write-in” choice, essentially it is a “lost” choice and does not contribute towards selecting one of the choices.
 - ii. People who wanted their opinions counted responded accordingly to the instructions. When people elect not to respond it is, in essence, a response. Their failure to participate becomes part of the results.
 3. Since this was a survey and not an official vote, it is just one piece of information among many towards making the best choice for the community.
 4. In response to the contention that the response rate was so low as to warrant a second survey, one homeowner asked if a pre-determined target for a minimum number of responses had been established. She suggested that if a low return rate was the true concern, then future sampling of opinions should identify a pre-determined target for the desired rate of response. If the target is not achieved a second sampling could be justified.

A motion was made “to table counting the results of the second survey”, but when asked to define “to table until what time?” the motion was restated: “to only consider the results from the first survey”.

Motion – Ted Boardman

Second – Anita Douglas

Passes: 3 -2

VII. Old Business: None

VIII. New Business:

- A. Management Company - Capital Realty, Inc. gave its 60-day notice on December 7, 2021, to be effective February 5, 2022. The 2021 Board started a search for a new management company during December. The newly elected board members participated in the search for the new company starting January 3, 2022.

There are currently three possibilities. Two companies have sent over proposals and a third company is working on one. Sandy thanked Joan for her hard work in interviewing the companies.

B. 2022 Annual Assessment Billing:

- I. With a new management company coming on board, there will not be an option for electronic payments unless the new company is hired before the billing is completed.
- II. Until which time a management company is identified, the Board is exploring the option of opening a P.O. Box.
- III. The Board agreed that the due date for the payment will be February 15th.
- IV. They Board is working on the letter to go out with the billing.

IX. Owner Comments: In response to a homeowner question, it was reiterated that given the vote, the results of the second pond survey would not be tabulated

X. Adjournment – a motion to adjourn was made at 7:14 p.m. by
Motion – Marc Wagner second-- by Anita Douglas. Passes.

Submitted by Sandy Martin, with input from other board members, creating revisions to the draft provided by Marc Wagner.

February 20, 2022