

Special Board Meeting

February 5, 2010

Attendees: Paul Sinclair, John Crawford, Mary Mullins, Eileen McManus, Ken Spare, Dave Mullins

Purpose of meeting: John Crawford requested a special meeting of the board to discuss the board's options on responding to perceived conflicts of interest and the perception by at least some resident that there are reasons to distrust the board. He also wanted more clarity on the February board decision to ask him to take the lead role in coordinating a Crestwood Homes Association General meeting. Additionally the Open meeting policy the board approved in February needed some correction.

We met for a little over 2 hours. There was a great deal of discussion among those present on how best to clarify to all CHA residents the board's role in this process.

No regular board business was discussed at this meeting. All decisions made were made by consensus.

1. It was decided that as the original drafter of the Open Meeting Policy, John Crawford was directed by consensus to amend the policy and clarify that the option of closed meeting or closed sessions (parts of a meeting) were limited to legal matters. We agreed to strike the part on closed meeting to deal with employee issues since CHA does not have any employees and does not for see having any employees.
2. It was also discussed and agreed that John Crawford would draft a e-mail to all CHA members, stating that the board based on discussion at the General meeting in November and the reaffirmed board understanding of that desire by the membership will NOT make any board decision by vote or by consensus on the proposal for moving Rockhill Tennis Club to the 5236 Cherry location.

3. John was affirmed to have the complete support of those present to communicate that the role of the board to facilitate the conducting of a general meeting with the purpose of allowing whomever attends the opportunity to hear what facts are available first hand from the RTC. The suggestion was made that the meeting should include RTC people to present and ask questions at the beginning and then leave so that the CHA members could continue discussion on their own. Other than that it will be up to the membership to decide if there is to be a vote, how it would be accomplished and who would participate in drafting a "new declaration of restrictions" should that become necessary. It was discussed that there might be value to having a uninterested third party act as moderator for that meeting.
4. It was also discussed and reaffirmed that as Vice-President and within the published definition of his duties including city liaison, he would be the official contact between the CHA board and RTC and the conduit for the board to facilitate delivery of facts to the CHA membership.
5. Also discussed either as part of previous mentioned communication to CHA members or as a separate communication, give some clarification of the enforceability of the current declaration of Restrictions, and that recording is not critical but to do it requires access to the original document.