

Georgetown East Association, Inc.

June 8th, 2021 Meeting

Board Members: Alison Thompson, Sheila Goodwin, Tom Geraci, and Jean-Paul Antona were present via webinar and Sam Gray and Gerard Bribiescas were present at the Ameri-Tech office conference room.

Ameri-Tech Community Management Present: Robert Kelly, LCAM

Gerard Bribiescas called the Special Meeting to order at 6:30 pm: A full quorum established with Alison, Tom, Sheila, and JP on the webinar and Sam and Gerard at the Ameri-Tech office conference room. Proof of Notice was postmarked June 6th, 2021 in accordance with Association ByLaws.

Consent Agenda Approval:Sam motioned to approve the consent agenda. Alison second. All in favor.

1. April 2021 Minutes
2. May 2021 Special Membership Meeting Minutes
3. Officer, Board & Committee Reports, President's Report
4. April/May 2021 Manager's Report
5. Ratify the Landscape contract with Mu-Grow Brothers, Inc
6. Ratify the Stormwater Pipe Inspection contract with Pipe Restoration Solutions, Inc

Follow-up Business

East Boundary Ditch:

1. Tom: Spoke with Chris from McKinley engineering. He will come up with two approaches to the ditch. One will be minimal spend by only looking at obstruction and correcting the flow. Another approach will be to straighten up some of the issues with the drainage and propose that we enclose it and cover it so that issues go away; piping it would alleviate any issues and could raise the property value. We will have those proposals by next week.
2. Gerard: Our documents state that we cannot spend money on personal property lots; just so that it is in consideration of these proposals.
3. Gerard: My president's report includes the number filed with SWFWMD..

Governing Documents Task Force:

1. Mary: We are at a point where I need direction from the BOD. The task force was chartered to re-write the documents and assist you in having the documents approved by 75% of the members. For all intents and purposes the Articles of Incorporation and ByLaws is what you saw at the workshop. We are shifting gears to the heavy work in the covenants and restrictions. One of the things we learned as we have been working is that there are numerous varying

expectations for the purpose of this work. I'm really here to clarify the purpose of this task force. We need very clear direction for the final outcome of this work. One of the guiding principles has been that we will listen. As we listened it's been clear that the homeowner's expectations of the outcome has nothing to do with the governing documents. Has to do with city codes: noise and pet restrictions. We have to reinforce this idea that we want our documents to reflect guidelines that are above city and county codes. So as we look at CCRs, it will be much more listening and timely and even more pushing back. I've laid out multiple approaches in the attached document. Approach #1 is the most basic: cleanup approach. If you add to approach #1, then approach #2 is removing references to the developer and addressing technology and contemporary grammar - this is also a simple approach and could likely get 75%. Approach #3 is where we are right now because we've already started looking at ByLaws. It represents the simple approach of #1 and #2 but it also includes the CCR. Attorney Steve has requested that we don't change the covenant's and conditions; he will do that. We should focus on the ByLaws. We have surveyed the community: Two year staggered terms (94% approval); Term limits (53% approval); Board member recall provision (71%); Fiscal audit every five years (71% strongly agree/agree) 24% somewhat agree; Year-round nominating committee (82% strongly agree/agree) 18% somewhat agree. I'm comfortable with approach #3. Approach #5 includes the expectation from some members that we will address the walls and fences. Approach #4 includes use of lot restrictions to clarify the Board's authority in its oversight role, etc. Looking at historical documents, we have 32 resolutions that never made it into the governing documents because the BOD at the time weren't sure they were allowed to. So this exercise represents a catch-up.

2. Alison: As I was looking at this, I felt like #2 was originally what I had in my mind as what we would accomplish. As we've gotten more involved in the walls and fences in the past few months, then #4 starts to sound like what makes more sense to me.
3. Tom: I agree with Alison. I was leaning towards #2 but #4 has attracted my attention.
4. Sheila: #2 was also my original but if we go to #4 would that include walls and fences?
5. Mary: No. But it depends on what you do separately with the Walls and Fences: if you get a new amendment, that will be part of the new document. But we run the risk of getting something approved that is voted down in these document changes.
6. Sheila: I agree with #4 with the idea that the Walls and Fences would be separate, if we get that far.
7. Mary: What would we include in additional usage restrictions?
8. Bob: Pressure washing - we've had an issue with one resident that there is not enough clarity in his opinion that roof cleaning is in our authority. Should we go after someone painting their house due to stucco aging?
9. Mary: Steve said that our CCR governing documents are set parameters and the Rules and Regulations define those parameters. By a majority of the Board, you can pass a Rule and Regulation. Board's have been very timid in doing that, or when it has been done, another Board comes along and changes it. We don't want to do anything too tight.
10. JP: My preference is to only do #2, maybe I could be persuaded to do #3. Reason is that if we go to 4 and 5 we may never finish in the lifetime of this current Board and all the work will be lost. We could get bogged down in details and never fully agree on 4 or 5. The next Board could

de-prioritize this and sideline it. So I would like to limit the scope to exactly what we can get completed under the current BOD.

11. Mary: If I have 90+% approval for items in #3, would you go that far?
12. JP: Yes
13. Gerard: We could do a survey of those that have email and ask them of everything in #3 and determine if we have close to 75%. Optional to participate.
14. Sheila: Sounds logical.
15. Mary: What I am hearing is go approach #2 and then be able to substantiate what we can get in #3 and go for that. If we don't get the survey results then we will default to #2.
16. Sheila: Yes.
17. Roth: We talked about this process limiting the number of rentals in the neighborhood. Where does that fit in approach #1-5.
18. Mary: Making that kind of amendment would be something the Board would approve. It would not be part of the document changes we are making.
19. Gerard: In regards to rentals, I'm very much for having guidelines for rentals. Let the homeowners become responsible and knock on doors that they want rental restrictions. Don't let members make us feel we are responsible for doing that. We have an association to run. We want the documents cleaned-up. I am in favor of 1 and 2, but definitely not #5. People are saying that we are using the process of the governing documents to push through an agenda. We are not trying to do that. We have the attrition of many years of Board's that never made rules and regulations and the walls and fences issues. I would like to accomplish at least 1 and 2.
20. Mary: When we first allocated funding for this project, we allocated \$5k. We know that is not a lot. Steve will ask a paralegal to pull a boilerplate. We are basically buying for \$5k boilerplate language that will legally modernize our documents.

Dartmouth Pond Aerator Update:

1. Gerard: The damaged aerator in Dartmouth/Westborough was replaced and the nozzle similar to the original was replaces. Solitude came through to make things right at no cost to us. So we don't need a new aerator at this time for that pond.

Stormwater System Update/Discussion:

1. Gerard: We have to decide how we want to move forward. Item #8 addresses the robot camera. PRS is in the process of doing that today and tomorrow. But since the water has risen, they cannot do the work right now.
2. Bob: I met the tech out there today. They knew the water had increased considerably. I got a call saying they could do it at the current water level but it would need a full day of pumping to do the camera. But they are two weeks out minimum. The tech while he was out there, he opened all the manhole covers and did a visual. Everything that he could visually see looks good. Everything seems to be flowing well. I asked him about the little erosion in Roxbury pond. The hole that looks like an animal hole, but it's actually a join where a pipe comes out. There is a gap. We should take the top off, put some fabric paper over it, and put the soil back on. That will last quite a few years or it will probably get bigger.

3. Tom: It's a shame we couldn't get the camera system in during the drought. But it's important to get it done, especially since we are seeing the hole. It's gotta be taken care of. If you are looking for a vote, I'm for doing it.
4. Gerard: Anyone have reservations moving forward with PRS? (No response).
5. Gerard: I motion that we continue to use PRS for pipe camera work. Tom seconds. All in favor.
6. Bob: I will email them and as soon as I get their schedule I'll let you know.
7. Gerard: How do we move forward on the stormwater drainage after the special meetings? Karen asked for a task force...? Can we handle this as a Board?
8. Sheila: How do we form a task force?
9. Gerard: We go to the larger community and utilize our communications to gather people who are interested. We would form a charter of what we expect them to do.
10. JP: We are going to have to decide a financial plan. Where is the money coming from for all these surveys and engineering work? Reserve? Operating? A task force can't decide that. Board needs to make those decisions.
11. Gerard: So it's something we are going to have to save for the Workshop.
12. Tom: I agree.
13. Alison: I agree.
14. Sheila: I agree.

New Business

Non-Compliance Site Inspections & Compliance Letters:

1. Gerard: Do we ask them to remove the satellite dish or leave it where it is?
2. Sam: The documents say you are not supposed to see it from the street. So it has to be removed.
3. Sheila: Because if we have an exception, it will be all over the neighborhood. I agree with Sam.
4. JP: I agree
5. Alison: I agree
6. Tom: I agree
7. Gerard: So it needs to be moved so it cannot be seen.
8. Gerard: We need to move forward with the compliance letters and fining process.
9. Tom: Twice a year may not be enough but monthly would be too often. But quarterly walk-throughs. We should give people a heads-up so it's transparent and not a "gotcha". We don't want to nitpick residents. Once in a while there are blaring issues out there that we need to address. I propose a quarterly walk-through.
10. Alison: I agree quarterly is staying on top of it but not a nitpick and announcing it so it's transparent.
11. Sam: I think quarterly is enough time. Also, for announcements, we should indicate what we are looking for: cracked foundations, dirty roofs, etc; so people can go ahead and address it.
12. Gerard: I'm all for quarterly because it takes about 3 months for the process to play out. Even twice a year can be a long process. I am so ready for the fining process to begin because we are spending too much money on arbitration and legal proceedings. Even if we get reimbursed, why do we have to go 1.5 years or 4-6 months to address these things? Since 2017, the state has

given us permission to use a fining process. We are not trying to bully anyone. We are trying to work with them to make them responsible homeowners.

13. DECISION: Compliance inspections will be done quarterly.
14. Gerard: OK, so let's get something done in June 2021, then quarterly.
15. Gerard: JP please work with me in drafting a letter in regards to the "voting member" and we will present that in the July workshop.

Moving General Questions & Comments from Residents to beginning of meeting

1. Gerard: for me it's a moot point because they can always email the BOD prior to the meeting. City of Safety Harbor does it at the beginning of the meeting?
2. Roth: We used to allow people to ask questions during the meeting. It got disruptive. So we started a sign-up sheet with the question they wanted to ask. And then ask the questions at the end. At the beginning of the meeting, you don't know what questions are going to come out of the meeting. I personally like having limited discussion during the meeting.
3. Gerard: When we tried to have limited discussion during the meeting, it did not go well.
4. Bob: I've never had open discussion early in a meeting. Usually it's at the end. You only have to give them 3 minutes.
5. Alison: I'd like to think that there could be some value in having people waiting until the end of the meeting so people can hear the discussion and add to what they learned.
6. Mary: Nothing is ever decided without prior discussion. Making sure any topic spans at least two months, then it doesn't matter whether the discussion happens at the beginning or the end. Let them express those comments at the end of the prior meeting. The heavy topics that are going to become contentious last several months. The value is getting the input before the vote, which doesn't have to be at the beginning of the meeting.
7. Gerard: Unless there is objection, we will continue to have questions / discussion at the end of the meeting.
8. Gerard: I motion to add a new item on the agenda for a Compliance Issue. Sam seconded. All in favor.

Compliance Issue:

1. Sam: 1105 Kensington had an architecture request to redo the driveway. The contractor was not licensed. The city requested a permit retroactively. The city says the driveway is not ADA compliant. The City asked her to have the HOA approve it. I find the driveway functional and looks good.
2. Sheila: There was a problem with the paver. The City is asking us to OK this? Is there any downside to this legally long-term? Why is the City passing the buck to us?
3. Gerard: Even with the walls, for instance, the City comes to the HOA for us to address it. And then we go to the homeowner. That's the same thing with 516 GTP. But these are fair questions. Sam and I need to do some more research.
4. Bob: I also was wondering if there is legal exposure here for the HOA. Shame on the homeowner because ultimately the permit falls on the homeowner. ADA doesn't apply because that's for public places. This is private property and city code.

General Comments and Questions: Kevin McCann & Steve Jolliffe, Lois Miller, Roth Block, Mary Gamble, Ruth Fruge', and Janice Brown.

1. Ruth: Instead of sending a million letters, you can start fining people? I hadn't seen a notice but that's great. I'm so glad you found that.
2. Gerard: We will send a notice to start that process.
3. Bob: A different HOA has this... statute actually reads that if a fine accumulates to \$1000, then it goes to a lien against the property and we can foreclose their house. We need to get clarification on this from Attorney Steve..
4. Gerard: We need to make sure that information is included in the notice letter.
5. Joe Mallozzi: In regards to voting, household vote. Currently, in the documents it's well written. It provides for a proxy for anyone in that household to vote. Same things as the NY stock exchange. It's a joint vote. For our HOA, we have a provision for the proxy. By designating someone in a household to vote, and perhaps someone didn't hear about it, they can't vote; that's an injustice. Regarding the ditch behind my house works really well. What is the problem that we are considering enclosing it.
6. Ruth: I second that.
7. Steve: I've mentioned this before... recently we have had a number of homes sold. New people moving into Georgetown. Can you confirm that new people are receiving documents with our regulations. We've been here 12 months and we've been hearing this document will happen. When is it going to happen?
8. Gerard: We are currently working on the Governing Documents. It takes time. Meanwhile, we have the existing documents on the web site for people to download. Those documents are not easy to read but they provide the information.

Motion to Adjourn: 8:15 pm Sam motioned to adjourn. Seconded by Tom. All in favor.