



## Minutes

LAKE MARCEL COMMUNITY CLUB (LMCC)  
GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING  
June 2, 2019

1. Chair Opening Remarks & Rules of Order: Meeting came to order at 2:40 p.m.
2. Member Comments (2-minute time limit): Paul Gibian asked the board to introduce themselves. The board members proceeded to introduce themselves.
3. Approval of Meeting Agenda: Rick DeBlock moves to approve the agenda, seconded by Angie Ward. Passes unanimously.
4. Approval of Minutes of November 3, 2018 Special Membership Meeting: Rick DeBlock moves to approve the November 2018 minutes, seconded by Angie Ward. Passes unanimously.
5. Committee Reports
  - a. **Community events** by Juliette Brown. Need a dock for the July 4<sup>th</sup> pyrotechnics. Need volunteers. Garage sale is Saturday, July 20<sup>th</sup> which is the same weekend as Sandblast. Juliette hoped to create a map of the neighborhood with participating households marked to hand out to garage sale seekers. Food trucks are a possibility. Family Fishing Event is Saturday, June 8<sup>th</sup>. Approximately 2000 fish were put into the lake 2 weeks ago. A hot dog lunch will be served. Doug Lapchis has put together a diagram. We need a griller and server for this event.
  - b. **Architectural review and covenants** by John Gorman. John Gorman was not in attendance but there was nothing new to report.
  - c. **Facilities, dam and grounds maintenance.** Need a new chairman for this committee. Question was asked about new playground equipment: There is a project to look into it. New acquisitions would come out of capital reserves. Rick DeBlock reported that the playground vendor has dropped the ball with designs at the moment. He is awaiting their design options for varying budgets which would then be proposed to the membership for a vote. The plan is to improve the structures and play surfaces as there are some gaps between where we are and where we should probably be relative to safety and accessibility. The subcommittee would like to get input on what kinds of things members would like to see and expand on, and input on prioritization. There will be replacement of equipment that is wearing out. Sheri Dunn commented focusing on the fall zone for safety, for example wood chips, should be the utmost priority right now. Rick clarified that we know we are not as safe as we could be. We're not saying they're not safe, we do have play chips under most play structures. There is a swing set that doesn't and that's high on our priority. So, we do absolutely see bringing these to a higher level of safety than they are now. Hopefully up to today's safety standards – that's our goal. Angie Ward asked Rick to clarify if we are held to a different standard being a private place versus public place, such as a school? As Rick understands, partially because we're private, partially because it's already installed, there is no governmental agency that oversees standards for our playground. If someone was hurt and the case went to court, it would be up to the court what a reasonable standard is for us to meet. It behooves us to be as good as we can be with a plan to improve over the months and years to get to where we really want to be. Mary Harenda Wones suggested to consider hiring a private contractor to spearhead this effort to upgrade the playground equipment. Juliette Brown suggested looking into hiring Kevin Sehner or an associate. Mary would like to see a fair amount of money spent on upgrading all the playground equipment. Mary feels that it's been neglected since we don't have a property manager anymore and that is one of her big beefs about the direction the community has turned, that there are a few things we're focusing on, sort of the day to day stuff has not really been taken care of as when we had a property manager onsite, especially the playground equipment. Doug mentioned that the board authorized a new Capital Reserve Fund Study which will be undertaken. Once the reserve study is done, we'll have a better idea about the costs. Paul Gibian volunteered to be on Playground Subcommittee. Rick asked, as representatives of the membership would you be in favor of deactivating those activities that don't have adequate play surface until we can get an adequate surface, that's likely

going to be swings? One member didn't feel comfortable answering for members with families who are not present today who may use the swings often. Laurell Ramirez commented as a reminder that we all have an ownership interest in those parks, that it's not just on some entity of Lake Marcel. With each of our lot ownership we have a partial interest in those tracts, so we all have a personal responsibility for the way we use that property and we have a personal liability every time we enter those lots. So as a member of Lake Marcel, she doesn't see that we are going to be sued and lose our shirts, as we have insurance. She's not saying not to improve them as we see fit, but she's not sure she would be in favor of shutting down what we have because we can't make some of these requested improvements tomorrow. George Petrov commented that he would be concerned as it would be very easy to spend a lot of money trying to bring things up to some code which we might not even be subjected to. George mentioned that he is a parent and if his kids are swinging on the swings and playing on the playground that he is responsible for his children and as a member he is also responsible for making sure they don't misuse the equipment. So, George is not for spending a whole lot of money to potentially upgrade equipment without knowing what that cost is going to be. He doesn't feel like there is a fire to do anything immediately per se. He would like the studies to come through and be proposed as Rick has mentioned before and he thinks the community at large should actually take a vote on those. Angie said, that it really sounds like we're all on the same page as wanting safety for the children, so a plan that may take a little more process but it sounds like with our budget, she believes we could at least act immediately on the fall chips, some of the things that can help improve immediately some of the fall zones. She asked Rick if that was true. Rick said that is the most expensive part, this vendor has helped him get a proper perspective on the cost of things to include shipping, installation, and the play surface; vendor says plan to spend as much on the play surface as on the equipment. Improving the play surface, it's not as cheap as you might think. Rick questioned whether this would need to come out of the reserves. Angie and Dan Gutschmidt stated that if we just need play chips that that is a maintenance thing. Rick said that we do have play chips already but to do this, we'd have to do some excavating, we'd have to put some beams down because if you just put all the stuff on top of the surface it's deeper than the beams so it's just going to overflow the beams, and we'll be constantly raking up the chips that are out in the grass and putting them back in, which we can do but that's another maintenance cost. Rick was alerted by Art Grabb before this meeting that we need more chips at beach 1 because they are low. The problem with regular wood chips is that they compact down over time. There are other types of surfaces that we should look at, but for an immediate solution we'll just add some more chips, but they can only go so deep. In order to expand the fall zones, we would need to excavate the area for which we'll get Kevin's input on.

- d. **Fisheries** by Doug Lapchis. There was some miscommunication with the fish plant. We still need to plant the large fish. There is budget for about 500 large fish for later in the year when the temps are cooler. Grass carp will not eat lily pads or milfoil. We must keep 20% vegetation as a state requirement. If we have a problem, we can get 9- to 10-inch grass carp. A member asked how many grass carp are left as big schools are still seen by members.
- e. **Water quality & aquatic weed control** by Peter Templin. Peter Templin was not in attendance, but Krista Petrova read his prepared statement: The biggest current impact on our lake is toxic algae and the potential for preventing the recreational use of the lake during the late summer months. During the past year, there have been investigations of ultrasonic and chemical control of blue-green algae both of which has proved very expensive. To minimize the amount of phosphorus your own activities may be contributing to nearby water, there are a number of very helpful things that people living in the watershed can do:
  - **Minimize use of phosphorus cleaners.** Read the labels to see which products contain phosphorus and try the ones without it.
  - **Wash your car at a car wash** that recycles its water, keeping soaps and road dirt out of the surface waters of the watershed. If you must wash your car at home, use water only.
  - **Use low or no phosphorus fertilizers on your lawn.** Grass needs nitrogen and potassium in fertilizers to become lush and green. It doesn't need the phosphorus for good color or leaf production and the excess phosphorus will leach out when you water, getting into streams and lakes.
  - **Don't dispose of grass clippings in or near water.**
  - **Don't feed the geese and ducks.** They will congregate on beaches near good food sources and their feces will wash into the surface water and eventually into the lake.
  - **Scoop your pet's poop** and dispose of it in the trash or into the septic system.
  - **Keep your septic system maintained and functioning properly.** Have it checked every 3 to 5 years and don't put anything down the toilet that the system can't handle.
 Doug pointed that some newer septic system filters need to be checked yearly.

- f. **Community relations, safety & security** by Josh Arbit. Josh Arbit, the chairman of this committee could not be in attendance but Angie Ward read a report on his behalf: For those of you unaware the safety and security and the community relations committees were consolidated into one committee and the members include Lynn Hoyer, Ann Marie Gill, Rick DeBlock, and Angie Ward. A new camera system has been installed at beach 1 to provide wider angle lenses, more coverage, and they are stored on the cloud. They are wireless and there are some benefits. We are also considering additional cameras at beach 2 for more coverage. The committee has also completed an emergency response plan. It's currently in a draft format and the board is currently reviewing it, so we will share more information in the next coming months.

What's next? An online survey for the community will be going out so look for your email in about the next month. There will be a link posted on the Facebook page. This survey will not be physically mailed due to the manual work involved and the challenge of compiling the data with the online responses. Please participate, it will take less than 5 minutes and we take your feedback seriously and would like to use it to help make changes and improvements. Annual property review that went out in the newsletter. The Lake Marcel Community Club has covenants and bylaws has online standards for keeping homes and lots in the neighborhood in a park-like setting. As an HOA, we are legally bound to enforce our covenants and bylaws. Beyond law, this keeps property values as high as possible. The Community Relations Committee is responsible for this. Every year in the summer, we perform a drive-through to check for covenant violations. We do not enter your property rather we view it from the street. Thus, please ensure that your home and property look park-like from streets and neighboring properties. For more detailed information, please review your bylaws and covenants on the website or call the office. Some of the more common violations that we found last year were piles of items sitting out in view of the street. Common examples are building supplies from long completed projects, yard waste, etc., homes and structures in disrepair, excessive number of vehicles and trailers. We are currently limited to 5 vehicles per lot, that excludes short-term guests. There is no limit on trailers or campers, but please keep the appearance of your property in line with the park-like setting. If you have a project vehicle, please try to move it into a garage or structure. Long-term parking or storing of vehicles or trailers along the side of the street in the county right of way was another violation. It's okay to park short-term, up to 24 hours as long as it's not a walkway or marked for no parking. Please move anything that will be stored longer onto your own personal property. New structures on properties without getting the LMCC Architectural Control Committee approval for the plan were also in violation. Here is the protocol we will follow going forward: one month from now the committee will drive through the community. Again, no personal property lines will be crossed. FYI letters will be sent out for possible violations. One month after that will be given a grace period for remediation. However, if no change occurs, then a notice of violation letter will be sent to those properties and fines may result. Carrie Mussey asked if cars are parked inside the walkway which is our sidewalk, can they be ticketed or towed? Angie replied, if there is a sign that says no parking by county it can be ticketed or towed. Carrie requested if we could get the county to paint more of the walking men all the way around, because we only have a few of them. The county was out a few weeks ago painting crosswalks per Doug. Rick suggested the board or office manager contact the county regarding the adding of more walkway men.

Stephanie Steele asked if the board could do anything insofar as people who are utilizing the lake who are not members, is there anybody who polices that? She said it was a really big issue last year. Dan said that we hire security to come around and check ID on occasion during the summertime. It's scheduled at night though. Doug suggested keeping the gates closed as being the best deterrent. Laurell mentioned that we used to have car window stickers but that doesn't help if you walk. Laurell suggested that it's on all of us to get to know our neighbors. One thing you can do is say, "hi, I don't think we've met, where do you live?" It's a nice way of saying do you belong. Juliette mentioned that residents are supposed to accompany their guests at the beach/lake. She asked that we be kind to each other but also forceful when we do encounter people who don't belong. If you overhear a conversation where you can tell they are not from here, go up and say, "hey did you guys see the sign? This is actually private beach. I don't know if you're aware. We pay really good money in this neighborhood to maintain this beach for our own use and purposes and unfortunately, you're not a resident and I have to ask you to leave." And, if they don't leave, you can call the cops and have them arrested for trespassing. Angie mentioned that if you approach a teen, you might ask who they are with. If they just name drop, like someone they went to school with, you can say, "well you cannot be here without that member present" and ask them to leave. A question was asked about long-term guests using the beach and it was suggested to inform the office.

- g. **Treasurer's report** by Dan Gutschmidt: We have a \$39,267.55 carry-over/surplus funds that didn't get used or designated, it's not part of specific funds. Final dues collection notices have been sent out and liens will be processed soon.

6. **Property Tax Update:** Doug reported that in 2018, we petitioned to have our property taxes reduced on lots 96, 97, and 98 which are the 3 lots from the dam over to the office. The rest of that is in tract B for which we pay no taxes on, but we have been paying taxes since the 1960s on those other 3 lots. We got the assessments reduced down to \$55,000 per lot. That still was too much and we were trying to push that these should be part of tract B but did not get that accomplished yet. Doug relayed that Christina Lovell mentioned at a previous board meeting that they have to pay us back taxes for 6 years. We are in that process now to get the back taxes and still working on incorporating lots 96, 97, and 98 into tract B.
  
7. **Revised Beach Reservation Policy:** Juliette Brown stated that in our bylaws the beach use policy was capped at 25 guests, but in recent years there's been leeway to allow people to pay to reserve an area of beach 1 or 2 for their events including weddings, some of which have had more than 100 people. And as that has happened, there has been a lot more complaints of people in the summer on nice days trying to access the parks and other amenities and they encounter difficulty in either parking or using the facilities. In some cases, there have been members attending these events who have been hostile with members trying to access those amenities. We looked at 2 options, either increase the cost to reserve those spaces enough to compensate for the fact that residents who get the short end of the stick during those events, or just shut it down so that there are no events larger than 25 people. We ended up deciding that based on what those beaches were intended for, the best idea would just be to not have large events. They are not in the bylaws, they were never meant to be allowed. We have never had a policy in place that said there would be events held on our private beaches. It's just something that has sort of happened over time and since the rest of the people who pay dues are the people who own that property, those people should be the ones allowed to use it, not out-of-town guests and family members and wedding attendees. If at some point there is discussion that we want to try and incorporate something to extend use in our bylaws or something else, we can look into it, but for now all we are going to do is make sure our bylaws and policies are consistent and that there will not be any parties larger than 25. If you want to have 10, you can have 10. If you are planning to have more than 10 but less than 25, you need to make a reservation. In the summer during busy times and on holiday weekends, there will only be one reservation allowed. If there is a community event happening, that takes precedence over any individual's events. The 10 and 25 maxes are not per person or per household, they are per event, so whichever is greater. If 3 people in the neighborhood are all having a Tupperware party, the limit is 25, not 75. You will not be given any guaranteed parking. We need to share the parking with residents. A member asked how that impacts the Stillwater classes that come? Juliette said that at board discretion community events can become exceptions. George Petrov asked how do we plan to enforce this? There will be a sandwich board posted at the site during the approved events. Juliette suggested to go say something if you see 60 people congregating. If they are being disruptive, let us know. If they are being really disruptive, call the police as it's a violation of policy. Krista Petrova interjected that we can't say to a group of neighbors, "hey, I know you all live here but you need to go as there are too many of you congregating." Doug suggested if there is a party that is obviously more than 25, to find out who is running it and report it to the office and that would become a violation of the bylaws and we would then fine them. George pointed out that it's hard to tell if neighbors spontaneously show up versus a party, where is the line? Who do you go interrogate? And then you're the jerk for asking all the questions and possibly putting yourself into harms way. What's the practicality of this? Doug said to look for the food/cooking area to find out who is involved. Juliette stated that if you are a spontaneous group of 10, then you are in violation. It's 10 per meetup. George asked how can that be possible if you have 20 community members? Juliette said it's 10 per meetup and in violation. George asked if Juliette was saying, you can't have more than 25 people total at any time on the beach ever? Juliette clarified in one small group, all around one bar-b-que in one area. If they are across the beach in various groupings, that's not in violation. George asked how does that square with me as a member having unrestricted access? It seems to be working against what the policy is meant to prevent. How is this new policy going to shape and change the reality of what's happening? Juliette said for one, we won't have any more weddings, birthday parties, or anything that's obvious that in the past used to get a reservation. That should eliminate she guesses 80% of the animosity people have not being able to access things. We're asking everybody to police themselves. Laurell commented that if she went down with her family of 5 and meet up with friends who are a family of 5 and somebody else who is a family of 5 shows up and they decide "let's all sit together", then we are in violation is what you're saying? Juliette said unfortunately yes. Laurell said if we decide to join with our fellow community members and actually enjoy the same space and park then we could be in violation. This is supposed to be eliminating those big events, but it doesn't help with the sense of community, but it does eliminate the type of contention that happened with the loudspeakers, etc. Dan reiterated that this is kind of a preemptive on those events, so people are informed right up front in writing that no more than 25 people. As far as enforcement, it's a little nebulous, but we have a policy that's presented and we'll try to enforce it as much as we can. As far as people meeting at the beach, he doesn't know if this will come into play there. Laurell said that it could from the viewpoint of somebody who doesn't know us. Juliette said it shouldn't be in issue unless you're being disruptive or blocking access. A member asked in terms of enforcement once the reservation has been approved if there will be a card to identify that this has been approved. Krista stated that Adam usually puts out a sandwich board on the day of the reservation with the

details of the event which includes the name, area, and time. George added regarding the sense of community and comments of animosity, he would hate for this to lead to less of a sense of community and more animosity for the fact that, sure we need to police ourselves, but with this rule in place that everybody has more to be suspicious of and to question. Mary questioned why we need to have the first paragraph if we are just trying to limit it to 25, why worry about the smaller numbers? She also asked if there was something in the bylaws that said members are allowed up to 3 guests per household. This needs to be further researched.

8. Community Vote – Should the Club Sell Unused Community-Owned Properties and/or Sell Easements on Community-Owned Properties? Rick DeBlock stated: The Lake Marcel Community Club owns 5 lots that were sold by the developer at one time but have since been reacquired by the club for one reason or another. None has ever been developed and, in fact, all are unbuildable due to streams, wetlands, or other reasons. The club pays taxes on each of these – anywhere from \$165 to \$392 per year and collects no dues. Although the value of these properties would be very limited, still there might be a market to people that would like a membership in the club or for other reasons. If sold, not only would the club be saved the cost of taxes but it would also be able to collect dues. Because these lots are unbuildable and 4 of the 5 are classified by the county as Open Space, there would likely be no change to the use or appearance of the lots. The board is proposing that it form a strategy to seek buyers and, when found, assess the offer, it's impact if any on the lot and the club, the costs to sell, and when the board determines a net benefit to the club, sell the property. Article III of our bylaws requires a 2/3 vote of the membership at a meeting such as this. So, we are looking for your feedback on this idea generally. And if we proceed with this, to avoid holding up any specific sale process to seek your approval if a buyer is found for one or more of these tracts, we also seek membership approval now for any board-approved specific sale that meets these very specific criteria.

*The motion is that article III of our bylaws be amended to allow the board to sell any club-owned lot without the need for further membership approval where, to the best of the board's knowledge, the lot to be sold is a) not a beach lot or tract, b) unbuildable, and c) where the sale will not result in the change in the county-designated use of that lot. If that is acceptable, he has a proposed actual rewording of that bylaw.*

Discussion was had regarding the definition of "buildable". Mary brought up 3 concerns: There is no such thing as a legally unbuildable lot according county code. Every lot legally can be built upon. The practical reality is that sometimes there is not enough room, septic don't perc, there's too many critical areas and buffers involved. If someone came in and was willing to spend the money that's required for environmental mitigation, permitting, etc., they could build on any lot. Secondly, it is her understanding anyway, that those lots were specifically purchased with funds used from mitigation from a construction accident when Seattle Pipeline #2 went in, and a lot of sediment and contaminants went into the lake, so the City of Seattle settled with the Community Club and with those funds the board decided to purchase those properties as long-term protection for the lake water quality. Thirdly, she is not certain that there wouldn't be any ramifications to back taxes if a lot like that is sold. That is something that would need to be negotiated with the purchaser that any back taxes that the county might impose would have to be paid by the purchaser. Rick stated that the county says that whoever owns the property at the time there is a breach of the Open Space taxation agreement is responsible to pay those back taxes. Discussion was had regarding what is considered a breach and open space. Kriss Fridenvalds commented how the vacant lot next door to him is designated as open space but also is buildable for a single-family dwelling per the county's website. Doug commented that he negotiated the agreement with the Seattle Water Department and that covered \$30,000 which bought lot 15 which is on the westside of the fish ladder. The rest of them were acquired either through the owner not paying their dues or taxes, or repossessed by state or Sheriff's office sale. Only one lot was bought with Seattle funds. In terms of that is accurate that there is no unbuildable lot as far as a designation, but he believes all of these lots do not have a place where you can put a septic as you have to be 100 feet from water. There is no septic system that you can put in and be less than 100 feet from water. No one wanted to pay taxes and dues on a property that they couldn't put a septic on and that's why we have them. Doug stated that he thinks the community club on sale of lots should go to the community as it's presently written and get approval. Boards come and go but he thinks the community should have a right to say whether that piece of property is going to be sold rather than the board. It might take 6 months. He's been working on his for 15 months for the easement. Krista questioned Doug's statement that these lots aren't buildable because they can't have a septic on them, but if they are able to get a septic on an adjoining property wouldn't that make them buildable? Doug replied yes. Mary asked why these lots were purchased in the first place? Doug said mostly were by default, they were sheriff sales. They have some value for not getting back taxes. They were open space that they could ensure was going to stay there. Mary then asked what is driving this motion to sell these lots that were originally purchased with the idea of being open space? Rick stated that Josh was the one who suggested it and he's not here to represent the idea so Rick would do the best he could. He thinks the idea was that they are just sitting there, we're paying taxes on them, and if we could sell them, we'd be relieved of the taxes, we could get some dues and maybe someone would get some enjoyment out of them even if it's just access to the lake. Angie explained that Josh's motion was not only to sell unused community-owned properties but also easements, so really the motivating factor was the request for sale of easement, and so we wanted to come to the community and ask for your feedback and input

in what direction you would like your board to take when we are approached with offers or requests for easements or sale of property. George commented that the language of the motion sounds like it would transfer a lot of power from the members of the community to the board and he would be personally very much opposed to that for the purposes that he doesn't want his voice muted by a smaller, much weightier voice of the board. What is the benefit to the community as a whole to allow the board to decide rather than going through the proper voting procedure with the community? Juliette added to the backstory that sale of purchase came up when we were dealing with potential of easements which was if we grant an easement and there is damage to property owned by the community, a way to mitigate that is to not own that property and therefore any liability is no longer on us. If somebody has an easement and it causes damage that could be hundreds of thousands of dollars, the homeowners association becomes liable because it's our property. It was trying to propose a solution to not have to worry about the liability because if we transfer the sale of that property to the person who is going to use it as an easement and whatever their purposes are cause damage, we are no longer liable. Rick stated that the second motion is about the easement but this one is about possibly selling. Rick asked do you feel like the club should seek people who would like to buy these things? To put it into context, if it's about \$400 between taxes and dues, that's \$1 per membership. So even if we sold all 5, you're only going to save \$5 per year. *Is it worth the board's time thinking about doing this, is that something we should pursue? A unanimous "No" resounded.*

Rick continued: Occasionally, we get requests to grant an easement through LMCC-owned property. There are numerous examples of easements being granted in the past, but we felt it appropriate to verify member opinion on this practice. The bylaws, covenants, policies say nothing about granting an easement unless there is a change to use. So if there is a change in use or potential for a change in use, then we need 2/3rds vote at a meeting such as this. We don't want to change that. The bylaws do not require a vote of the membership for the granting of an easement through LMCC property where the use of the lot will not be effected. Still, we would like to get your feedback on the concept of granting an easement where, to the best of its ability, the board has determined that such an easement will not alter or modify the use of said real property. Laurell wanted to clarify about where Rick said that you grant an easement and you do not sell an easement. That is correct, you establish the easement. What we are most familiar with is granting easements to public utilities, but there are easements that are between private parties where there is an ongoing expense to that on an annual basis so it's not that there is never money transferring hands. Mary asked what were the prior easements that LMCC has granted? A member suggested that it may be the Cook residence where they live on one parcel and across the street is where their reserve septic is located, to his understanding. We own that lot and that was granted as an easement. It's now completely useless because we have that septic on it. Mary reiterated and added that it was a buildable lot, and if there is one lot that should be sold and get some money from, it would be that one. Mary said that this is a perfect example of why she is saying no to granting any easements through community-owned property unless it's in the already existing 5-foot road easement where utilities are supposed to go. She doesn't really see an example where it could be said that granting of an easement won't change the use of a piece of property. Every time you grant an easement, it always effects the future use of a property. These things need to be taken on a case by case basis. And, the county can already go into the 5-foot easement area and do whatever they want. If you put your own private line in there, when they are doing maintenance, they can rip it out or move it. Chuck Willis said as far as selling, do it. We get rid of the taxes and we get dues. It's a win-win for the community.

*Rick moved that a resolution be adopted that clearly authorizes the board to grant easements on real estate owned by the corporation when, to the best of its ability, the board has determined that such an easement will not alter or modify the long-term use of said real property and, if a short-term change in that use is possible, that any costs resulting from such temporary change of use or the restoration of the Open Space use would be borne by the grantee of the easement.* Paul asked for granting value of an easement, how do we quantify that? Juliette stated so far it has been like \$500. Doug stated that he gave the board a process in valuation for the easement that he is requesting. It is quantifiable and there is a standard process. Rick said one way of doing it is looking at the percentage of the lot that that easement represents and the value of the whole lot and then do some math and you come up with a value \$100 or less depending on the size of the easement. Paul asked if we are revisiting the easement which was requested at last year's meeting? The board answered yes. As there was no second to the motion, it was asked to be repeated. *Art Grabb seconded.* Rick commented that we have an email from Bill Burnstein with King County stating, back taxes would only be due if there was a decision by the owner to withdraw the parcel or removal required due to noncompliance. A temporary disturbance would not trigger removal of a part or the entire property only if the disturbance subsequent maintenance resulted in a permanent impact to the enrolled open space, in which case only the area impacted would really need to be removed. If a disturbed area is returned to natively vegetative conditions, removal would not be necessary. Dan said we have looked at having a hold harmless agreement written into an easement agreement. **The vote was 5 in favor and 43 opposed. The motion fails.**

*Chuck Willis makes a motion to allow the board to sell the property that we own that is worthless. Rick DeBlock seconded.* Dan pointed out that further discussion cannot be undertaken as we've gone past our reservation

time for the meeting room which ended at 5 p.m. Kriss suggested that in the future if there is to be a vote, it needs to be at the top of the agenda. **The vote was 10 in favor and 44 opposed. The motion fails.**

9. Committee Chair Vacancies. Krista Petrova stated: There are committee chair vacancies for Facilities, Grounds & Maintenance Committee, Architectural Control Committee, and co-chair for Community Events Committee. Krista then read a prepared statement from John Gorman, the president: Unfortunately, the time has come that I need to resign my position from the board. I have transferred to a new fire station and the resulting training and requirements no longer afford me the time to commit to the Lake Marcel Board. I have enjoyed my time on the board. Through thick and thin, happy and angry, it has been a great experience. To those of you in attendance, I ask that you step up and accept my challenge to continue to make this a great community. Without the help of volunteers, our community would not function as smoothly. Our events would disappear. Please consider joining the LMCC Board. If time is a concern for you, I ask that you consider helping out at any of our events. You don't need to be a board member to do that. Or maybe join one of our committees, again you don't need to be a board member, just a little of your time. To the board, thank you for time, hard work and commitment. Please continue on and guide our community in the right direction by keeping this a place for all walks of life. As there currently is no vice president, Dan Gutschmidt will be acting president until the board can find a suitable replacement. Sincerely, JW.  
Krista also announced her resignation as board executive secretary and LMCC office manager.
10. Nominations for LMCC Board of Directors (2 open positions, max 15): Angie Ward moved to nominate Laurell Ramirez to the board, seconded by Krista Petrova and Juliette Brown. Passes unanimously. Krista Petrova moved to nominate George Petrov to the board, seconded by Angie Ward. Passes unanimously.
11. New Motions.
12. Community Member Questions/Comments (2-minute time limit): Doug Lapchis presented his easement request, again. He argued that his easement request should not have gone to a vote of two-thirds the membership, as there is no change to the use of the property, and it could just be used as a utility easement. *Juliette Brown interjected (after 3 minutes had passed) that his 2 minutes were up and she moved that we turn down this easement and that we close all further discussion and we no longer waste any more time discussing this. Seconded by George Petrov. The vote was 42 in favor and 6 opposed, passes.*
13. Art Grabb moves to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Juliette Brown. Passes unanimously.