Glastonbury Landowners Association | Board of Directors
Meeting Agenda September 22, 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. **Officer Reports**
    a. President – Zane Curry
    b. Vice-President – Lance Rushmeyer
    c. Treasurer – Debbie Newby
        i. Preliminary reports and August 2026 Treasurer's Report are posted on the GLA website)
        ii. ***Approval of August 2026 Financial Reports (distributed to BOD 9/15/26) – BOD vote***
        iii. 2027 Assessment Statements Change Notice
        iv. Collections update
    d. Secretary – Alicia Roskind-Dearing
        i. Community meeting update
5. **Ombudsmen Reports**
    a. North Glastonbury – Vacant
    b. South Glastonbury – Miriam Barker
6. **GLA Insurance**
    a. GLA General Liability insurance informational update
    b. GLA Director and Officer liability insurance informational update
7. **Committee Reports**
    a. Road Committee
        i. **Committee recommendation on Fall maintenance spending**

1. ***North Glastonbury $24,795.23 funded by utilizing remaining $18,090.23 in 2025 budget and $6,705.00 from NG Road Reserve account, leaving $10,000.00 in NG Road Reserve account. – BOD vote***
2. ***South Glastonbury $50,791.94 funded by utilizing SG Road Reserve account leaving $10,000.00 balance in SG Road Reserve account – BOD vote***
3. ***NG mowing update and BOD vote on Caspari mowing***

b. Finance Committee

i. September meeting adjourned due to lack of quorum

c. PRC Committee

i. No new projects received

d. Governing Documents Committee

i. Legal review update on balloted Bylaw changes

e. Election Committee

i. Update on 2026 election process/progress

ii. ***GLA appointed election observers – BOD vote***

f. Compliance Committee

i. New complaint received Joe Bezotsky re: Jaylyn Jensen property

8. ***O'Connell (NG 5-C) Standing – BOD Vote***
9. ***Eleven parcels deemed Not in Good Standing due to Covenant Violations per 2025 election materials. Discussion and decision re: 2026 election – BOD vote***
10. ***Rule 2.02 finalization – BOD Vote***
11. **Final Landowner Comments**
12. **Adjournment**

Upcoming Meetings:

October 6, 2026 – Road Committee – 6:00 P.M. MST

October 14, 2026 – Project Review Committee - 7:00 P.M. MST

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:

October 27, 2026 6:30 PM MST

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
Tuesday – September 22, 2026 – 6:30 PM
Join Via Zoom or Dial In
Call In: 1-346-248-7799 **Meeting ID:** 619 079 2223 **Passcode:** 2023

Call to Order (6:46pm)

1. Board Members Present - Alicia Roskind Dearing, Debbie Newby, Zane Curry, Jaylyn Jensen, Walter Wunsch, James Timmer, Steve Anderson, Lance Rushmeyer, Scott Stomierowski
Absent with Notice: Scott Stomieroski, Holly Gill, Tyson Wright, Chris Farrar
Absent without Notice:

2. Landowners Present - Val O'Connell, Ron Wortman, James & Leslie Everett, Jewel Wieczorek, Tim Brockett, Miriam Barker, Jack Sutton, Lisa Gaskin, Haylee Hall

3. Landowner Comment on Non-Agenda Items

a. Ron Wortman has lived here for 20 years, in his work history he has served as a reporter for a number of organizations, a couple of them with a membership of 2,000 people, he has served as a secretary for a small city of 2,500. He is less than pleased with what he is seeing captured in the minutes. He does not get a vibe of what went on and who was involved, etc. Alicia explains that she writes the minutes pretty much word for word in what is being said in the meeting, so she is unclear on how to make the minutes any more detailed. She often has to go back and remove things that are not appropriate to be included in the minutes due to the amount of detail she captures. *Ron followed up via email explaining that he was looking at the wrong minutes and he was pleased with the current BOD minutes.*
b. Ron would suggest that any owner of property in this organization that has brought suit against the organization and cost the organization a lot of money due to this, he would like to see these individuals banned from serving on the Board. It is unfair to the landowners who have cost the organization a lot of landowner money that they then get to serve on the Board.
c. Val said that she is a landowner that has previously sued the Board, but she did this because she felt that she had to in order to get the Board to do what they should be legally required to do. She doesn't feel it would be fair to invalidate landowners that have sued the Board. She feels the money being spent by her lawsuit was important for the organization overall and landowners.

4. Officer Reports

a. **President – Zane Curry.** Fire prevention and weed management. While there was a great deal of discussion and beginning efforts made with fire prevention, we did not have as bad a season as some expected. Zane hopes to have the representatives of the fire department present at the Annual Meeting to discuss this further. He also intends to have someone from the MSU Extension in Livingston to be there to discuss how we can address weed management. He would like this Annual Meeting not only to be a platform for what has happened in the past, but also address future items that the GLA can do to address future issues and matters. Zane believes it is not feasible to include roads with 3 or less homes on them to receive fall maintenance. He lives on one of these roads, so he is saying this as someone who would be affected by this. He thinks that the roads that have the highest number of landowners should be prioritized for fall maintenance. For those on roads with fewer homes, he suggests that they band together, come up with things that need to be addressed,

and work together to raise those funds and then the GLA possibly work out a way to match those dollars raised by landowners.

b. **Vice-President – Lance Rushmeyer.** A landowner had a serious accident on one of the GLA roads. Zane said he spoke with the landowner. She said she approached a curve too fast and went off the road. It was a portion of the road that had a sharp turn; she went off the side of the road. She is in the hospital, but she is ok. It was not the fault of the condition of the GLA roads.

c. **Treasurer – Debbie Newby**

   i. **Preliminary reports and August 2026 Treasurer's Report are posted on the GLA website).** The Financial Reports and August Treasurer's Reports are posted on the website at https://www.montanagla.org/financial-reports for future review. Income year to date (YTD) as of 8/31/26 was $171,012 with expenses of $134,503. Net Income, including bank interest earned YTD of $4,882, is $39,720. Net Income YTD is $23,570. There are $106,000 operating funds in Savings at Bank of the Rockies together with the Bank of the Rockies and SunWest checking accounts. An intended $10,000 transfer from SunWest to Bank of the Rockies went the opposite way in August. There has been an offsetting transfer from Sunwest to Bank of the Rockies of $20,000 in September. August assessment fee income was low at $7,254, but the year to date is $141,932 which is 96% of our budget and 89% of assessments invoiced this year.

MOTION: Walter makes the motion to approve the August 2026 Financial reports. Lance seconded.
Discussion: Steve said that he is voting no because even though the values of the community properties have changed to tax valuation rather than market valuation, he still does not believe they should be on our balance sheet, and he will continue to vote no unless those are removed completely.
In Favor: Alicia Roskind Dearing, Debbie Newby, Zane Curry, Jaylyn Jensen, Walter Wunsch, James Timmer, Lance Rushmeyer
Not In Favor: Steve Anderson
Motion Carries.

   ii. **2027 Assessment Statements Change Notice.** These statements were included in the 2026 Ballot Packet stating that the GLA will not be proceeding with printed and USPS mailed assessments for Q2, Q3, and Q4 beginning in 2027. Quarterly statements will continue to be emailed out. Landowners may still pay quarterly, but the landowner will have to keep track of when to pay and how much they owe.

   iii. **Collections update.** Liens of 4 long-term delinquent landowners have been updated this month. She believes demand letters will be sent out to them as well by the attorneys. Zane explains that they will be sent to Debbie for final approval and then be sent out. There is 1 long-term delinquent landowner who was paid in full. 8 payment plans are now in place. She is currently working on 3 other accounts to get payment plans going.

d. **Secretary – Alicia Roskind-Dearing**

   i. **Community meeting update.** Alicia explains that it was unfortunate that the in-person meetup did not occur on Sunday. All of the GLA were prepared to move forward on Saturday, but the NG Teaching Center had already voted as a Board to cancel for Sunday due to potential weather. Because the GLA had moved their time of the meeting to accommodate the NG Teaching Center event, Emigrant Hall was unavailable for the new time, so in lieu of no backup location, we decided to postpone until a day that we could reserve the Emigrant Hall and be sure we could move forward regardless of weather. The

new in-person meetup date is now set for September 27, 2026. This date is set and confirmed regardless of weather and other events. If there is weather, the event will move to Emigrant Hall. The setup of the event will depend on the NG Teaching Center event. If they proceed on Sunday with their picnic, then the GLA will only have a one hour meetup and encourage landowners to join the Teaching Center picnic. If the picnic does not proceed, the GLA meetup will be longer with light refreshments and snacks provided. Zane asks that if landowners plan on attending that please feel free to bring some refreshments or snacks to share with your neighbors. Zane explains that landowners should expect that the GLA will provide some type of refreshments and snacks, but we encourage landowners to also bring something as well for the meetup.

5. Ombudsmen Reports

e. **North Glastonbury – Vacant**

f. **South Glastonbury – Miriam Barker**

6. GLA Insurance

g. **GLA General Liability insurance informational update.** Our general liability insurance was renewed, but our insurance company Key Insurance in Livingston did not send out renewal notice to us, so we had to get it done with a time crunch. The general insurance from the past was showing more than 100 vacant parcels, this amount was incorrect, so once corrected, it allowed our premium to go down after that change was made. One of the things Zane felt was very pertinent, with the help of Jaylyn Jensen, in July 2024 there were questions asked about liability of the GLA in the event of an accident on our roadways. The insurer responsibly refrained from providing any legal advice, but advised that if the GLA was interested in an umbrella policy that that was available at about $1,000 per additional $1,000,000 of coverage. The quote came back with an additional $5,000 for $5,000,000 in incremental coverage. He feels that is substantial given the roadwork that was undertaken to prevent the Board from being sued. We want the roads to be safe, however, being responsible stewards of the GLA, Zane asks the Directors to consider whether or not the GLA should increase our coverage. Until the GLA gets to a point where our assessments allow for reasonable improvements on less travelled roadways, he wants Directors to consider if we should increase our coverage. Lance thinks that over $2,500,000 is excessive and he thinks it would bring more attention to the policy than would be needed for the organization. He believes $1,000,000 is more than enough to cover the GLA. Zane got the quote broken into $1,000,000 increments for Director consideration.

h. **GLA Director and Officer liability insurance informational update.** Zane asked for a quote on Director and Officer insurance. He has not yet received that back. He will share that as soon as he receives it. There was a quote given in August 2024 that was shared today. In August 2024 there was a quote for $500,000 for Director and Officer coverage. Zane explains that it's relatively linear. A $500,000 insurance policy would cost approximately $2,000.The first $2,500 would be out of pocket to the GLA (deductible) and then the insurance policy would kick in after that. This quote is from August 2024, so it is likely this has somewhat changed since then. Leslie Everett explains that it was her understanding that the GLA Directors and Officers were uninsurable. Alicia Dearing states she also thought this was the case and was one of the main reasons she resigned in 2025 due to the risk to Directors to serve on the Board without coverage. Zane said the quote was given to someone on the GLA, but it was never pursued. Lance explains that just because they provided a quote, that does not mean that the underwriters would approve it. Zane explains that in most cases, if an offer is extended it is a policy that would be written.

7. Committee Reports

i. Road Committee

i. Committee recommendation on Fall maintenance spending. The Road Committee met and the Committee is asking the Board to consider the approval of the funds allowing those funds to be available to the Road Committee to spend as they see most appropriate in collaboration with the contractor to allocate the most efficient use of the dollars for those funds. The Committee recommends that the Board approve:

1. North Glastonbury $24,795.23 funded by utilizing remaining $18,090.23 in 2025 budget and $6,705.00 from NG Road Reserve account, leaving $10,000.00 in NG Road Reserve account. The quote for NG outstanding road work as of August 15th is $19,200. $5,200 would be needed to regrade and retool the work that was done in the spring. They also need to look at culverts and Taurus. The estimate is $5,000. The estimate for culverts in NG is $1,000. With that in mind, we will likely have to take Aquarius off of the list of priorities and prioritize Taurus, and then pair back other work to ensure culvert cleaning is addressed. Caspari Way East is in a somewhat of a state of disrepair, but given that there are only three landowners on that road, it may not make sense to prioritize this road. Zane has already spoken to two of three of these landowners, Ryan Kinports and John Carp. They are aware of this situation. Asphalt repair . Randy went out and took a look at Sirius and that is what he feels is necessary for repairs. Jack Sutton has been personally putting down asphalt bags himself. The asphalt on Sirius is getting to the end of its life in general.
2. The Road Committee reviewed Randy's estimates for gravel. $6,705 from road reserves for asphalt at the direction of the road committee. Zane asks that landowners please join the Road Committee meeting if they have strong feelings on where these funds should be allocated.

MOTION: Zane makes the motion to approve the NG asphalt repair to Sirius Rd for $6,705 by Randy Traucht. Walter seconded.

Discussion: Lance feels this is critical before moving to repairs on some of the smaller roads. Jewel asks if there are any repairs slated for Aries or Capricorn. Zane said that Randy drove the asphalt roads and this was all he identified that needed to be done at this time. Zane asks that if there are repairs that landowners feel are necessary on these roads, that they please send photos where they see needs attention and the Road Committee will take it up. Jack states that there is a pothole that is growing and serious right by the soccer field. Zane explains that this has been considered in this quote. Zane asks that if any new needs arise that landowners please bring this to the attention of the Board, and the Board and Committee will act on it promptly.

All in Favor. Motion Carries.

MOTION: Zane makes the motion to approve fall road maintenance to NG roads for $24,795.23 utilizing the remaining 2025 budgeted amount from NG Road Reserve. Lance seconded.

Discussion: Debbie Newby expressed concern about the overall level of 2026 road spending relative to the annual budget and the impact on reserves. Lance and Zane emphasized the long-term cost of continued deferred maintenance and feel this is necessary to prevent even larger amounts being spent in the future. Val O'Connell supported prioritizing roads.

In Favor: Alicia Roskind Dearing, Zane Curry, Walter Wunsch, James Timmer, Lance Rushmeyer
Not In Favor: Steve Anderson, Debbie Newby
Abstain: Jaylyn Jensen, Scott Stomierowski

Motion Carries.

3. **South Glastonbury $50,791.94 funded by utilizing SG Road Reserve account leaving $10,000.00 balance in SG Road Reserve account.** The estimate that came in from Randy of highly necessary road work is $80,000. ins. Zane states, that if you look at the a) the road policy and what is primary b) the number of parcels impacted (the end of Arcturus, Aquila, Leo, Virgo, Libra, Scorpio, Polaris, and Upper Hercules), you're touching a pretty significant number of parcels. Unfortunately, Sagittarius Place and Sagittarius Skyway are likely going to have to wait. However, in the road committee meeting, there was discussion of Skyway, and there are some portions of Skyway—about a 75 to 100 yard stretch—that are in a very significant state of degradation. Zane understands it's a big commitment and big spend, but if we spend less than that, he asks Directors to explain what they feel is appropriate and why. Debbie feels that the Board should have at least a week to know and understand where this money is being allocated by the Road Committee, so she is not comfortable voting on this at this time with no specifics. Zane apologizes for being unable to provide this further in advance, but it was the soonest he could get it out. Zane explains that if we don't approve this tonight, then we either a) have to meet again as a Board or b) take this up via email vote. Alicia asks if there is time for the Board to consider this and vote in the October meeting. Zane explains that snow could come any day now and then it would cause issues for necessary work to be done before winter weather has moved in and then it won't be possible to get it done. Lance asks if the mag chloride did not help the roads to be in better conditions. Zane explains that you can see the difference with how the mag chloride helped in areas that were able to have it applied compared to areas where it was not in our budget to provide it. It's a considerable difference in areas that have mag chloride applied. He feels it does help when we can afford to apply it. Walter feels that the GLA should approve half of what is estimated. Alicia asks the Road Committee members in attendance how they feel about this work being proposed and do they feel it's really appropriate. Zane explains that this was approved by the Road Committee unanimously, except Walter who was absent. Scott and Jack both stated they agree with the cost and that the work needs to be done.

MOTION: Zane makes the motion to approve the SG fall road maintenance of $50,791.94 funded by utilizing SG Road Reserve account leaving $10,000.00 balance in SG Road Reserve account. Lance seconded.
Discussion: Val O'Connell asks Walter why he is suggesting half the amount being proposed. Walter says prudence. She would like to know what we are doing half of and what is being left behind? Walter feels we should only do the most important things. He does not agree with some of the items that Randy is suggesting, and he feels it needs to be reviewed in more detail. Steve feels that this amount does not make sense. Steve lives in South and he feels like even though these roads have the most homes on them and because they do, that they should be expected to put their own money towards these roads rather than the smaller roads with less landowners having to put their money in when they never get any attention. Zane explains that this is up to this amount or less. Even if this is approved, it does not mean it will be spent. Scott is starting to feel that maybe we should delay until after the next Road Committee meeting on October 6th. He likes what is proposed, but he'd like more time to consider it with everything being brought forward at this point, and although he doesn't like the idea of voting via email because it feels like a closed vote, he would like more time for all to consider. He feels like because it's up to this amount, but if the Road Committee reviews on Tuesday

In Favor: Zane Curry, James Timmer, Lance Rushmeyer
Not In Favor: Steve Anderson, Debbie Newby, Alicia Roskind Dearing
Abstain: Jaylyn Jensen, Scott Stomierowski, Walter Wunsch
Motion Failed.

NEXT STEPS: Zane expects all Directors to attend the October 5, 2026 Road Committee meeting so they are prepared to vote promptly via email on October 7th because this work needs to be done.

4. **NG mowing update on Caspari mowing.** The Board approved at the July 2026 meeting for Gregg Sheldon to mow North Glastonbury. Byron Kassing was engaged to mow in SG. Zane followed up multiple times to receive an invoice for this, he still has not provided one, so he is assuming that it's being donated. Gregg Sheldon was approved for the work and he completed it, but we still have not received an invoice. Before it was complete, Tyson Wright sent an email to the Road Committee on how high the grass was on Caspari Way. Tyson asked Gregg to mow it in hopes the Board would reimburse them for paying for the mowing. If the Board did not approve the additional mowing of $100, then Tyson got the go-ahead from fellow neighbors, Doug Gill, to pitch in to cover this additional expense. Zane explains that there is $2,600 in mowing budgeted. We have only spent $900, so Zane feels that it's within the budget to cover the additional $100 for this mowing. Alicia feels that these landowners went ahead and committed to this being mowed without Board approval, so they must be able to cover these funds, it seems like it could be a donation towards their road. Walter agrees that it feels like a donation by these landowners. Scott feels that by approving funds spent by landowners without Board approval sets a bad precedent and creates unrealistic expectations for future GLA Boards to be expected to approve expenses that landowners are willing to take on personally. ***After the meeting it was identified that the mowing budget is actually $500, not $2,600 as stated.*

j. Finance Committee - Debbie Newby
   i. September meeting adjourned due to lack of quorum

k. PRC Committee - Ryan Kinports
   i. No new projects received

l. Governing Documents Committee - Alicia Roskind Dearing
   i. Legal review update on balloted Bylaw changes. Existing counsel was unable to review in the timeframe required to get the ballots out, so they declined. We sought legal advice elsewhere, but the other firms that we spoke with ended up being unable to work with the GLA due to conflicts or requiring us to cut ties with our current counsel. Given that, our current counsel was given more time to review, they said they could complete the review of these documents and they will be able to review the revisions by October 31. They are aware there is a $2,000 spending limit on this review.

m. Election Committee - Zane Curry
   i. Update on 2026 election process/progress. There are several members in NG that have said they have not received their ballots. Zane explains that the Main Print Shop that was

hired to do our mailing, made a mistake when sorting the cells of the address and name sheet, they did not populate the first name correctly. So although their last name and parcel number and address are accurate, the first name is likely wrong. Steph at Main Print Shop sent a very nice apology letter. She has offered a refund, credit and / or a personal letter to all members of the community with a personal apology on her own dime. Zane thinks that with the meeting's intention being grace, that we forgive this error and accept just an apology letter as compensation for the mistake. It's a local, small business. She went above and beyond to get this mailing out and worked over the weekend to get this done in time for us, and it was an honest mistake. They were also significantly less expensive than any other printing companies. He doesn't feel there should be a big penalty. Debbie agrees, but she wonders if that's why some of the landowners have not received their mail. She explains that the Emigrant Post Office has been quite particular lately, and Debbie feels like it could be very possible that they are not being delivered to these landowners due to the wrong first name on the mailing. Zane will go in and ask the people at Emigrant Post Office and Livingston Post Office personally and see if this could be a possibility of why some people did not receive their ballots. ***It was later identified that most NG landowners did not receive the original ballot because if the first name is wrong, the post office will not deliver the mail.*

1. This error was only in NG. It did not happen in SG. Most SG landowners have received their ballots, so the error in name could very well be the problem. All agree with the only penalty being a mailer from Steph with a personal apology.
2. Zane accidentally put on the ballot 4 positions in SG and 3 in NG; this is actually reversed. He also forgot to add the "up to" that was approved at the last BOD meeting. Zane would like to ask that we send an eblast with the correct instructions. The ballot itself is accurate, so it does not affect the actual voting or ballot. The return envelopes that are in the mailing, they have 3 lines in the upper left corner. Both in respect to cost and time, it would not go out in time if the return address had been provided. So in this same eblast we will include instructions and possibly a demo of how to properly mail this. It's not necessary for the mailing, but it would be ideal to have a return address just in case. If a ballot does not have anything in this space, their ballot will not be counted. Alicia feels that we either need to send out a new envelope or send something out via USPS explaining this because not all landowners check their emails. Alicia asks if maybe we can see if Steph could provide this envelope at cost. So the GLA would pay for the envelopes and materials, but Main Street would comp the time due to the mistake. The GLA will send out a new envelope for landowners to use, and Alicia will send out an Eblast first thing tomorrow notifying landowners to either write something in the return area or wait until they receive the new return envelope.

ii. **GLA appointed election observers.** ATS asked that the GLA provide observers for the election processing. The Election Committee recommends that there be one volunteer from NG and one from SG and that the volunteer not be currently up for election and would not be accepting a write-in vote. Linda Kremer, Debbie Newby, and Zane Curry have volunteered for SG. Lance Rushmeyer has volunteered for NG. Debbie said that she would like to remove her name; she is not running for the Board, but she may consider a write-in position.

MOTION: Walter makes the motion that Linda Kremer be the observer for SG. Jaylyn seconded.
AMENDED MOTION: Walter makes the motion that Linda Kremer be the observer for SG with Zane as a backup if Linda is unable to do it. Jaylyn accepted and seconded.
Discussion: Ron asked if there would be some type of training for the observer beforehand. Zane explains that yes, there will be at least one or possibly two dry runs to be sure they are properly prepared. The dry run would be on Oct 22nd. The counting is on November 5th. Ron Wortman volunteered as an observer for NG. Jewel wonders why limit it to one volunteer. What if something comes up and needs backup. Zane thinks it's a great idea and amends the motion.
All in Favor. Motion Carries.

MOTION: Zane makes the motion that Ron Wartman be the observer for NG with Lance Rushmeyer as the secondary. Walter seconded.
All in Favor. Motion Carries.

n. **Compliance Committee**
    i. New complaint received Joe Bezotsky re: Jaylyn Jensen property. Joe Bezotsky has come in in regard to Jaylyn Jensen's property. The Compliance Committee meeting is being scheduled now. One of the four committee members is out of town for the next two weeks, and another one is still figuring out their schedule and when they will be able to join. That will be announced shortly.

8. O'Connell (NG 5-C) Standing. The O'Connells do have a cabin on their property that is closest to the road relative to their primary residence. This project has not gone through a full project review. They did submit an application and paid the fees in association to this project in 2025. These funds have been deposited into the GLA bank account, but were not applied to the O'Connell's account. Zane asked Jack Sutton to come up and take a look at the cabin. Jack said the project is on a foundation. It has no kitchen, no power. It is 74 ft from the easement line on Taurus. It is 60 ft from parcel NG 5D. Generally speaking it does seem like it needs to go through the PRC process. They have submitted the forms, but the calculation of the dollars on it was not accurate. Zane feels that a new form needs to be submitted. Zane feels strongly that it does need to go through the PRC process, and that the PRC should expedite it since they applied in 2025 but nothing has happened and the GLA has been holding their funds. Val believes the cabin is 2,700 sq ft. or less. Jack has it as being larger. Val feels he is wrong. Zane explains that this is exactly why it needs to go through the formal PRC process. Jaylyn asks how it would be qualified because it's larger than a guest house, so how is that going to work with the PRC process? This does not actually require a Board vote because this is in the Governing Documents that this is required to be reviewed. Zane explains that this needs to be prioritized and the Board needs to vote on this so that Val can move forward with her candidacy for a seat on the 2027 Board.

o. **$250 late project application fee.** The O'Connells submitted a check for $1032. They asked that the funds in excess of PR fees on the project be applied to their assessments. It was over $600. That excess should fully cover the late fee of $250.
p. **Standing status as of 9/22/26.** Debbie has a question about a second dwelling assessment on the parcel with the addition of the cabin. When people are building new homes and they are putting new homes on their property, they get a second dwelling assessment as soon as the home is dried in. This cabin does not have a kitchen, but it once was used as a living cabin with a kitchen. Debbie feels that it now qualifies as dried in. Zane explains this is a grey area. In a home that is pre-built, it is inherently dried in. Given that the Board has recently approved removing the second dwelling assessment for a dwelling not having a kitchen, Val could very easily ask tomorrow for the Board to

consider removing this dwelling assessment due to lack of kitchen. Zane asks that Val complete new PRC forms so that they are accurate and updated.

q. Val O'Connell is currently on the 2027 Ballot for GLA Director. It is Zane's understanding that Val was not aware she was not in good standing in the 2025 election. Zane does not have any evidence as to why they were taken out of compliance. So unless we can find evidence as to why that is, then it's only fair to bring her back into compliance. Val explains that the cabin was on wheel, not on a foundation up until the fall of 2025. They have now put the cabin on a foundation, so that is no longer a violation. Val explains that they never wanted the cabin. It was abandoned on their property, but now they have gained 85% ownership of the cabin. That was also an issue in the past until they could prove ownership, which they now can prove. Debbie explains that the litigation amount in regard to the O'Connells is over $33,000 Debbie asked Elena if this balance had been paid, and she said until this point, she does not believe it has been paid nor resolved. Val explains that the GLA sued Val O'Connell's. The GLA lost and the O'Connells had to file bankruptcy. That is now settled. Debbie asks for all of this information to be provided to the Board so the Board can properly understand all of this. Val does not feel any of the Legal fees are due by them. They filed bankruptcy and the court has clarified that they no longer owe this due to the bankruptcy. The GLA sued the O'Connells in December 2019. Zane feels that a lot of information has been provided, and we need more of this information from Val before we can fully consider the matter. All we know now is that the accountants are carrying a line item that says litigation incurred: O'Connells. The GLA sued the O'Connells saying that attorney fees were assessments. The courts found that this was not the case.

9. Eleven parcels deemed Not in Good Standing due to Covenant Violations per 2025 election materials. Discussion and decision re: 2026 election. There were 13 parcels that were Not In Good standing in the 2025 Election. Of those 13, one parcel has been sold, and with no information on what the violation was, we have no way of knowing what these violations are. That leaves us with 12 parcels that are Not In Good Standing per the 2025 Election materials. An email and a certified email was sent to the 2025 Officers asking for this information to be conveyed to the 2026 Board. Zane calls on Tim Brockett, who is on the call, asking if he can provide this information. Tim did not respond. Zane explains that we can either a) contact these parcel owners directly. Zane knows one is in active litigation, so that takes it down to 9 as that owner has 2 parcels. Zane explains that just because there was a legal matter, but that doesn't automatically mean there is a Covenant violation. We need to confirm that there is a Covenant violation. Debbie points out that a Covenant violation is different from owed assessments. The names were just sent to the Board today. Alicia explains that she has more information on at least 4 of these landowners. She will put together that information and send it to the Board.

10. Rule 2.02 finalization.

a. This was an agenda item that was voted on at the August 25, 2026 Board meeting. The Board voted to approve Rule 2.02 pending legal review. Legal got back and said that the Board could make this rule, but there were concerns about some parts of this being challenged. Jaylyn incorporated Legal's guidance and revised the rule so it was more specific. Following Legal's advice Jaylyn:

- Adding greater specificity and clearer definitions.
- Strengthening due-process protections.
- Providing that the GLA will give **15 days' notice** before any Board or committee meeting scheduled to consider the circumstances.
- Allowing the landowner to provide feedback **orally or in writing**.

- Requiring a fair and reasonable process that considers all relevant facts (summarizing Montana code requirements).
- Adding language that takes into consideration the effect and scope of the action, the cost of time/effort/funds, and the kind of interference involved.
- Removing language that allowed the Board to later revisit the determination (per legal advice that a new individualized determination with the same procedural protections would be needed).

b. Zane explains that since the prior vote approved the rule, essentially it has been approved, the vote now would be to accept Jaylyn's changes to it. Zane asks if these revisions to the rule are an overall improvement to the rule. Jaylyn explains that the substance of the rule itself has not changed. There is just more specificity and due process added to ensure it's properly applied across the board. She has simply added more specificity to the rule and added in due process. Due process is already in our Bylaws, but Zane feels it's important that it's re-iterated in the rule. James Timmer asks about where the timeframe came about. Jaylyn explains that was what felt fair. James asked how the attorneys felt about the 3 year time period. Zane clarifies that the prior Rule 2.02 is in effect because the attorneys, Cotner & Blackford, said it is within our power to enforce, but they made suggestions to make the rule stronger. Jaylyn incorporated those comments and has revised the rule.

Updated Rule 2.02 - Violations of Covenant 10.01 - Any landowner found to be Not in Good Standing for violating **Covenant 10.01, Association's Authority,** as a result of impeding the process of an incoming Board's transition from the preceding year, through the withholding of requested information whether electronic or physical including financial records (budgets, payment plans; notices of liens and legal actions; source templates for all of these, etc.), election records, lien records, landowner records and correspondence; and/or internal correspondence, between board and committee members; the physical or electronic control and log-in information relating to the GLA website, telephone administration, email address; and any historical information related to website content, legal records, property review records, road work records (contracts, agreements, emails, etc.), landowner covenant violation records (violation type, date of Board determination, etc.), shall incur all the restrictions of such standing stated within GLA Governing Documents for a minimum of three (3) years and until such time that any legal fees or expenses incurred by the GLA to pursue the requested information is paid back to the GLA.

In compliance with Montana Code Annotated, Section 35-2-520, the GLA must provide 15-day notice of an official Board and/or committee meeting scheduled to consider the circumstances surrounding a proposed suspension and where Landowners shall be provided the opportunity to be heard orally or in writing. The GLA must use a fair and reasonable process that considers all relevant facts and circumstances and provide at least five (5) days' written notice before the suspension becomes effective.

Throughout the decision-making process, the Board shall take into consideration the effect and scope of the actions taken. The cost in terms of time, effort and funds of the Association to deal with actions of interference and obstruction, and the inconvenience and confusion to Landowners in communicating and dealing with the Association.

The Association may extend the suspension, following a new individualized determination and the same procedural protections listed above.

MOTION: Jalyn makes the motion to approve the modified Rule 2.02 with revised language incorporating legal advice, replacing the original approved Rule 2.02. Debbie seconded.

Discussion:

In Favor: Alicia Roskind Dearing, Zane Curry, Walter Wunsch, James Timmer, Lance Rushmeyer, Debbie Newby, Jaylyn Jensen, Scott Stomierowski
Not In Favor: Steve Anderson
Motion Carries.

11. Final Landowner Comments

a. Val states that in the past when a landowner is asking questions, there was a time limit, it is the Board timing the landowner response. Zane explains that it's stated that there is a time limit of 2-3 minutes, but we are very liberal with that time. The only time that landowners have been cut off when it's clear the comment is going to create a back and forth between landowners and Director or landowner and landowner.

MOTION: Lance makes the motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:15pm. Alicia seconded.
All in Favor. Motion Carries.

Email Votes Sept 8 - Sept 22, 2026

Motion: Motion to approve the attached ballots for North Glastonbury and South Glastonbury.

Date(s): Sept 11, 2026 - Sept 14, 2026

Motion Made By: Zane Curry
Motion Seconded By: Debbie Newby

Specific Actions Taken:

Approved ballots will be shipped to all landowners on September 15, 2026

Discussion:

Zane: "Pay particular attention to the manner in which the Boards' decisions during the 9/8/2026 meeting have been addressed in respect to these two ballots. There is language related to Val O'Connell (NG) and Tim Brockett (SG) that has been drafted to fairly/equitably inform all Member Interests of what options/solutions are available related to those two candidates who did submit timely and complete nomination packets. Please note that these will have been delivered to the Main Print Shop no later than open of business on Monday 9/14 for ballot mailings to go out in a timely manner on 9/15."

Alicia: "As I recall, we discussed keeping everyone who was not-in-good standing out of compliance for 2026, but given that we do not have clarity on why or how they are not in good standing, that we opted rather to do more fact finding. I have no record of a vote or motion about voting them out of compliance, because I don't think we actually voted on it. I think we just discussed it, and then there was a motion to do more fact finding instead. Unfortunately the recording kept dropping on Tuesday, so I don't think we have the full recording of when that was discussed. I've attached the draft minutes that I took in real time, and I have never missed an entire vote. Maybe some wording, but not a whole vote. I don't see this vote in here. We rather voted to wait and get more information from 2025 officers. I have highlighted this part of the meeting in Green. In this case, I think we should air on the side of keeping Val on the ballot until we can confirm she is not in good standing. If we find she is not, her votes would not be counted. I don't feel it's fair to keep her out of compliance and off the ballot without clarity that she is in fact not in good standing. She has been working hard this year to make sure she was in compliance, so I would like to know 100% that she is out of compliance if we are going to keep her off the ballot. Please review the minutes and even the recording to see if I am missing something, or maybe you see where I'm missing something here.

I would like to amend the motion to include Val on the ballot until we can confirm she is not in good standing. I feel it is cut-and-dry with Tim since we clearly voted on him ourselves, so we know he is indeed not in good standing."

Zane: "Without listening to the recording, I am thinking Alicia may be correct. I do not have notes confirming the Board made the same motion the Election Committee recommended. I know I did make a motion to get information from 2025 Officers that passed.

At this time I will agree with Alicia on leaving Val on the ballot -- unless we have definitive information or a vote that we in fact did pass that motion."

MOTION AMENDMENT: Approval of the NG & SG Ballot Packets including Val O'Connell as a candidate until there is definitive information about her Not-In-Good standing from 2025.

Action Director Count: 12

In Favor: Zane Curry, Alicia Dearing, Tyson Wright, James Timmer, Christine Farrar, Debbie Newby, Scott Stomierowski, Jaylyn Jensen,
Not In Favor: Steve Anderson
Abstain:
No Response: Holly Gill, Walter Wunsch, Lance Rushmeyer

Motion Count: 8-1-0-3 (In favor / Not in Favor / Abstain / No Response)

Motion Vote: Motion Carries.

Motion: I motion to approve 1) August 25 and 2) September 8 GLA BOD Meeting Minutes.

Date(s): Sept 22, 2026 - Sept 25, 2026

Motion Made By: Alicia Roskind Dearing
Motion Seconded By: Zane Curry

Specific Actions Taken:

Alicia will post the approved minutes to the GLA website.

Discussion:

Action Director Count: 12

In Favor: Zane Curry, Alicia Dearing, Lance Rushmeyer, Christine Farrar, Debbie Newby, Scott Stomierowski, Jaylyn Jensen, Steve Anderson
Not In Favor:
Abstain:
No Response: Holly Gill, Walter Wunsch, Tyson Wright, James Timmer

Motion Count: 8-0-0-4 (In favor / Not in Favor / Abstain / No Response)

Motion Vote: Motion Carries.

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.