



**Glastonbury Landowners Association | Board of Directors
Meeting Agenda April 29, 2026**

Please note landowner comments will be invited and encouraged at the following times:

- A) After the intentional Moment of Silence – on non-agenda items only (1-3 minute limit per presiding officer pre-determined length to be announced at the beginning of the meeting)**
- B) After motions are made, seconded, and BOD discussion has concluded, but before a BOD vote is taken on Agenda items only (1-3 minute limit per presiding officer pre-determined length to be announced at the beginning of the meeting)**
- C) At the conclusion of the meeting before Adjournment (1-3 minute limit per presiding officer pre-determined length to be announced at the beginning of the meeting)**

1. Call to Order

2. Moment of Silence – With Intention

3. Landowner Comment – Non-Agenda Items

4. Approval of Minutes – March 2026 GLA Board Meeting minutes have been approved via email vote and are posted at <https://www.montanagla.org/board-minutes>

5. Officer Reports

- a. President – Zane Curry
 - i. Community meeting update
- b. Vice-President – Lance Rushmeyer
- c. Treasurer – Debbie Newby
 - i. **March 2026 financial report – BOD vote**
 - ii. Past due accounts of 1yr or greater
 - iii. PayPal account status
- d. Secretary – Alicia Roskind-Dearing

6. Ombudsmen Reports

- a. North Glastonbury – Vacant
- b. South Glastonbury – Miriam Barker

7. Committee Reports

- a. Finance Committee
 - i. Reserve Fund transfers pending Sunwest CD maturity
 - ii. Past due accounts – Discussion of lien status and actions taken
 - iii. **Formation of Collection Committee – BOD vote**
 - iv. Change on GLA statements prompting Members to consider signing up for emailed assessments

- b. Roads**
 - i. **Road maintenance contract High Country Excavation – BOD vote**
 - ii. Spring maintenance planning discussion
 - 1. Allocation of funds to NG spring maintenance – BOD vote**
 - 2. Allocation of funds to SG spring maintenance- BOD vote**
 - iii. Road sign update
- c. Governing Docs**
 - i. Update on 2026 Governing Docs revision process
- d. Election Committee**
 - i. No update as the committee did not meet in April
 - ii. Next planned meeting: 1H May with date TBD, monthly meetings to be scheduled through balance of 2026
- e. Project Review**
 - i. **Board vote on SG-84A - Kassing**
 - ii. **Board vote on NG-22B - Macchio**
 - iii. **Board vote on NG-57E1 – Newhouse**
 - iv. **Board vote on SG42A - Quesenberry**
 - v. **Board vote on SG 101 – Slavenas**
- f. Compliance**
 - i. No update as the committee did not meet in April as there were no new issues brought to the Compliance Committee or GLA Board’s attention

8. Fire safety update – Walter Wunsch / Byron Kassing / James Everett

9. Covenant 1.04 Request – SG 88A - Brockett

10. Final Landowner Comments

11. Adjournment

Upcoming Meetings:

April 7, 2026 – Road Committee - 6:00 P.M. MST

April 13, 2026 – Finance Committee – 6:00 P.M. MST

April 14, 2026 Governing Docs Committee – 6:00 P.M. MST

April 15, 2026 – Project Review Committee 6:00 P.M. MST

April 18, 2026 – Community Meeting - Emigrant Hall 10:30 A.M.

Please see GLA website at www.montanagla.org for meeting details and agendas. Note that meeting times and venues are subject to change, and as such the GLA website at www.montanagla.org will be the official record of where and when all meetings will be held.

Next GLA Board Meeting:

TBD – to be voted on during March Board Meeting

All GLA Board of Directors meetings will be conducted in accordance with the 05.18.2015 [Conduct of a Meeting Policy](#). This policy can be found on the GLA website (www.montanagla.org) under Governance > Policies > Conduct of Meeting

Glastonbury Landowners Association

Board of Directors Meeting

Wednesday – April 29, 2026 – 6:30 PM

[Join Via Zoom](#) or Dial In

Call In: +1 720 707 2699 Meeting ID: 879 1933 7183 Password: 2023

Call to Order (6:33pm)

1. Board Members Present- Alicia Roskind Dearing, Lance Rushmeyer, Steve Anderson, Debbie Newby, Zane Curry, Scott Stomioski, Chris Farrar, Walter Wunsch, James Timmer (left at 9:48pm), Jaylyn Jensen (left at 10:34pm)

Absent with Notice: Holly Gill, Tyson Wright

2. Landowners Present- Alyssa Allen, Ryan Kinsports, Byron Kassing, James & Leslie Everett, Chris Fowle, Hailey Hall, Jeff Nash, Jack Sutton, Miriam Barker, Guy Gravart, Craig Newhouse, Linda Kremer, Tom Spruance, Jewel Wiczorek, Robert Quesenberry

3. Landowner Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Jeff Nash shared that Lisa Bush (may be a different last name now) animals are running free. There was a foal found dead across from her land that they believe is hers. She has put up an electric fence. He explained that she threatened to burn property down and personal harm. The horses are being neglected. The property smells due to her animals running wild. Cris Fowle spoke about a lot of work being done by the Sheriff's office to mitigate this situation, but there is only so much they can do due to the MCA codes. They are limited by what they can handle. Horses continually are out. Landowners asking for assistance any way that the Board can. Zane recommended the landowners put in a formal complaint with Covenant violations, potentially a nuisance violation, via email to the Board so that the Compliance Committee can take this up and begin reviewing.

4. Officer Reports

a. President – Zane Curry

i. Community meeting update. Saturday, April 18th at 10am. There were about 30 or so attendees of landowners and Board members. The meeting went really well and he feels the format worked well for landowners to connect with the GLA Board. Issues were discussed that were important to landowners. Zane feels it is a better, more interactive format than the landowners simply listening to an in-person Board meeting. Zane plans to hold another one in June.

b. Vice-President – Lance Rushmeyer. No report.

c. Treasurer – Debbie Newby

i. March 2026 financial report – BOD vote. Net Income for the quarter ending March 31 was \$28,057 with Expenses of \$18,443 for the quarter. Cash operating funds of ~\$130,000 including Bank of the Rockies Savings, Checking and Sunwest Checking accounts. 2 Sunwest Certificate of Deposits (CDs) valued at \$60,639 will mature June 1st, at which time those funds may be added to the cash operating funds. 85-87% of budgeted Assessment funds have been collected through March. It was noted the Collections Jan-Mar 2026 Statement budgeted amount represents 93% of invoiced assessments. The GLA 2026 Budget expects Net Income at a 93% Collection Rate.

MOTION: Zane makes the motion to approve the 2026 March financials. Lance seconded.

All in Favor. Motion Carries.

ii. Past due accounts of 1yr or greater. One landowner in the Customer Balance Summary statement from March has since become current. Now we have 20 landowners with past due amounts of 1 year or greater, representing less than 5% of the parcels.

iii. PayPal account status. PayPal is only running right now on the old GLA website. There is ~\$1,700 in this account, and now we are having issues transferring funds out of the PayPal account. Elena from ATS used to be able to make transfers out, but it has stopped working recently. We are not sure why this has occurred. Zane explains that because we were trying to add PayPal to our new website, Squarespace, that it got locked. He is in process of unlocking the account and transferring ownership from Mark Seaverto himself.

d. Secretary – Alicia Roskind-Dearing

Alicia has had a lot going on in her personal life, so the minutes took longer than she would have liked for March to be approved. The March 24, 2026 BOD Meeting Minutes are approved and available on the GLA website. She aims to have a quicker turnaround in the future.

6. Ombudsmen Reports

a. North Glastonbury – Vacant

b. South Glastonbury – Miriam Barker had no report.

7. Committee Reports

a. Finance Committee

i. Reserve Fund transfers pending Sunwest CD maturity - The Finance Committee will consider transfers to the Reserve Funds following Sunwest CDs maturing in June and following Spring Road Maintenance.

ii. Past due accounts – Discussion of lien status and actions taken. A lot of activity. Debbie created a lien spread sheet that has been very helpful. Sent out four 10-day legal action warnings and two lien warnings. One of those accounts has paid in full. Two liens have been released. One payment plan was put in place in March. Two additional payment plans are in discussion.

iii. Formation of Collection Committee – Alicia Dearing and Chris Farrar have volunteered to be on a Collections Committee. Debbie explains that the committee's process will reach out to landowners that are less than a year delinquent to see if they would consider a payment plan and make sure that they have received their assessment statements. She is concerned there are times when the landowner may not receive their USPS mailed statements showing they were delinquent. For committee members that are in town, she could use help going to the County Clerk and Records office. There would be no open meetings due to the nature of the confidential materials being reviewed.

MOTION: Lance makes the motion to approve the Collection Committee formation and members. Debbie seconded.

Discussion: Board Members and Landowners wondering if a committee being formed is necessary and could it cause more issues being a formal committee, given that no information can be publicly shared with landowners. Leslie suggests that it rather be a working group under the Finance Committee. Debbie thinks there is some benefit in having it approved by the Board so that the Board and landowners know who has access to sensitive information. Alyssa explains that committees are required to take minutes and have some standards so having a committee, so it could cause issues because it's closed and there are no minutes, ultimately creating more work and potential risk. Alicia explains that we are already doing the work, if it is going to be a committee she does not want to participate.

Motion rescinded.

iv. Change on GLA statements using a direct quote from Covenants 11.06. The GLA Assessment statements “call out” box near the bottom of the statement changed this line *from*: “Covenant 11.06 Penalties and interest begin 30 days after each due date for unpaid assessments” *to*: Covenant 11.06 “...if the assessment remains unpaid for 30 days after such due date, a 5% penalty will accrue on the amount of the payment due and the assessment shall thereafter bear interest from the due date at a rate of 1.5% per month, compounded monthly.”

b. Roads

i. Road maintenance contract High Country Excavation – BOD vote. The Road Committee (RC) voted and recommended a 5-year contract with High Country Excavation (HCE). A road maintenance company owned by a SG landowner, Randy Traucht. Randy has provided road services for the GLA in the past and presently. The contract includes Spring and Fall maintenance, as well as snow removal, plowing and grading for SG. HCE will do the maintenance for North, but a different contractor will be used for North snow removal. Walter is abstaining because Walter and Regina have offered a zero-cost loan to Randy Traucht and HCE so he can purchase a grader and a water truck. Mag Chloride is not included in the contract. The GLA can have the Mag Chloride be a pass through cost or the GLA can do it on their own as long as they provide notice to HCE. There is a bi-lateral contractual out for both parties within 12 months of the beginning of the contract with no costs. Beyond that 12-month “trial period” the contract can only be broken due to non-performance. There is an escalation clause, should there be a big jump in diesel prices that the contract would adjust for drastic rises in diesel prices. Zane explains that this structure helps lock in a contractor so that the GLA does not have to continually review new contractors and contracts every year, and the contractor lives in the neighborhood with equipment on site so Randy is close and able to do the work in a timely manner. There is a clear benefit to having one provider that the GLA trusts and knows the GLA roads well. In the future when the contract is in full effect, Randy will honor the GLA’s rate for the individual landowners personal driveway work, etc.; another benefit of this contract.

MOTION: Lance makes the motion to accept the RC’s recommendation of a 5-year contract with High Country Excavation (Randy Traucht). Jaylyn seconded.

Discussion: Alyssa Allen said that she has had Randy do work for her, and she has known him for years and he is really easy and great to work with. She thinks it’s a great idea. Linda Kremer explains that Randy has done work for them for years, and that he is wonderful. He is always there when he says he will be and he’s a hard worker. She thinks it is great that this is being proposed.

In Favor: Alicia Roskind Dearing, Lance Rushmeyer, Steve Anderson, Debbie Newby, Zane Curry, Scott Stomieroski, Chris Farrar, Jaylyn Jensen, James Timmer

Abstain: Walter Wunsch

Motion Carries.

ii. Spring maintenance planning discussion The RC ran out of time to fully discuss the Spring maintenance, so the Board has two options: 1) Hash it out in this meeting and vote without approval from RC, or 2) Return to the RC for review and approval at their next meeting in May, and the Board will vote by email. The Road Maintenance is very time sensitive, so if the Board does not vote tonight then the vote must be over email. Most Directors wanted it to be reviewed by the RC first and do an email vote. Item tabled.

iii. Road sign update. tabled

c. Governing Docs

i. Update on 2026 Governing Docs revision process. Alicia explains that Gov Docs has met twice in April to review proposed Gov Docs revisions. They will meet once more to finalize the proposed revisions and vote to approve the changes. The committee will then submit them to the Board via email for review and comment. The committee will meet once more before the May BOD meeting to incorporate Director edits, and then send them back to the Board for review and approval for legal review at the May BOD meeting. Alicia explained the whole timeline that would be required to pass the Bylaw revisions including legal review, landowner comment, additional legal review from any changes due to landowner comment, Board vote to send to landowners for a vote. Zane suggested having a cover sheet sent with the revisions for Directors so they understand the timeline when they begin reviewing the revisions.

d. Election Committee

i. No update as the committee did not meet in April

ii. Next planned meeting: 1H May with date TBD, monthly meetings to be scheduled through balance of 2026

e. Project Review

i. Board vote on SG-84A Kassing. Byron Kassing applied for a new well for a new home (approved by the Board last year). Construction of the home is already in progress. The current well is only 3 gallons per minute, so they would like to keep the existing well for watering their garden. James Everett did a site inspection and the proposed new well meets the setbacks.

MOTION: Alicia makes the motion to approve the well application for SG-84A Kassing. Lance seconded.

Discussion: Some other elements of the project have already been approved by the Board. This is only for the new well.

In Favor: Alicia Roskind Dearing, Lance Rushmeyer, Steve Anderson, Debbie Newby, Scott Stomieroski, Chris Farrar, Jaylyn Jensen, Walter Wunsch, James Timmer

Abstain: Zane Curry

ii. Board vote on NG-22B - Macchio. Macchio is applying for a 288 square foot shed / garage. There was one concern around the setback, which has been addressed. There was a little difference between the written square footage and what was drawn on the plans. It is correct as far as the application is concerned. It was a typo. Either one would have met the standard, but PRC just wanted to confirm the number was accurate.

MOTION: Lance makes the motion to approve NG-22B Macchio plans for a shed / garage.

All in Favor. Motion Carries.

iii. Board vote on NG-57E1 Newhouse. The project is a relocation of a cabin to that lot that will connect into one of the existing shelters that is there. It's all staked out, including the leach field. It meets all the PRC standards and setbacks. Ryan verified that there would be no viewshed issues and that it would not exceed the 30 foot height limitation; some earth work is being done to make sure it complies. It was a unanimous yes vote from PRC for approval. Craig Newhouse will notify the GLA and the landowners when the cabin is being moved because it will be a big effort and may require temporary road closure.

MOTION: Alicia makes the motion to approve project application for NG-75E1 Newhouse to move an existing cabin to the property and connect onto the current underground shelter, with the condition that

Craig Newhouse will notify and work with the GLA and Road committee to ensure affected landowners will be aware of the road closure. Lance seconded.

All in Favor. Motion Carries

iv. Board vote on SG42A - Quesenberry. A well had begun without an application. They have now paid the late fee and paid all their project fees and assessment dues, with a well application into the PRC. Robert will be providing a plat map asap. Robert has tried to get ahold of Park County sanitarium; they didn't seem to know what he was talking about. There is no permit for a well. He spoke to the DEQ but this was before they decided to drill a well. They had to do this last minute because their current well serving the home is going dry. They would still like to keep it active for garden irrigation or back up well. The original well is 280 feet.. Robert is a plumber and knows the proper procedure to get a well approved with Park County and DEQ. The plat map has not been reviewed by the whole Board. Robert has measured the new well to be 45 yards from the septic/drain field. Linda Kremer asked about the County minimum required distance between well and drainfield - 100'. Ryan Kinports will be going on site to check setbacks. The PRC has not voted on this yet due to time constraints needed to get it approved. Robert paid the late fee and project application fee within hours of being notified and was very amicable and pleasant to work with in this process of resolving the application. This is a necessary action and timely because his well is going dry, so it would be ideal that it is approved with conditions so he can continue the work on the well.

MOTION: Alicia makes the motion to approve SG42A Quesenberry well application with the condition that PRC does a site inspection and verifies the setbacks and PRC standards and the plat map is provided to the Board for review.

All in Favor. Motion Carries.

v. Board vote on SG 101 – Slavenas. The request is the ability to subdivide the parcel below the 10 acreage minimum allowed in this area of High South. It is a Tenancy in Common ownership. The PRC has not reviewed this application at this time. Ryan is not seeking a vote tonight by the Board, but he would like the Board to discuss it tonight.

MOTION: Walter moves to approve SG 101 Slavenas variance application. Lance seconded.

Amendment: On condition that the GLA follow-up with Rasa with what the court is requiring the GLA to provide. Lance seconded.

Discussion: James Everett explains that there is an issue with this application because it is requesting a variance. Walter believes it's cut and dry. There is a timeliness issue due to the health of one of the people involved. Debbie explains that this is an application for a variance in the absence of a subdivision request. Debbie believes it should also have a subdivision application to apply the variance to. She explains that there is an active court order to partition and that the GLA should step back until the courts decide on this case. Zane explains that if the court order accepts the partition, then there would be no reason for a subdivision request. It would be and / or not both. Debbie believes in the event of a court order neither the variance nor subdivision requests would be necessary; the GLA would follow the court order as a higher authority. Other Directors feel it is complex and should go back to the PRC.

Regina explains that if the Board now wants to treat this like a legal land tenancy, then the Board has no right to give both tenants a separate vote and assessment. That they should not have been assessed like this if they were not separate lots. Given that both have been assessed this whole time, it should be considered a subdivision. Debbie explains the billing of each Tenancy in Common separately is clearly outlined in the Covenants 11.03A. The Covenants specifies that landowners with Tenancy in Commons will each receive a land assessment separately; it does not make it a subdivision. This is to cover the cases where people were trying to get around the subdivision

requirements by using the Tenancy in Common rather than have to go through the subdivision process. So this is addressed in the Covenants, and the Board would not be responsible for refunding past assessments collected.

Scott Stomierowski asks Regina if there are any legal documents outlining that Tenancy in Common should be treated like a subdivision. Regina explains that there are no legal documents showing this, but when the Covenants were being created it was explained that legal tenancies were grandfathered in as subdivisions.

Nancy (power of attorney of the landowner) is seeking variance for a subdivision of this parcel to cover the care of her aunt (landowner) who is unable to do so due to her health. The landowner requesting the variance says in a written letter that the court is awaiting a letter from the GLA saying that the GLA has granted the variance, but it does not appear in the court order that the court is requesting this. Zane suggests that this may require legal counsel. Debbie explains that the GLA must follow what the court orders, so the GLA cannot, at this time, decide because the court has not made a final decision yet; it is pending a survey. If the court grants their partition, then the GLA will have to abide by that.

Zane asks if the PRC is willing to consider this case in advance of their planned monthly meeting to keep this moving in a swift manner. Zane discusses reaching out to their legal council to see where the court order is in the process. Leslie Everett recommends that the Board's council is in place to protect the Board and that they can call GLA legal counsel to discuss this matter. To protect the Board, it should be counsel to counsel so that our counsel can advise on this matter due to how complex this matter seems to be. Leslie continues to explain that the deed specifically says that this Tenancy in Common is required to follow the Covenants, it appears to her to be cut and dry, but because there are such strong differing opinions that it would be prudent for the Board to seek legal counsel.

Zane agrees that the only airtight path for the GLA is to engage the GLA counsel to ensure the path forward is correct. Zane explains that if the GLA granted the variance there is concern that it would continue to set the precedent for approval of Tenancy In Commons. In reality the tangible effect of it is nothing because these homes are already there and have been for a long time.

Alyssa has worked with the GLA since 2005, when it became the GLA in 1997, prior to that many church members went in together on parcels of land. They couldn't really subdivide because it wasn't really real estate because of the 55-year leases. Then when the GLA was formed, some people subdivided, but others stayed as Tenancy in Common. What Alyssa was taught as a new Board member back in the day (2005), that the GLA always honored the Tenancy in Common percentages as subdivisions. That it was pretty much a done deal, that those are established percentages that the GLA has to honor because it was already subdivided through Tenancy in Common. That was the general precedent in the past. Regina explains that this is always how it's been handled in the past. To change now would be completely contradictory to the past precedent.

Leslie is confused on how this variance would be granted; it is clearly outlined in our governing documents. Tenancy in Common is a clear and common type of legal ownership. It in no way grants subdivision. It is shared ownership of a common property. The Covenants clearly outlines Tenancy in common. The deed clearly states that the parcels must uphold the Covenants. The landowners signed these deeds. Voting and approving a variance would directly contradict the Covenants, which is the Board's fiduciary responsibility to uphold. Regina explains that the original Covenants that are on their deed did not have a lot size limit. She believes that the Covenants referenced on the deed are not the ones that were created in 1997. The deed says 1999, and the tenants all signed that deed.

Walter rescinded the motion.

MOTION: Zane will ask Rasa what information she has been requested by the court in regards to what the GLA needs to provide with her case and report back to the Board.
All in Favor. Motion Carries.

f. Compliance

i. No update as the committee did not meet in April as there were no new issues brought to the Compliance Committee or GLA Board's attention

8. Fire safety update – Walter Wunsch / Byron Kassing / James Everett

i. Walter, Byron and James have been boots on the ground and are learning more with the help of Lance. James and Byron met with the assistant fire chief and a few fire fighters. They started in NG in Golden Age Village. There is a 100 gallon tank and fire hydrants at GAV. The recommendations that the chief had is two fold: 1) Installing a cistern, preferably as far away from GAV as possible, to extend the range of area. The suggestion was around Capricorn and Aquarius. A landowner would have to volunteer to have these cisterns installed on their property. There would need to be a cistern tank. Lance offered his property for a cistern which is very close to Capricorn and Aquarius. Byron contacted Twisted Pine who has two used tanks that he has not seen yet, but that is one option. The fire department would be responsible for keeping it full. 2) Find out who is responsible for maintaining the hydrants. Does anybody maintain the fire hydrants? Does anybody check the flows, etc? The chief said in the past that when they have gone to test that there has been some pushback. They really need to find out who is responsible to move forward. Walter says it's the responsibility of the GAV and that Mitch Stukaloff at the GAV needs to be contacted.

ii. Then they went to SG. There is a cistern on Arcturus Dr. between Dry Creek and Leo. It's a 10,000 gallon tank. There is a lock on it so they have no idea if it has water. It's a fairly new looking lock. If they can get into it, then the fire department will check and fill it. Walter explains that the Yellowstone Ballot Company was the developer for those properties and may have the key to the lock. YBS has given permission to use the tanks. They can be called to ask to use it. Byron said they can also cut the lock off; it shouldn't be locked. It appears to be on their property, so it really shouldn't be cut but it's a registered Fire Department site so legally they can cut it. The next site is the pond at the end of Virgo. It's really not a pond right now; it would require a liner to be able to hold water. They looked at the site at Spec Tech. It's a 10,000 gallon tank that is completely full. They would like to do one more pond as far away from Spec Tech off Hercules, and they recommend putting a hydrant on it so it's more accessible.

iii. In general the accessibility of the fire trucks, the 3,000 gallon tanker cannot go off road, and they want to make sure they can have access to all these fire sites so they must be able to access it via the roads.

iiii. There may be a grant available through the Department of Natural Resource Conservation (DNRC) for a pond or a cistern. The fire chief said he was going to look into it. James explains that there may be some other grant funding available.

iiii. Byron recommends the most pressing things are to cut the lock of the locked tank in South and look into putting in a cistern on NG. Lance says that he has no problem donating his land for a cistern and he is near Aquarius and Capricorn. Contact for Rakela, Yellowstone Ballot Company 406-222-0430. Lind Kremer explains that there is a pond in South that once was for a fire site, but a landowner has diverted the water away from the pond and to his property to provide water for his animals. There would need to be some ditches dug, but it is a good spring that should be restored. Jewel said that she has a neighbor that may have a 10,000 tank, that may be willing to work with the community to use that as a fire site. Claire Anderson's property. Linda explains that it used to be a requirement with subdivisions to provide a fire site; there may be more fire sites that we are not aware of.

NEXT STEPS: Alicia will send out an EBlast seeing if there are landowners with cisterns already willing to volunteer for fire sites.

9. Covenant 1.04 Request – SG 88A - Brockett

i. Tim Brockett at SG 88A has sent a request to the Board to consider the removal of this parcel from the GLA, per Covenant 1.04. On the request he clarifies he wants to create a separate HOA for high South to better meet the needs of high South. Zane explains we can vote on this as is or we can consider conditions. Lance likes the idea with BIG conditions. Zane suggests inquiring if there are any other landowners if there are any other high South landowners that are interested in this. Two high South landowners are on the call that have not been contacted by Tim about a separate HOA and have no interest. Alicia asks that it be discussed in Closed Session before a vote is taken.

MOTION: Alicia makes the motion to move this to Closed Session for further review with the condition that the final vote will be held in a public meeting.

All in Favor: Alicia Roskind Dearing, Lance Rushmeyer, Steve Anderson, Debbie Newby, Zane Curry, Scott Stomierowski, Chris Farrar, Walter Wunsch, Jaylyn Jensen

Absent: James Timmer absent for vote due to leaving meeting early

10. Final Landowner Comments. Landowners thank the Board for a healthy transparent debate and allowing them opportunity to comment during the meeting.

Lance makes the motion to adjourn to adjourn at 10:43 pm. Zane seconded.

Email Votes March 24 - April 29, 2026

Motion: Motion to approve March 24, 2026 BOD Meeting Minutes & Email Votes

Date(s): May 1, 2026 - May 4, 2026

Motion Made By: Alicia Roskind Dearing

Motion Seconded By: Zane Curry

Specific Actions Taken:

Alicia will create a new Ooma digital phone service account and create a new number for the GLA.

Discussion:

Action Director Count: 12

In Favor: Zane Curry, James Timmer, Alicia Dearing, Lance Rushmeyer, Steve Anderson, Scott Stomierowski, Christine Farrar, Debbie Newby, Walter Wunsch, Jaylyn Jensen

Not In Favor:

Abstain:

No Response: Holly Gill, Tyson Wright

Motion Count: 10-0-0-2 (In favor / Not in Favor / Abstain / No Response)

Motion Vote: Motion Passes.

Email voting is permitted via the Bylaws under Article VI. Section J.

J. Action Without a Meeting. Any action required or permitted to be taken by the Board of Directors may be taken without a meeting if all members of the Board are contacted and a two-thirds majority of the Board members shall individually or collectively affirmatively consent in writing to the proposed action. Such written consent or consents shall include electronic communications and shall be filed with the Minutes of the proceedings of the Board. Such action by written consent shall have the same force and effect as a majority vote of the Directors. Any certificates or any other document filed by the officers under any provision of law which relates to action so taken shall state that the action was taken by two-thirds majority written consent of the Board without a meeting and that the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws of this Association authorize the Directors to so act, and such statement shall be prima facie evidence of such authority.