

Glastonbury Landowners Association
Community Property Committee

Thursday – August 3, 2026 – 6 PM

[Join Via Zoom](#) or Dial In

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

Call to Order (6:32pm)

1. Committee Members Present- Jaylyn Jensen, Jewel Wieczorek, Leslie Everett, Lance Rushmeyer, James Timmer (left at 9:10pm)

Absent with Notice:

Absent without Notice:

2. Landowners Present- Linda Kremer, Jack Sutton

3. Landowner Comment on Non-Agenda Items

4. Review 30-day landowner comments submitted. The Committee received 9 comments about the 2026 Proposed Bylaw Revisions. Two items of positive feedback and appreciation. Two of them were in regard to the Road Policy: 1) disagreeing with how some roads are not serviced but they pay equal dues, 2) suggesting potential revisions to the road structure language incorporating some of the language from 2008 and clarifying what “shall be fiduciary” means in laymen’s terms. 3) were items that would be totally new revisions that would need to be tackled in a future Gov Docs cycle: 1) sharing closed session videos after a certain time frame, 2) voting for parcels in arrears, 3) how to properly and consistently calculate square footage during the PRC process. One disagreed with the limiting language for the Yearly Maximum language being proposed saying that it could unfairly stifle future Board operations. Debbie Newby, Director, explained in an email response that she feels that would not be the case. That fair representation would be met by the amount of Landowner interest in each election cycle ensuring the Board is sat equally and fairly to match the amount of landowner participation in that year. One comment from a Director requesting potential revision to the Special Meeting for Removal in regard to quorum for these meetings. One just wanted further clarification about closed session verbiage in regard to “Confidentially personal information” and “homeowner health issues.” The Committee clarified that closed sessions cannot be used at random to discuss these matters. These matters would have to have arisen in regard to a GLA issue to discuss these matters related to a landowner. The closed session cannot be used as a vehicle for gossiping about landowners and their personal matters or health. These new parameters around closed sessions in the Bylaws are simply to clarify the situations that could arise requiring a closed session versus an open session.

NEXT STEPS: Alicia or Jaylyn will respond to Chris Farrar’s questions about closed sessions.

5. Incorporate landowner comment and edit 2026 Proposed Bylaw Revisions - Vote possible

- a. Most Landowner comments could not be incorporated due to the nature of the suggestion. The one about the Special Meeting for Removal and quorum will need to be reviewed by legal to proceed, and the rest will have to be taken up in future Gov Document sessions outside of these changes due to the time constraints of this cycle.
- b. Under Article VI, Board of Directors, D. Election Process, Directors’ Term of Office, and Voting on Other Matters. Page 8. The Committee felt the percentage threshold should be higher than 5% minimum vote to receive a Director seat. The Committee agreed unanimously to change the minimum percentage from 5% to 10% for recommendation to the Board.
- c. The Committee went through and identified the most important revisions to be sent for legal review. Although it is desired that all revisions be reviewed by legal counsel, the cost of this could be more

significant than the desired change itself. Items that felt cut and dry legally, may be omitted for legal review, if the cost outweighs the benefit. Leslie Everett strongly discouraged this mindset and felt it is prudent that all revisions be reviewed by legal counsel. All Committee members agreed with her, but also felt that the cost and timeliness needed to be considered and weighed. Depending on how the Board votes, some revisions may either be omitted or can go for vote without review.

MOTION: Motion to forward current Bylaw revisions to the Board, and request that highlighted revisions are sent out for legal review as quickly as possible.

In Favor: Jaylyn, Lance, Alicia, Jewel

Not in Favor:

Abstain: Leslie

Motion Carries.

6. Review and update 2026 Proposed Bylaw Revision Process. Ideally the Board will receive legal counsel on some or all of the revision by Sept 12th. All revisions must be complete no later than Sept 12th so that they will be ready for inclusion in the 2026 Election packet being shipped on Sept 15th.

NEXT STEPS: Alicia will send the updated highlight packet to the Board for consideration and vote (via email) on partial or full legal counsel of the 2026 Proposed Bylaw Revisions.

Meeting adjourned at 9:54pm