

Woodmont Country Club

March Membership Meeting Minutes

March 23, 2021 7pm – 10pm (virtual)

Introduction/Call to Order

Ryan Crompton

Member Check –In Report

Kjersten Johansen

- 105 Members attended the meeting

Approval of Agenda

Ryan Crompton

- Agenda approved, no changes

Approval of May 2020 Minutes

Kjersten Johansen

- Minutes approved, no changes

President's Report

Ryan Crompton

- Our elected president, Jeremy Brewer resigned in June of last year. As Vice President, Ryan assumed Jeremy's role, Nancy Kennedy moved to the Vice President role. Toni Lund joined the board and was asked to take on the Maintenance Committee.
- Welcome to new members. We now have 153 members.
- Progress on the Long Range Capital Plan was made this year – gate extensions and ivy removal most recently, more to come in that section of the meeting
- Organization is in good financial health (Treasurers Report to follow)
- Covid prohibited most of our social events, but the new holiday event - Wander Woodmont - was a great success.
- Discussion of how to make public comments in the meeting.

Treasurer's Report

Eileen Clemans

- We have more new members than expected, and that means more dues and more money, so our income is higher, expenses are as expected.
- We had a \$3000 donation last year for Forest Management which paid for the ivy removal.
- The Forest Management \$5000 was not used, we paid \$315.68 for the tree permit but that money will be reimbursed.
- Real estate taxes will be about \$6500 this year.
- We now use Zelle for digital payments, this is available to everyone for June 1st payments, more information to come with a Woodmont treasurer email to send payments.
- Showing the last 3 years in comparison to help answer questions about income vs. expenses.
- You can see we are in better financial shape this year, and we will probably plan to spend more than we bring in this year – Tennis Court repairs, etc.
- May meeting there will be a proposed budget
- Please send questions to the Woodmontcc@hotmail.com account.
- Ryan – we underspend mostly because of Covid, which made it more difficult to get major improvements completed and of course, we couldn't do social events.

Public Comment Period

- No comments

Old Business

- None

New Business

Property Overview and Tax Update

Debra Palmer-Seiler, Steve Swank

- Our bluff property, Tract (parcel #953660TRCT) is 11.22 acres and was moved to tax exempt status in 1984 when we appealed to the State of WA to convert it from multiple parcels to a single tax-free tract. It includes 2275 feet of waterfront, tidelands, the bluff which is critical areas designated for erosion and landslide hazards, the plaza, grassy area and gate, the beach and tidelands that extend 60 feet from the bulkhead and then beach down to 272nd street.
- Our Tennis Court property (parcel #9536600230) was not appealed for taxes because we felt it could be sold for the valuation. We pay about \$4000 per year in property taxes for this parcel.
- We appealed the properties with the King County Assessor. The first property (parcel #5068400106) is North of Tract (parcel #953660TRCT) on the border of 264th Street and is landlocked. It has extreme topography and it appears the Bootlegger stairs are actually on that property so we wouldn't want to sell it. We appealed the valuation of \$25,000 and won, so the valuation was reduced to \$12,500.
- The second property (parcel 9536601450) is also landlocked, a small parcel with no street access. Also won this appeal and got this reduced from \$25,000 to \$12,500 as well.
- The Final piece of property (parcel #9536600700) is a large property over 3 acres. Very environmentally challenged, water basin, deep ravine, wetland, soil and erosion issues. We argued the cost to develop was prohibitive. King County Tax Assessor valued it at \$183,000. We are appealing through the Washington State Board of Tax Appeals (WSBTA).
- Steve Swank did a real estate appraisal for WCC on the 3-acre parcel with a market approach valuation of \$35,000 and recommended it's highest and best use would be to submit an application for Open Space which reduces taxes for 7 years. Steve feels we will have a better chance of success with the Washington State Board of Tax Appeals. They are backed up for 18 -24 months.
- Path forward: do we want to keep the properties, sell, donate or apply for Open Spaces. Propose performing a survey and creating a committee to execute on decisions.
- Question: Every year we talk about these 3 pieces of property, Is there some way we can just get rid of these properties? Ryan- Yes, we could, that is one of the 3-4 options Debra laid out, but we would like to start with a survey of membership to determine where to focus.

Social Committee Update

Nancy Kennedy

- We had few Social Events this year due to Covid, Exceptions were Wander Woodmont and the 4th of July non-motorized Regatta which we did because it was pretty easy to socially distance when everyone is in a Kayak or on a paddleboard.
- Our upcoming Social Events were displayed for this coming year, starting with Earth Day clean up event in April. The plan, provided Covid rules allow, is for 2 Potlucks, 2 Jellyfish Jams and the Bootlegger Bash (which was moved from last year).
- Sharon is leading the kids parade but needs help from some of the parents.

- Friday night socials will be starting up soon, this is a bring your own dinner and beverage and visit with neighbors at the plaza.
- Hoping to do Tour De Woodmont this year in December, we need 3-4 volunteers to open your homes to have people over. There is a \$125 refreshment stipend.

Long Term Capital Plan

Ryan Crompton

- In May 2019 we did a survey to understand highest concerns with regard to improvements. 24 households responded and we built the first Long Term Capital Plan as a result. This ensured that we were checking off the biggest concern items from members.
- We have completed most of the items that were on the plan over the last two years, with a few remaining for this coming year. Completions include the Tennis Court Repair, playground clean-up, new BBQ grills, Al Smith Stair repair, Plaza table refurbishment, gate extensions and safer entry route near gate.
- Entry has been cleaned up and entry sign and lighting needs to be replaced this year. Security cameras need more community feedback before we move forward. Tennis court resurfacing estimates are being collected now, expect to spend 10 – 12k to refinish these. Finally, the gate paint is failing and will likely need to be repainted in the coming year.
- New survey will come out to build the new LRCP. In the upcoming plan, we would like to focus on Improvements since we have done a good job covering the maintenance in the past couple years.

Public Comment Period

- Mary Eun thanked Debra, Steve and Matt for all their work on the property tax issue.
- Doug Andrews had a question about hedge/trees cut on the side of the road above the guard rail in lower Woodmont and wondered if the club will be stabilizing the road there. Nancy responded that she had contacted the City of Des Moines, and they were going to have their Transportation department look into this. This may be in a critical area. Sue said when she talked to the City, they were not even aware who had cut these trees.

Nominating Committee

Mary Eun, Rick Devitte

- Mary shared Nominating Committee process document.
- We had three goals – ensure open positions are available, ensure there is a fair process allowing members to vote if there are multiple applicants for a position and be consistent with proposed by-law changes.
- Showed open positions – President, Treasurer, Social, Trees, Communications, Reservations
- We will look for new members by sending out notice after this to encourage anyone interested in applying to send an application to both Mary and Rick by April 23rd – who are you, your address, your statement of why you want to be on the board. Limited to 250 words.
- Looking for cross section of members across the community and encourage those who are new, established and what your specific interest areas are.
- Will let you know if your position is contested so that you can consider if you want to join a committee or maybe select a different role.
- If more than one applicant wants to run for the same role, we will send out the statements and ask the membership to vote.
- There will be at least 7 days to vote, and there will be time before the May meeting to compile the results and develop the final slate for May meeting ratification.

Public Comment Period

- Trish Davis – Thanks to Mary and Rick for their work to bring a well-rounded approach to filling board positions. Also, thanks to everyone else who has served on the board who are stepping down. There are many years of experience in these members, and the history of their time here. Their work has been very time consuming. Thank you to Jeff Green for donating gift cards for new members.
- Susan Cwertnia – Are there descriptions of the positions, and why are there so many openings?
Mary – Yes we will send out an email with information about each role and board member responsibilities to the general membership. It is a lot of vacancies; 2 people have said they'd like a different role and the longest three serving roles have been encouraged to open their positions in keeping with the bylaw changes that are going to be discussed later in the meeting.
- Anthony Gibb – Thank you Trish for thanking the board. All positions should be up for election every year, so why are we doing only some? Also why does a board member get to stay by virtue of wanting to stay? It isn't in the bylaws; I am concerned that if bylaws are not followed then liability insurance doesn't protect the board. Some members of the neighborhood feel treated disparately by the board. Board should serve the community and all members should feel welcomed. Proposed changes to the bylaws seem to be geared toward restricting access to the board and entrenching positions? What is the rationale to limiting access to the board?
- Kjersten – can we address the latter half of these questions after the Bylaw review? Mary – regarding one year terms, there are no rules for voting even though they do state we have one year terms, can we answer that after the bylaw review?
- Trish – Anthony can you be clear about board member behavior or not making people feel welcome?
- Anthony – there is a red flag if a member of the neighborhood feels singled out, and that is when people get litigious. A community can best handle this by opening the arms and not making rules that make people feel singled out.
- Trish – We need good board governance, what happened had to do with not following rules, a behavior, not a person. And that is very different from what has been getting out to the community. Board members have been demonized and maligned. They haven't been able to tell their side of the story. A strong board president should nip that in the bud immediately, and the next board president should be fully aware of Roberts Rules to run efficiently and unfortunately that hasn't happened.

By-Law Change Preview

Brian Jacobson, Carol Belland

- Carol – I have served on the board for many years in different capacities, but also am hearing that members feel the board is not accessible and that there are many years that no one would sign up to be on the board. So many members have been on the board because no one volunteered.
- Most organizations have regular turnover on the board built into their bylaws. Brian Jacobsen and I put together some changes to the bylaws to address these issues. They have not been changed for a long time, it's a very static document.
- When I was running the board, I did change all the gender bias in the bylaws.
- Brian - Very intentional about ensuring there were open spots on the board every year. Also want to maintain consistency and stability, so people should remain on the board over time to keep continuity and institutional memory. We need good representation on the board from all areas. Those were some of our goals as well as cleaning up some language.
- Discussed voting on these changes in this meeting, but historically we review in March and vote in May.

- Seemed extreme to put the whole board on the ballot each year. So it hasn't been our practice since I have been here.
- Carol – the 1 year term has been in the bylaws for at least 35 years.
- Displaying bylaws with changes and summary of changes with reasoning behind it.
- Added Non-Discrimination clause, removed redundant clause about president continuing, added audit clause, changed to running for a committee not a general director, added that at least 3 oldest must move off if no one else will and if others want that role, reserved a position formally for the North Beach representative (there are legal agreements with North Beach that make participation important).
- Vacancies has been rewritten (review documentation) and election process is described.
- Force Majeure and ability to hold virtual meetings.
- Removed appointment of committees from annual meeting
- Added requirement to use Roberts Rules of Order with at least the President understanding and using this process.
- Carol - North Beach agreed to be members in order to have their access easement, and thus it's important for someone to represent us on the board.

Public Comment Period

- Anthony Gibb: Does the nominating committee have the authority to vet candidates, or can anyone who meets the requirements be on the slate? Mary Eun: No, the nominating committee does not vet candidates. We do ensure applicants are current members in good standing. Any applicant in good standing can choose to run for an office. We are not choosing people or vetting them beyond being an active member.
- Anthony Gibb: Bylaws say there are ten 1-year positions and there is no justification anywhere in the bylaws that say there can be less than ten, so why is that not the case? Mary Eun: There is nothing in the bylaws specific to how the voting happens. We are presenting the 10 members for a 1 year term by presenting a slate for the membership to vote on. The bylaws do not say that each member needs to be individually voted upon.
- Mary Paynter: Robert's Rules which are long and complicated, suggest we find someone with a lot of expertise in them and have them be parliamentarian to assist with keeping us on track in meetings. Also suggest 3-year terms that alternate so that only a portion come up every year.
- Kjersten Johansen: What is intent moving forward with the bylaw changes? Brian Jacobsen: we need a 2/3 approval from the membership to make these changes. Intention is to bring these changes to a vote in the May meeting. Vote will be to accept all proposed bylaw changes. Carol Belland offered to provide paper copies if needed.
- Pat Malara: Thank you to the board. Question about trees at the playground area, basketball court. Kjersten Johansen asked to hold this until final comment period.

Boat Launch Policy Committee

Ryan Crompton

- This was spurred by our previous guidelines which said to try to launch at the highest tide possible which wasn't always the case. Many other topics around boat launching were discussed.

- Provided an overview and history of the boat launch review, committee makeup and areas of research. Many different proposals from the committee. Tide levels, parking, boater education, boater behavior on the water, etc. Three meetings were held of the committee into October, lots of emails, but the committee never came to consensus on the level of the tide. Seven voted in favor, three against, so set the tide level at 6 feet and the rule was implemented immediately after the February 8 meeting. He further explained the Board motion at the March meeting to disband the group and send out a survey. He said that the plan is to send out a platform where all members can share their opinion and comments. That will then be sent out to the membership which they can use to form their opinions on how they want to choose their choices on the survey.

Public Comment Period

- Michael Fuller: Why was further work done after the 7:3 vote from the board? Ryan said the boat committee work had not been captured prior to this vote and we felt it needed to be considered. Michael said, just to clarify, we currently have a 7-3 rule that is in place for the membership to follow. Ryan said that is correct.
- Adrienne Worah: Does this rule apply to launching kayaks? Ryan clarification that this only applies to ramp usage by motor vehicles.
- Jim Davis: Thanks to the board and boat launch committee. Transparency is super important. Supporting a board decision after it's made is critical. You can't leave the board meeting and then have the debate start. If a decision does need to go to membership you take it there in an ethical and clear-cut way. If you have criticism of the bylaws, get your red pen out and actually mark it up. Suggested that the boat committee was stacked and that we should not stack committees (boat or tree) with people who want changes on either side. We should donate our property. We should not be driven by special interest, or short term service on the board. Prefer the 3 year rolling terms. Glad the current rule will stay in place and that we are getting the survey out to make everyone's thoughts known.
- Terry Donohue: I am the cofounder of the Maury Island Incident Historical Society (come to Burning Saucer!). Let's work together on this whole thing. I do not agree with the 2' tide launch, it's too close. It should be at 6. I have some scientific backup, we can get into that in May. We do not want non-members to be able to launch, I think there is a huge liability issue there.
- Steve Edmiston: I want to applaud the board, and Ryan for the presentation with a process on a contentious issue. Would like the members to be as informed as possible, and then poll them to give feedback to the board. I think it's a brilliant process. I have really strong opinions but believe there is a good way for me to share them in this process. So thank you.
- Pat Malara: Wanted someone to address trees planted in upper Woodmont. Would like to have the canopy trimmed down, requesting an arborist. Kjersten – suggest you send email to the woodmontcc@hotmail.com so that we can make sure the committee can address this.
- Richard Cogzell: Just wanted to correct Jim Davis on his comment that only 5 of the 9 people on the boat committee own PWCs, it was only 3 of the 9 on the committee who owned PWCs.

- Ryan Crompton: I did want to go back to the assertion that I stacked the boat committee. We did put out to the entire membership over a couple of weeks. We did not cherry pick anyone, everyone who applied was put on the committee. I don't particularly appreciate the assertion that I stacked the committee. Jim Davis apologized.
- Nancy Kennedy: In the July 13th board meeting of 2020 the board agreed on an unbiased committee of 3.
- Ryan Crompton: Yes and then we put out the call for interest, got way more than three and I felt that selecting 3 would be construed as selecting bias, so best to allow those that volunteered to participate.
- Ruth Cogzell: The Boat Launch committee had 2 PWC users, Richard and Karen, so the assertion of 5 PWC users was totally incorrect. This is a discrimination against PWC users. The boating committee was meant to develop policies for all vessels being launched. But Jim, you mentioned PWC users specifically, which needs to be addressed. While the committee was in process, the board voted to bring in the 6' rule without community consent. Then, they disbanded the committee saying there was no consensus, when in fact there was a motion and vote happening to bring in guidelines, that the majority agreed with. So there is discrimination against PWC firstly, and why was the 6' rule brought into place.
- Jennifer Jacobsen: I want to correct Ruth's statement. I am on the board. I want to say that we waited months and months for any information about that committee. We were told Carol would be at a meeting and she was never invited. We were very patient and we saw that summer was coming and we saw that this issue needed to be addressed.
- Ruth Cogzell: The boating committee was not aware that there was a timeframe to get a response back to you. Carol was the lead who was to provide the recommendation from the committee. The same day she said that she was pulling out because it was too stressful, she said that because there was no consensus that she would present two different proposals to the board that night. Several members of the committee asked her to present to the board the guidelines which had agreed to the majority on the boat launch committee. That presentation was supposed to happen the night the 6' rule was put in place. So either the board ignored that or it was never presented to them in which case there is a significant process issue, which includes the board voting on a rule without the recommendation of the committee they assembled or any survey of the desires of the membership.
- Debra Palmer-Seiler: I want to point out many inaccuracies. The boat launch committee was formed in July, not September. The majority vote the board heard about was that it was 4 out of 9 that had voted. No board time for Fred's research or Larry or Bill's proposal. Ryan presented his proposal, so it got board time. The board did not know that 9 people were added to the boat launch committee. Board only got communication on 1 WAC, with notes from one committee member. It talked about limited amount of driving but was not definitive. We can only make rules on WCC property. But we don't own to a 2' tideline. We didn't get any information on the research that was done. There were 4 meetings, not 5. Kjersten – we do own down to ELT (Extreme Low Tide) per DNR correspondence I received today. Debra- the iMap looks like we don't own 6'. Kjersten – yes, iMap is off, most of us who have gotten surveys have seen that it is

significantly off. Debra – There was total lack of communication to the board, there are comments on email that they begged the board to reconsider but that family never wrote to the board.

- Kjersten – We were impatient and needed to make a rule in February. I do not know why. We did not wait for information, but we could have waited. I said so during the debate, that I needed more information, that we did not fully understand the impact of a 6' tide rule. I asked that we get more information and in response the motion was forced to a vote. More information was certainly available had we waited.
- Deborah Palmer-Seiler – the March meeting was coming up and it was very contentious and we needed to make a decision before the meeting. Much information was never shared with the board.
- Nancy Kennedy - One of the reasons we made the motion is because we were told the committee could not reach agreement on the tide level, so it was time for the board to act.
- Ryan Crompton – I felt like I had more information to share with the board, but they only cared about a unanimous agreement from the committee, and upon hearing that would not be coming they didn't want to hear anything further.
- Mary Paynter – It seems there was a communication failure and it started with an unclear charge between the board and the boating committee, clarifying what questions they were to answer and whether a unanimous conclusion was the requirement. So having a task force with a very clear charge might have alleviated many of these issues. We also need to be careful about social media and emails, where there is a temptation to say things you wouldn't say in person. Maybe a covenant that says how we are going to treat each other in times of conflict would help.
- Anthony Gibb – Deeply flawed process in the boat launch, but under the circumstances a vote was taken. Why was the vote taken when there were so many issues that needed to be resolved? It seems the result was highly arbitrary and deeply flawed, so perhaps this needs to be taken as a lesson learned and we use the survey to correct.
- Toni Lund – the former guidelines said to launch at high tide, and that can mean something different to different people. So we felt we needed to set a tide level.
- Brian Kerr – Yes, high tide changes every day, that is one of the problems with a 6 foot tide rule, there can be weeks where the high tide never gets past 6 feet, so you can never launch. You should always look at the averages to see what makes sense. I would like to commend the family that is down at the beach doing great family events with their jet-skis. Their kids aren't in front of the TV or social media, they are down there making memories and isn't that what this place is supposed to be for? They are down at the beach having fun with their kids, it's really nice and we are dismissing it because, why? Some people don't like the noise?
- Steve Edmiston – Are we dealing with the board's decision or are we changing the rule with a vote of the members? The board voted 7 to 3 so that is a majority. We are going to revisit the

rule so I think we should end the meeting on that note, we have a process laid out by the presiding officer and I think we should stop the debate and go with that now.

- Ryan Crompton – Yes I would like to take this opportunity to end the meeting. The next meeting will be May 13th.

Other Business

- None

Respectfully Submitted,

Kjersten Johansen

WCC Secretary

Note: The minutes were not finalized by the Secretary prior to her resignation. The remaining Board of Trustees finished the review, corrections and approved these minutes.

Attendee List
Name used to Log into Meeting

- | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Adrienne Worah | 45. Kirk Salomon | 95. susan clarke |
| 2. alan | 46. Kjersten Johansen | 96. Susan Cwiertnia & Darren Paschke |
| 3. ANET FOX | 47. Kristi Brewer | 97. Ted |
| 4. ann ardizzone | 48. ktdon | 98. TJ Biehle |
| 5. Anthony Gibbs | 49. Laine | 99. Toni Lund |
| 6. Becky Crompton | 50. Larry Knutson | 100. User (Mary Paynter) |
| 7. Billie | 51. LIA C. GREDZENS | 101. William Dwyer |
| 8. Brad Holmes/Leanne Cooper | 52. Liz DeVito | 102. young |
| 9. Brian Jacobson | 53. lmkbh_2aplxj5 | |
| 10. Bruck Harris | 54. Lora Kerr | |
| 11. Cara Zemanek | 55. MacUser | |
| 12. Carlotta Smith | 56. Marcus Berry | |
| 13. Carol Belland | 57. Maria Weber | |
| 14. Charles Park | 58. Mary Eun | |
| 15. Colleen Washington | 59. Matt Small | |
| 16. Dan Hyde | 60. mestichella | |
| 17. David and Kendra Rosen | 61. mfuller | |
| 18. Debra Palmer-Seiler | 62. Michael & Colleen Washington | |
| 19. Dixie | 63. Michael Sthay | |
| 20. Donna Martin | 64. Michaela | |
| 21. Doug Andrews Guest | 65. Michele Raus | |
| 22. Ed | 66. Mike & Marcie Gibbons | |
| 23. Edris Staiger | 67. Nancy | |
| 24. Eileen | 68. Nancy Hogan | |
| 25. G Dorland | 69. Nicolette Donohue | |
| 26. Gary Deakins | 70. Nyles Scott | |
| 27. Gary McLean | 71. Owner | |
| 28. gary spies | 72. pam kelly | |
| 29. Gligorea | 73. Pat and Kristen Andersen | |
| 30. Greg & Melissa Magdsick | 74. Pat Malara | |
| 31. Jarvis and Charlene Chen | 75. Phillip Dean | |
| 32. Jeff Eadie | 76. Rich & Marian Gordon | |
| 33. Jeff Green | 77. Rich Bergquist | |
| 34. jeffb | 78. Richard Cogzell | |
| 35. Jennifer Jacobson | 79. Rick Devitte | |
| 36. Jerry Leighton | 80. Robert and Sandra Willott | |
| 37. Jerry Palmer | 81. Roger Barton | |
| 38. Jim Boyd | 82. Ruth and Richard Cogzell | |
| 39. jim stender | 83. Ryan Crompton | |
| 40. Jim Trish Davis | 84. Ryan Merickel | |
| 41. John Benson | 85. Sandra Babbitt | |
| 42. John Gao | 86. Sharon Andrews | |
| 43. Karin Stender | 87. Sharon Morehouse | |
| 44. Kevin and Janelle Trau | 88. Shilpa Sehgal | |
| | 89. Stephanie and Anthony | |
| | 90. Steve | |
| | 91. Steve Edmiston | |
| | 92. Steve Ellis | |
| | 93. Steve Hanel | |
| | 94. Stevin Alyssa | |