

Glastonbury Landowners Association, Inc.
Board of Directors - Meeting Agenda
May 11, 2022 – 7:00 pm

Emigrant Hall & Call-in Nos. 877-660-4969 or 406-272-4075
<https://meetings.dialpad.com/room/glastonburymt>

- 1. Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance, invocation and one minute of silence (7:00 p.m.)**
Meeting called to order at 7:05 pm.

PRESENT: John McAlister (President Pro Tem), Directors: Aija-Mara Accatino, Newman Brozovsky, Gerald Dubiel, Claudette Dirkers, Jerry Ladewig, Charlotte Mizzi, Andrea Sedlak, ABSENT: Timothy Brockett; *Landowners on Phone*: Cheyenne Bray, Joe Bezotsky, Jessica DeBruin, James Everett, Cristin Fowle, Doug Gill, Linda Kremer, John Lee, Matthew Olen, Alicia Roskind, Orion Skinner, Scott Stomierowski, Tyson Wright, [Other-406-270-6993]; *In-Person Attendees*: Charles Barker, Miriam Barker, John Carp, Dorothy Keeler, Leo Keeler, Neil Kremer, Jeffrey Ladewig, Martha McAlister, Debbie Newby, Valery O'Connell, [daughter] O'Connell, Clare Parker, Jim Sconyers, Mark Seaver, Linda Ulrich, Ron Wartman.

- 2. Announce meeting being recorded**

- 3. Opening Remarks – Set the Background for the Meeting – McAlister**

John McAlister thanked landowners and board members for coming to the meeting. He pointed out that the GLA Board is currently under court mandate to continue normal business while preparing to stage a special election for new directors, ombudsmen, and to determine the will of the landowners regarding the question of separating the GLA into GLA North and GLA South or to retaining the current structure. This election is to be conducted this summer, concluding on August 19th.

- 4. Visiting Landowner Input Period – (20 minutes, up to 3 minutes per speaker)**

Linda Ulrich: Should landowners communicate directly with Judge Swandal or send questions / comments to me? *Either works. Judge asked me to collect questions, but you can also communicate directly with him if you wish.*

Dorothy Keeler: Will questions / comments be private or broadcast openly? *It is up to Judge Swandal. I am not determining that. Thus far, the questions that I have seen are all quite similar.*

Linda Kremer (phone): Why is the board currently meeting when we are under the Judge's order and an election is coming up? *We are to continue to conduct business of the GLA and make decisions that are required to keep the community running. Judge Swandal, Ryan Jackson are aware that board meetings will continue.*

Clare Parker: Why is Director McAlister not sending landowner lists to Director Mizzi? *I maintain the list on a confidential basis and, if requests are accompanied by a legitimate reason, I will release it.*

Dorothy Keeler: Director Mizzi has repeatedly sent out mailings with misinformation and still claiming to be secretary despite the Judge Gilbert holding those claims in abeyance. A further comment was made concerning Director Mizzi filing the GLA Annual Report illegitimately.

Leo Keeler: Volunteered to work on the Project Review Committee if he can work with people other than Charlotte Mizzi and Gerald Dubiel. *This is on the agenda later.*

5. Officer and Committee Reports

5.1 Elections – McAlister for Swandal

5.1.1 Letter from Wm. Nels Swandal

The Letter from Judge Swandal outlining the election procedure was mailed and emailed on Tuesday, May 3rd. Up to 12 directors and 2 ombudsmen will be elected. There will also be the question of whether to separate the GLA into GLA North and GLA South or remain as it currently is structured, on the ballot. Judge Swandal has also mandated that a one-page description of the pros and cons or status quo or splitting the GLA will be included in the ballot in order to help landowners understand the implications. Two committees of the board (up to 3 members each) will supervise production of these documents. Director Mizzi disputed the legitimacy of the creation of the documents.

The dates of the nomination packet mailings and elections packet mailing were described.

5.1.2 Questions for Judge Swandal

Linda Ulrich: Will determination of the status of landowners being in good standing to stand for election or vote include not only financial obligations but also covenant violations? *Yes. Good standing is based on both having paid assessments and not having any covenant violations.*

Ron Wartman: How will people react to having to pay assessments by end of July rather than by October? *It was not a problem during the bylaw election and will be managed this time as well.*

Ron Wartman: Is Judge Swandal aware of the timing of elections and when ballots have to be received? *Yes. Procedures are being developed with Judge Swandal.*

Ron Wartman: Will the board determine the candidates or will Judge Swandal make that decision? *Judge Swandal is completely in control of this process. The board will not be involved.*

Questioner: Will this all be professionally managed? Will Judge Swandal make certain that the people managing the process are professional? *Yes. It is completely in his hands as mandated by Judge Gilbert.*

Ron Wartman: Is John McAlister the only one that Judge Swandal is communicating with? If not, how can there be a unified action on the elections? *That is not something that is known at this time.*

Leo Keeler: Leo expressed concern about other board members or landowners contacting Swandal and causing excessive billing. *Again, Judge Swandal will make the determination who he speaks with and will enforce that himself.*

Questioner: Can we get itemized bills from Swandal so we know who is responsible for each item on the bill? *Judge Swandal is to provide itemized invoices to be paid by the GLA.*

Jeff Ladewig: Will the position papers that are to be generated concerning the split of GLA be reviewed and evaluated by a neutral party for factual presentation? *Judge Swandal will review the documents.*

Linda Ulrich: Will Judge Swandal be “fact-checking” the documents that are to be included describing the pros and cons of separation? *Judge Swandal did not use the term “fact-checking.” He said he would be reviewing. How he does that is up to him.*

5.2 Project Review Committee (PRC)– Dubiel

5.2.1 Recommended for Approval

5.2.1.1 Stull (SG 52)

Guest residence combined with a garage, well, septic, and driveway.

McAlister: Motion to revoke approval (October 6, 2021) of former project plan for a residence and approve the accessory building, well, septic, and driveway without a \$250 fine originally proposed by Director Mizzi.

Seconded: Dubiel

Project approved: Unanimous (Accatino, Brozovsky, Dirkers, Dubiel, Ladewig, McAlister, Mizzi, Sedlak)

Director Dirkers asked who would fill out the Board Action Forms and send them to the board for review prior to sending to landowners. Director Mizzi said she would do it.

5.2.1.2 Keeler (SG 26-A1)

Well to be placed on Keeler property. Seismologist determining best site.

Mizzi: Motion to approve a well on Keeler parcel conditioned on the approval of the site by the county and state.

Seconded: McAlister

Project Approved: Unanimous (Accatino, Brozovsky, Dirkers, Dubiel, Ladewig, McAlister, Mizzi, Sedlak)

5.2.1.3 DeBruin & Lee (SG 22-D)

Application for a septic system based on creation of office/workspace above garage with kitchenette & bathroom.

Dubiel: Motion to approve the septic application.

Seconded: Mizzi

Project Approved: Unanimous (Accatino, Brozovsky, Dirkers, Dubiel, Ladewig, McAlister, Mizzi, Sedlak)

5.2.1.4 Lundberg (SG 84-C)

Not originally on the agenda. Forced by Director Mizzi sending out unapproved minutes of the PRC to landowners. Should be on legal committee agenda. Covenant violations: Storage container, new well put in without project application too close to road.

Lundberg is out of compliance and so cannot submit a belated application for a well. This must go to the legal committee for consideration.

Landowner Doug Gill (phone) indicated his disappointment that we were even considering this project.

Director Mizzi wanted to discuss this at the board rather than the legal committee.

The consensus of the board is to take this to the legal committee.

5.2.2 Conditional - Discussion

5.2.2.1 Curry (SG 79)

Conversion of pole barn to guest residence. All buildings are in compliance, but the prior owner never applied for project and paid fees. New owner had no way of knowing that prior owner did not pay fees. New owner has now applied properly and wants to build. All new construction proposed will be in compliance.

McAlister: Motion to approve the conversion of the barn to a guest residence based on Bylaw XI.B.

Seconded: Sedlak

Project Approved: Unanimous (Accatino, Brozovsky, Dirkers, Dubiel, Ladewig, McAlister, Mizzi, Sedlak)

5.2.3 Letters of Inquiry to Potential Violators

These projects or planned projects are problematic for one reason or another and all need some level of communication or other action.

- 5.2.3.1 Ranttalo is out of compliance. His case is on the legal committee agenda.
- 5.2.3.2 Barthlen (SG 32-A3)
Plans a manufactured house on a foundation. Minor subdivision covenants do not allow it. In discussion now to seek a solution.
- 5.2.3.3 Thompson, De La Parra, King (NG 8-A1)
Property recently bought by three individuals. Rumor exists that they plan to install multiple tiny homes to house employees who work at a camp in Gardiner. One tiny house has already been moved onto the property without project plan. One residence already exists on the property. They are out of compliance and must be contacted.
Action Item: Sedlak to do first draft. McAlister to write a letter.
- 5.2.3.4 Rendleman (NG 68)
Building a large residence. Proposed to build a canvas-sided yurt as a guesthouse. Board approved the residence, disapproved the yurt. The fees are mixed up between the residence and yurt. The builder (Radick) has been informed.
Action Item: Need to communicate with Rendleman to reach resolution.
- 5.2.3.5 Thorpe (NG 6-A)
Has an RV on the property in which someone is living. Needs to be addressed. Mr. Sconyers was at the meeting and is living in the RV. He is working on the Thorpe property and is only briefly living there until that project is completed.
- 5.2.3.6 O'Connell (NG 5-C)
Sconyers reported that he has a potential buyer for the log cabin and will move it off as soon as possible.
- 5.2.3.7 Zsilavetz (NG 6-B1)
Has two RVs on site and people are living in them. Need to contact Zsilavetz to determine status and why those RVs are there and when they will be moved.
Action Item: McAlister will write letter – Sedlak agreed to provide first draft based on templates that are already available.
- 5.2.4 Updates
 - 5.2.4.1 Grenier (NG 28-C)
The board had written to Mr. Grenier in the fall of 2021 informing him that his tiny home was not legal, had Covenant and sanitation violations per Covenant 3.05 and must be removed. He responded that it would be moved within 6 months. The tiny home has been sold and moved off the property.
 - 5.2.4.2 Draft Tiny Home Policy for comment & consideration
A landowner group drafted a document as a first attempt to define standards and procedures for tiny homes to be built in the

community. This draft policy was made available to the board for consideration. Landowners will be given an opportunity to comment and then the board will vote on acceptance of this procedure at a future meeting.

There was substantial unified discussion between Leo Keeler and Director Dirkers about the origin of the declaration that structures under 200 square feet did not require project review. This standard was initiated in the Project Review Committee. It put in place a change in the Covenants without landowner approval and has wide-ranging consequences. The statement has been removed from the website but there is still concern. It must be addressed.

5.2.5 Nominations for New PRC Members

John McAlister made a motion nominating Leo Keeler, Ron Wartman, and Director Dirkers to join the Project Review Committee over objections of Director Mizzi who claimed that President McAlister did not have the authority under the court order to do that.

Seconded: Sedlak

Vote: Yes: Dirkers, Ladewig, McAlister, Sedlak

No: Mizzi

Abstain: Accatino, Brozovsky, Dubiel

Discussion ensued about the impact of abstentions on the voting outcome. No consensus, but Director Brozovsky said in past practice, an abstention was a no. People who abstained said that they did so because they did not know if President Pro Tem John McAlister had the authority to nominate new members to any committee.

Action: McAlister to get clarification from Judge Swandal on the scope of his authority and send it to the board.

5.4 Treasurer's Reports – McAlister

5.4.1 March 31st and First Quarter Financials

Discussion and approval

Sedlak: Motion to approve the end of year 2021 and first three quarters of 2022.

Second: Dubiel

Motion passed: Unanimous (Accatino, Brozovsky, Dirkers, Dubiel, Ladewig, McAlister, Mizzi, Sedlak)

5.4.2 FY2022 Budget

Presentation

Discussion & approval

Treasurer John McAlister presented the official budget plan for FY2022.

Director Mizzi produced an alternative budget to the one produced by the Treasurer John McAlister and presented it.

McAlister: Motion to approve budget presented by the Treasurer.
Second: Sedlak
Vote: Yes: Accatino, Dirkers, Dubiel, Ladewig, McAlister, Sedlak
No: Mizzi
Abstain: Brozovsky

5.5 Roads Report – Dirkers

Director Dirkers described her work on the roads in the late summer and fall of 2021 in North and South. Very successful.

5.5.1 Road Survey & Report

This spring, Directors Dirkers and Ladewig surveyed the South roads on March 30. Directors Dirkers and Accatino surveyed the North roads on April 1. After that activity, Director Dirkers generated a report based on the notes from Directors Ladewig and Accatino and they collaborated on the final version. That report was recently presented to the board in written form.

5.5.2 Plans for Spring Grading & Guardrail/Post Repair

A month later, the process was repeated after the spring rains had started. Director Dirkers has been communicating with two bidding contractors on the state of the roads and their recommendations for the treatment. Director Dirkers has also prioritized cleaning the culverts and existing ditches, and the installation of new roadside ditches as needed to keep the water off the roads. Director Dirkers has ridden the roads with one new contractor who has not done the Glastonbury roads previously.

Director Dirkers pointed out the importance of repairing the guardrails and posts and the necessity of carefully planning and budgeting for these repairs, both for this year's immediate needs and into the future with a program of 5, 10, and 20 year plans.

Director Dirkers is anticipating bids from two contractors and is seeking bids on the repair of the guardrails and posts with those contractors and others.

Questioner: Will snow fence repair be prioritized? *Yes, in the fall.*

Questioner: Will maintenance of roads be done even if there is no mag chloride application? *Yes. Mag. chloride was applied just 6 months ago and both road contractors advise reapplying this fall.*

Mizzi: Put forward the idea of setting up a capital improvement account to use in adding guardrails and wants to get started this summer. Also wants to widen Upper Gemini and Caspari Way and add guardrails and posts. *Very hard to widen Gemini and very expensive. Perhaps in the far future.*

Keeler: Question about the mudhole on Aquila and the concern that the platted area of the road is not being fully maintained. *Yes. There was a misunderstanding of the platted road map and where the exact end of the platted area was on Aquila. It has been corrected now.*

McAlister: Motion to nominate Director Dirkers as the Chair of the Road Committee.

Second: Sedlak

Vote: Yes: Accatino, Dirkers, Dubiel, Ladewig, McAlister, Sedlak
Abstain: Brozovsky, Mizzi

- 8. Visiting Landowner Input Period** – (15 minutes, up to 3 minutes per speaker)
Valerie O’Connell made absurd slanderous comments about John McAlister. The meeting broke up in chaos.

- 9. Adjournment**
Meeting adjourned at 10:15

Finished Business – Past Meeting Minutes & Email Votes

The large volume of email votes and minutes of past meetings that have not been finalized by the board are under review and will be published separately as quickly as possible.

The Board approved these minutes at its meeting on June 28, 2022.