

By-Laws & Resolutions Advisory Committee
July 9, 2021
Microsoft Teams

Present: Chair Jim Trummel and committee members Bob Hillegass, Lora Pangratz and Lisa Romersa and Board Liaison Camilla Rogers. Also, present was Josh Davis, OPA Marketing and Public Relations Director. Chair Jim Trummel called the meeting to order at 1:03 PM.

The agenda was approved.

The minutes of the June 4, 2021 meeting were approved.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

C-04 (By-laws and Resolutions Advisory Committee) status: The revision to this resolution was at first reading at the June 16, 2021 Board meeting. There were no comments.

ARC section 5.13(h): The chair reviewed the Microsoft Teams meeting with Association counsel Jeremy Tucker regarding this By-laws item. Mr. Tucker will provide a suggested revision to the current By-laws provision. An email summary of this meeting is attached to these minutes.

Maximum votes that can be cast sections 4.07(c)(2), 4.07(c)(3) and 4.03: The chair reviewed a previously distributed analysis of the history of relevant provisions and the current By-laws which is attached to these minutes. In discussion of this topic there was emphasis on this being a policy decision. The committee decided to accept a revision to indicate that the required number of petition signatures is to be based on the number of votes in the Association at the time a petition is filed. The decision is interim and will be subject to a later vote as the By-laws effort continues.

Search Committee sections 5.02(b) and (c): The committee has received responses from the Elections Committee, Search Committee and Communications Advisory Committee regarding the future of the Search Committee. A summary of the responses is attached. After a discussion of the responses, it was decided to proceed with considering a revision to the By-laws that would eliminate the Search Committee. Lisa Romersa, assisted by Board liaison Camilla Rogers, will develop a draft for consideration by the committee.

Eligibility to vote sections 3.04(c) and 4.07(a): These sections are being considered because of questions related to the eligibility of a candidate applicant for a past election to the Board. The issue was the 35-day provision in 3.01(c). Note: The agenda topic incorrectly referenced sections 3.04(c) and 4.07(c). There was a discussion of how to clearly express eligibility to vote. The chair will draft a clarifying provision for the committee to consider.

Super majority section 4.08(c): The background for this topic was discussed. The purpose of the suggested revision is to avoid Association governance decisions made by members' votes to be by a minority of members. The revision would require a minimum number of eligible votes to be cast in favor of a proposed action in order for the action to be implemented. A spreadsheet tally of referendum voting for 5 referendums since 2005 was reviewed and is attached to these minutes. The topic was discussed, but further consideration was deferred to a future meeting.

Additional review sections: The chair reported receiving two requests for consideration in revising the By-laws:

- a. Committee membership section 10.02: Attendees at the Executive Council (committee chairs) meeting May 26, 2021 requested that consideration be given to permitting Associate members to be members of committees.
- b. Director removal section 5.12(a)(4): An Association member has requested that consideration be given to reducing the requirements for removal of a director by the Association membership.

These two requests were discussed in order to provide background information for future consideration. The two items were deferred to future meetings. The background information that was discussed is attached.

NEW BUSINESS:

There was a discussion of the schedule for future meetings. It was decided to proceed with meetings schedule of July 23, 2021, August 6, 2021 and August 20, 2021. Each meeting would be by Microsoft Teams.

GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT REVIEW:

The Camilla Rogers reported that Board review responses for resolutions B-07, F-02, F-03, M-05 and M-07 are still pending and there will be further followed-up.

C-06 Communications Advisory Committee: The committee has reported that a revision is being prepared.

F-04 Delinquent Assessments: The committee received the 2021 annual review required by resolution F-04. The committee had previously expressed concern that the report had not been accomplished in prior years. Receipt of the report concluded the periodic review of F-04.

The Governance Document Review was updated and is attached to these minutes.

Bob Hillegass moved that the meeting be adjourned and the motion was seconded by Lisa Romersa. The meeting was adjourned at 3:27 PM on a unanimous vote.

Jim Trummel
Minutes Recorder

Jim and LouAnn Trummel <jetlat@verizon.net>

To: Robert Hillegass, Keith Kaiser, Lora Pangratz, Lisa Romersa, Camilla Rogers

Cc: James Trummel

Thu, Jun 24 at 12:48 PM

I met with Jeremy Tucker, OPA counsel, this morning by Microsoft Teams to discuss the By-laws issue of Section 5.13(h) and the authority of the Board regarding ARC(ECC).

Mr. Tucker is going to provide us with suggested wording for 5.13(h). Although the current provision is a standard or common by-laws provision regarding committees, in the context of OPA and our governing documents (DR's in particular), it is imprecise and can lead to confusion.

Specific points from the meeting:

*The Board does not have authority to intervene in ARC decisions or hear appeals. However, there is an exception in later section DR's where a right of appeal does exist and has to be recognized.

*The Board does have the right to approve the ARC Guidelines.

*The Board can set criteria for ARC membership and general committee procedural provisions that do not limit ARC decisions. This Board can also set length of terms, term limits and other committee considerations such as are in resolution C-01.

Some other interesting comments: (these comments are in my words as I understood Jeremy)

The authority given to ARC(ECC) in the DR's is common among HOA's and in many ways preferred. The approach is based on appointing persons who can be expected to be attentive to their responsibilities. It is expected that a committee like an ARC/ECC would act professionally and consistent in performing its duties. The committee authority is intended to avoid instances in which a board, not being involved in the decision process as fully as a committee would, could make inconsistent decisions, or perhaps even decisions based on a degree of favoritism. If a committee is not showing due regard for covenants (in the case of OPA, the DR's) or established guidelines, the board should act aggressively with regard to retaining committee members.

Jeremy gave an interesting example (not OPA) of a committee approving a privacy fence that went across the front of the property although the covenants/guidelines for a privacy fence do not allow across the front of the property. The owner had the fence constructed as approved. The board is now faced with "what do we do now? can the association sue the owner based on an unauthorized approval"? (decisions to be determined)

Jim

MAXIMUM NUMBERS OF VOTES

June 18, 2021

Background

At the 2019 annual meeting of Ocean Pines Association, member petition was filed to amend the By-laws. The proposed amendment, if approved, would revise the Section 5.13(d)(1) 20% expenditure authorization to 10%. The petition was referred to the Association counsel for advice regarding whether it met the requirements of a valid petition as specified in Sections 4.07(a) and 4.07(c)(2) of the By-laws. It was the advice of counsel that the petition did meet the number of signature requirements of 4.07(c)(2), but not the requirement of 4.07(a) that the proposal be suitable for an affirmative or negative response. On the basis of counsel's advice, the petition was rejected as not valid. Legal action, initiated by the Petitioner, was successful and the proposal went to referendum as written in the petition.

Section 4.07(c)(2) of the By-laws was applicable to the filed petition and it reads as follows:

(2) For issues for referendum under Section 4.08, removal of a Director under Section 5.12(a), or for amendments to the By-laws under Section 11.01, a petition requires signatures representing at least ten percent (10%) of the maximum number of votes that can be cast.

The phrase "...maximum number of votes that can be cast." Is not further defined in the By-laws or other governing documents of the Association. The phrase is also used in Sections 4.03 and 4.07(c)(3).

In the advice regarding the validity of the petition, it was counsel's opinion that the "...maximum number of votes that can be cast..." "was 10% of those votes eligible to be cast on the day the petition was filed. It was determined that the number of votes eligible to be cast the day the petition was filed was 7688 with the required 10% being 769. The petition contained 808 valid signatures. The number of signatures required was not contested by the Association.

Voting data published for director elections and referendums commonly refers to the number of eligible votes as determined by the 35 days prior to voting deadline provision of Section 3.04(c). The number of total votes within the Association, without regard to eligibility, is not normally published. Although the number of lots shown in annual budgets is sometimes used as the number of votes in the Association, an exact number would have to be provided from Association membership records. For examples of published voting data, refer to Election Reports by the Elections Committee which are posted on the Association website.

By-laws Work Group

The By-laws Work Group took note of the fact that the interpretation of the signature requirement was based on counsel's opinion and recommended that the By-laws provision be clarified for any future petitions. There have been some public comments by others regarding a possible interpretation different from that of counsel. The Work Group has proposed a clarifying revision to the maximum number of votes that can be cast which is based on the total number of votes in the Association, without regard to eligibility at any given day in the fiscal year.

By-laws History

The Board of Directors adopted a complete revision of the By-laws on July 28, 1982. From that date until the referendum approval of revised By-laws on August 9, 2008, the By-laws provisions applicable to petitions were as follows (bold emphasis is added):

“Section 4.09. Referendum Issues. Issues for referendum action may be proposed by the Board of Directors or by the filing with the Secretary of the Association of a petition signed by voting members in good standing representing at least ten percent (10%) **of the total voting units.**”

Notes: this is only a partial copy of the then 4.09. The section continuous on with details regarding the process of going to referendum. The definition of members in good standing was used to identify members eligible to vote.

“Section 1.07. The term **“Voting Unit”** shall mean and refer to each residential lot, condominium unit or single-family attached dwelling owned by a voting member of the Association.”

The terms “Voting Unit” and “Member in Good Standing” were deleted from the August 9, 2008 By-laws. Although not copied here, Voting Unit was replaced by a definition of “Member” which made reference to the Charter and Declarations of Restrictions for establishing voting privileges instead of only listing specific residential dwelling categories.

Comment: If the 2019 petition had been evaluated under the By-laws existing prior to August 9, 2008, the required number of signatures would have been 10% of all votes in the Association without regard to eligibility at the time the petition was filed. The question to be answered is whether there is reason to believe the change in language to “maximum number of votes that can be cast” was intended to revise the number of signatures required. There is available a “Summary of Proposed By-Laws Revisions” published May 2008. The “Summary” included the following explanations for revisions applicable to petitions.

a. The deletion of Voting Unit was acknowledged as a term no longer used. The expansion of the term “Member” to include all voting privileges was acknowledged without further explanation. Although not specifically stated, the expanded Member definition effectively replaced Voting Unit.

b. Petition provisions were taken from other sections and consolidated into 4.07, however, nothing is said about a revision to the number of signatures required for a valid petition.

Current By-laws (2008 revised)

There are eleven (11) provisions in the By-laws in which Association members can either participate in the governance of the Association or in which membership is an element in governance. Nine (9) of these provisions expressly require an eligibility to vote in order to be effective. The two provisions which do not include eligibility to vote refer to the “maximum votes that can be cast”.

- a. Section 3.03(c): When a member submits a proxy the member’s eligibility to vote shall be confirmed.
- b. Section 3.04: Voting for director or referendum is by ballots cast by members eligible to vote.
- c. Section 3.05: In order to constitute part of the required quorum and be able to vote at a members’ meeting, the member must be eligible to vote.
- d. Section 4.05: Specifies the number of eligible to vote members required to constitute a quorum at meetings of members.
- e. Section 4.07(a): Specifies that signatures on petitions must be those of members eligible to vote.
- f. Section 5.01: In order to serve as a director, a member must be eligible to vote.
- g. Section 5.02(a): A candidate for director must be eligible to vote.
- h. Section 5.02(b): Search Committee members must be eligible to vote.
- i. Section 10.02: Committee members must be eligible to vote.

j. Sections 4.07(c)(2) and (c)(3): The number of signatures required for a valid petition is based on the “maximum number of votes that can be cast”. There is no reference to members eligible to vote.

k. Section 4.03: The number of signatures required on a members’ petition to call for a special meeting of members is based on the “maximum number of votes that can be cast”. There is no reference to members eligible to vote.

Petition Filing Date

Section 4.07(c) provides that for a petition to be a valid petition it must contain the required number of signatures when filed with the Secretary. If the required number of signatures is based on the number of eligible votes on the day of filing, that number progressively increases throughout the fiscal year as the number of eligible votes increases. With eligible votes as the basis for the number of signatures, it would be advantageous for the petitioner to file a petition as early as practical in the fiscal year.

Summary

a. A search of Maryland statutory law and case law did not disclose any reference that would be of assistance in interpreting “...the maximum number of votes that can be cast.”, In advising the Board on the required number of signatures for there to be a valid petition, the Association counsel referred to an earlier advice on eligibility to vote in determining the sufficiency of a Board candidate application. No reference was made to statutory or case law.

b. Interpreting “maximum number of votes that can be cast” as those votes eligible when a petition is filed does not adequately consider the continuity of by-laws provisions unless there is a clear intent to revise. In addition, it requires an imposition of eligibility on two membership references in the By-laws when all other such references to governance expressly have an eligibility requirement.

c. As a policy decision, the By-laws could be revised to make it clear that the basis for the required number of petition signatures for a valid petition is eligible votes when the petition is filed. However, that would fail to recognize that the By-laws equally apply to all members and not just members eligible to vote at any given time. Clarifying the provision to remove eligibility to vote would link the number of required signatures to the entire membership.

Proposal

The By-laws Work Group has proposed that Sections 4.07(c)(2) and 4.07(c)(3) be revised by adding the bold emphasis to 4.07) (c)(2) and (3) as indicated below. The intent of this proposal is to remove consideration of eligibility to vote from the determination of the number of signatures required for a valid petition. The vote references in 3.01(a) include all votes within the Association.

Although this discussion has been principally about revising the petition provisions of 4.07(c)(2) and (3), Section 4.03 should be considered for the same revision.

The proposal is consistent with historical By-laws provisions regarding petitions. It is also consistent with the By-laws expressly stating when voting eligibility is a requirement in governance actions involving Association membership. The “maximum votes that can be cast” provisions do not refer to voting eligibility.

(2) For issues for referendum under Section 4.08, removal of a Director under Section 5.12(a), or for amendments to the By-laws under Section 11.01, a petition requires signatures representing at least ten percent (10%) of the maximum number of votes that can be cast **as referenced in Section 3.01(a).**

(3) To call a special meeting of members under Section 4.03, a petition requires signatures representing at

least fifteen percent (15%) of the maximum number of votes that can be cast **as referenced in Section 3.01(a).**

Jim Trummel

SEARCH COMMITTEE INPUT REQUESTS

Updated July 2, 2021

Requests for input regarding effectiveness of the Search Committee

Communications Advisory Committee comment on the following is requested:

1. Does the Communications Advisory Committee see a role for itself in the search process for Association board of directors candidates?
2. If a Search Committee did not exist (By-laws Sections 5.02(b) and (c)), and the responsibilities were not transferred to another committee, would the Communications Advisory Committee consider accepting search responsibility? If so, would that include person to person search contact? Resolution M-09 Candidate Search Process for OPA Board Elections provides instructions for the search process.
3. Any other comments on the candidate search process.

Communications Advisory Committee response

Today the Communications Advisory Committee discussed the 3 questions posed to us at our meeting. The committee answers the questions as follows:

#1 The committee sees it's role as communicating a reminder of the time requirements.

#2 & #3 The committee believes if the Search Committee did not exist or even if it continues, that adding another module to the Resident's Academy describing the process of becoming a candidate for the Board, as well as what to expect if elected, could be a valuable tool for encouraging residents. That would be the role our committee sees us providing.

Cheryl

Elections Committee comment on the following is requested.

1. Would the Elections Committee consider combining the election process and candidate search function under one committee to be an acceptable Association governance policy?
2. Would the Elections Committee, as currently comprised, be staffed to assume the Search Committee functions of By-laws Sections 5.02(b) and (c) and the provisions of resolution M-09 Candidate Search Process for OPA Board Elections.
3. If the Elections Committee believes that combining Elections and Search would be acceptable, but not as currently formed, what By-laws or resolution amendments would be necessary?
4. Any other comments relative to the search function I the election process?

Elections Committee thoughts on possible merging of Search and Elections Committees

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our thoughts on the possible merger of the Search and Elections Committees.

SUMMARY: Elections Committee (EC) feels the merger would be inappropriate and possibly impact the appearance of independence.

Upon reflection, the two committees serve very different populations with different objectives. Search Committee (SC) talks with a wide range of people and discusses many different topics with various people. EC only deals with candidates

that have been vetted by the Association Secretary. EC scrupulously tells all candidates the same information at the same time so that no candidate has more information or learns something before other candidates.

It seems reasonable to project that some (perhaps those who lose an election) might assert that other candidates were given information early in the process and therefore the election was tainted. The EC works diligently to ensure the election is administered fairly for all candidates.

It is also possible that a combined Search and Elections Committee could be seen as favoring a candidate due to their encouragement to possible candidates being misconstrued as helping a candidate. Other candidates might see the merged committee as having “favorites”, a possibility we should guard against.

Encouraging members to run for a Director position is a fundamental job for the existing BOD. That alone might explain the challenge of finding members for Search Committee.

EC suggests that a possible action might be to produce a video on the OP Academy series about “Considerations for running for the Board” or something similar.

Prepared by: Steve Habeger, Chairperson, Elections Committee

Search Committee comment on the following is requested:

1. Is the Search Committee, as a separate governing document committee, effective and necessary in encouraging Association members to be candidates for the Board of Directors?
2. What amendments, if any, to the By-laws would make the search function more effective? In particular, do the following By-laws provisions contribute to the effectiveness of the search function?
 - a. The one-year term of committee members.
 - b. That a potential candidate is to receive an application form from the Search Committee.
 - c. The Search Committee to provide a list of candidates to the Secretary.
 - d. The Search Committee to attempt to acquire at least two candidates more than the number of vacancies.
3. Any other comments on the Search Committee and the search process.

Summary of comments from 2021 OPA Search Committee (SC) Report

1. Recommended that the Search Committee be deleted: membership recruitment is difficult and can be expected to continue to be difficult.
2. Eliminate Search Committee as an intermediary for candidate applications (section 5.02(c))
3. Delete the less than two more than candidates than vacancies provision in 5.02(e) because of no historical use.
4. Communications Advisory Committee could assist staff in distributing information regarding becoming a candidate for the Board.

referendum	total votes in association	total votes eligible	total yes votes	total no votes	total votes	% returned of eligible votes	yes votes as % of eligible	yes votes as % of total in association	comments	
Steen Homes Gum Point Road 9/14/2002	7649	7435	2611	2600	5211	70%	35%	34%	Approved. Status uncertain; development has not been started	
Community Center Southgate 8/13/2005	8098	7855	2560	2346	4906	62%	33%	32%	Approved but litigation canceled project.	
By-laws major revision 8/9/2008	8427	7500	2122	804	2926	39%	28%	25%	Approved	
Yacht Club rebuild 9/7/2012	8446	7698	3432	1641	5073	66%	45%	41%	Approved. Project was completed.	
By-laws expenditure amendment 5/14/2021	8452	8114	2531	1358	3889	48%	31%	30%	Approved	
<u>Notes</u>										
1. The total votes in association is the number of lots in the fiscal year of the referendum. It is taken from past budget records.										
2. The eligible votes for Steen Homes and the By-laws expenditure amendment are actuals. The others are best estimates based on available data. Note: The actual eligible votes number for the Yacht Club rebuild was found after the distribution of this spreadsheet and is entered above. However, the difference is 10 votes (7698 actual vs 7688 estimated) and is insufficient to change the calculated % data.										
3. All yes, no and total votes are actuals.										
4. All percents are rounded to the next higher whole number without decimal in order to not imply a greater degree of accuracy than justified.										
5. The yes votes as a % of eligible votes is for use in considering the Work Group proposal for adding a supermajority requirement to the approval of a referendum proposal.										
6. The yes votes as a % of total in association is just a variation of Note 5 for comparison purposes.										

NOTE: The below highlighted areas denotes the updates/changes made at the 7/9/2021 meeting by the C-04 Committee Members.

**Ocean Pines Association
By-Laws and Resolution Advisory Committee**

Governance Document	Effective Date	Last Review Date	Scheduled Review Date	Comments
By-Laws <i>Responsible: Board</i>	8/9/2008	Aug-08	TBD	7/9/21, Currently in the review process by the By-laws Work Group and the By-laws and Resolutions Committee.
Articles of Amendment and Restatement <i>Responsible: Board</i>	4/24/2013	Apr-13	TBD	
Declaration of Restrictions <i>Total Number on File 33</i> <i>Responsible: Board</i>				<i>Note: For informational purposes, the OPA has total of 33 Declaration of Restrictions on file.</i>
Snow Hill Depository <i>Responsible: Board</i>			Jun-19	
Board Resolutions				
B-01 Book of Resolutions <i>Responsible: Board</i>	1/4/2020	Jan-20	Jan-22	
B-02 Rules of Order for Board Meetings <i>Responsible: Board</i>	11/19/2008	Oct-18	Oct-20	4/2/21-The review of this resolution placed on hold until after the review completion of the other "B" series resolutions noted below.
B-03 Meetings of Association Members <i>Responsible: Board</i>	11/19/2008	Nov-18	Oct-20	4/2/21-The review of this resolution placed on hold until after the review completion of the other "B" series resolutions noted below.
B-04 Agenda Development for Board Meetings <i>Responsible: Board</i>	1/27/2018	Jan-18	Oct-20	4/2/21-The review of this resolution placed on hold until after the review completion of the other "B" series resolutions noted below.
B-05 Conflicts of Interest <i>Responsible: Board</i>	11/19/2008	Oct-18	Oct-20	4/2/21-On hold continues. Under review by a Board Work Group. Note: B-05 and B-08 lists Conflicts of Interest topics differently. These differences need to be reviewed and reconciled.
B-06 Indemnification Policy <i>Responsible: Board</i>	11/19/2008	Oct-18	Oct-20	4/2/21-The review of this resolution placed on hold until after the review completion of the other "B" series resolutions noted below.
B-07 Petitions <i>Responsible: Board</i>	11/19/2008	Oct-18	Oct-20	6/4/21, C-04 Chair referred the resolution document to the C-04 Board Liaison for Board review. 7/9/21, Currently in the review process.
B-08 Director Ethics & Conduct <i>Responsible: Board</i>	7/27/2018	Jul-18	TBD	On 6/21/21 the Board voted unanimously to repeal this resolution. Potential revisions of remaining "B" series resolutions are now under review.
Committee Resolutions				
C-01 Committee General <i>Responsible: Board</i>	9/9/2020	Sep-20	Sep-22	
C-02 Architectural Review Committee <i>Responsible: C-02 Chair</i>	5/2/2020	May-20	May-22	
C-03 Budget and Finance Advisory Committee <i>Responsible: C-03 Chair</i>	10/10/2018	Oct-18	Oct-20	In March 2021, C-04 Chair contacted the C-03 Chair to advise this Resolution is due for review. 6/4/21, No response, C-04 Chair to follow-up with the C-03 Chair. 7/9/21 Review in Process.
C-04 By-Laws and Resolutions Advisory Committee <i>Responsible: C-04 Chair</i>	10/20/2018	Oct-18	Oct-20	6/21/21, Board held first reading of pending changes without comments. Second reading is scheduled for the 7/27/21 Board Meeting.
C-05 Clubs (Food & Beverage) Advisory Committee <i>Responsible: C-05 Chair</i>	10/20/2018	Oct-18	Oct-20	<i>This Advisory Committee was suspended by the BOD at the 9/9/2020 Board meeting.</i>
C-06 Communications Advisory Committee <i>Responsible: C-06 Chair</i>	10/20/2018	Oct-18	Oct-20	In March 2021, C-04 Chair contacted the C-06 Chair to advise this Resolution is due for review. In April, C-06 Chair advised they are reviewing several possible changes. 6/4/21, C-06 Chair requested more meeting time to complete their work. 7/9/21, C-04 Chair suggested they forward the Red-line copy to the Board for the first reading.
C-07 Strategic Plan Advisory Committee <i>Responsible: C-07 Chair</i>	1/27/2018	Jan-18	Jan-20	In March 2021, C-04 Chair contacted the C-07 Chair to advise this Resolution is due for review.
C-08 Elections Committee <i>Responsible: C-08 Chair</i>	10/10/2018	Oct-18	Oct-20	6/4/21, On hold until completion of the 2021 Election Report.
C-09 Executive Council Committee <i>Responsible: Board President</i>	5/20/2009	Sep-17	Sep-21	
C-10 Environment and Natural Assets Advisory Committee <i>Responsible: Chair C-10</i>	10/27/2017	Mar-19	Mar-21	In March 2021, C-04 Chair contacted the C-10 Chair to advise this Resolution is due for review. 6/4/21, No response, C-04 Chair to follow-up with the C-10 Chair.

COPY UPDATED ON: 7/9/2021 - For review at the next C-04 By-Laws Resolutions Advisory Committee Meeting Scheduled for 7/23/2021

Page 1 of 2

NOTE: The below highlighted areas denotes the updates/changes made at the 7/9/2021 meeting by the C-04 Committee Members.

**Ocean Pines Association
By-Laws and Resolution Advisory Committee**

Governance Document	Effective Date	Last Review Date	Scheduled Review Date	Comments
				7/9/21, No response, C-04 Chair to follow-up with the C-10 Chair.
C-11 Golf Advisory Committee <i>Responsible: C-11 Committee Chair</i>	5/2/2020	Feb-20	Feb-22	
C-12 Marine Activities Advisory Committee <i>Responsible: C-12 Committee Chair</i>	5/20/2009	Jul-17	Jul-19	6/4/21, C-04 Chair will contact the C-12 Chair to obtain status of review by our 7/9/21 meeting. 7/9/21, No response, C-04 Chair to follow-up with the C-12 Chair.
C-13 Recreation and Parks Advisory Committee <i>Responsible: C-13 Committee Chair</i>	10/10/2018	Oct-18	Oct-20	In April 2021, C-04 Chair to contact the C-10 Chair to advise this Resolution is due for review. 6/4/21, No response, C-04 Chair to follow-up with the C-13 Chair. 7/9/21, No response, C-04 Chair to follow-up with the C-13 Chair.
C-14 Racquet Sports Advisory Committee <i>Responsible: C-14 Committee Chair</i>	12/19/2020	Dec-20	Dec-22	This Advisory Committee was reinstated by the BOD at the 12/17/2020 Board Meeting. The Committee will operate as defined in the Board Approved, Resolution C-14.
C-15 Aquatics Advisory Committee <i>Responsible: C-15 Committee Chair</i>	10/10/2018	Oct-18	Oct-20	4-2-21-On hold pending resumption of Committee Meeting. 7/9/21, C-04 Chair to advise the C-03 Chair that this Resolution is due for review.
Financial and Budgetary Resolutions				
F-01 Investment Guidelines <i>Responsible: Board</i>	3/24/2016	May-18	May-20	
F-02 Annual Budget Development <i>Responsible: Board</i>	11/19/2008	May-18	May-20	Request was sent in April 2021. 6/4/21, Board Liaison to follow-up with Board for status report by our 7/9/21 meeting.
F-03 Financial Reserve Accounts <i>Responsible: Board</i>	10/17/2020	Oct-20	Jun-21	Request was sent in April 2021. Is Drainage a separate Reserve Fund? 6/4/21, Board Liaison to follow-up with Board for status report by our 7/9/21 meeting.
F-04 Delinquent Assessments <i>Responsible: Board</i>	6/1/2019	May-21	May-21	
General and Administrative Resolutions				
M-01 Compliance Procedures <i>Responsible: Board</i>	5/2/2020	May-20	Jul-21	
M-02 Amenity Policies <i>Responsible: Board</i>	11/2/2019	Nov-19	Nov-21	
M-04 Maintenance of Lots <i>Responsible: Board</i>	5/2/2020	May-20	May-22	
M-05 Animal Control <i>Responsible: Board</i>	2/17/2010	May-17	May-19	3/5/21- The C-04 Board Liaison was requested to ask the Board to review this Resolution. 6/4/21, Board Liaison to follow-up with Board for status report by the 7/9/21 meeting.
M-06 Elections and Referendums <i>Responsible: Board</i>	2/5/2020	Feb-20	Oct-20	March 2021-C-04 Chair provided M-06 Chair and M-06 Board Liaison with suggestions/comments from the C-04 Committee Meeting held on 2/2/2021. 6/4/21, The duplicated ballot safeguards, used in the last ballot, were not in compliance. The By-laws work group suggested changes to obtain compliance. Status pending.
M-07 Bulkhead and Waterway Maintenance <i>Responsible: Board</i>	6/16/2010	Jul-17	Jul-19	3/5/21- The C-04 Board Liaison was requested to ask the Board to review this Resolution. 6/4/21, Board Liaison to follow-up with Board for status report by the 7/9/21 meeting.
M-08 Association Manuals (Includes a Total of 8 manuals) <i>Architectural Review Committee Guidelines, Employee Handbook, OPA Emergency Operations Plan, OPA Financial Management Procedures Manual, OPA Financial Management Policy Manual, OPA Job Descriptions Manual, Employees Safety Manual, and the General Manager's Policy Instructions.</i> <i>Responsible: Board</i>	7/20/2011	Nov-17	Oct-20	C-04 Chair has placed this on hold until after the Board appointed By-Laws Workgroup has completed their work. Any changes they make to our by-laws or governing documents may require changes to the Association Manuals to correct any possible inconsistencies between these manuals and our governing documents.
M-09 Search Committee <i>Responsible: Committee Chair, GM and Board</i>	2/16/2019	Feb-19	Jul-20	3/5/21-The Bylaws Work Group is currently reviewing the status of the Search Committee.

COPY UPDATED ON: 7/9/2021 - For review at the next C-04 By-Laws Resolutions Advisory Committee Meeting Scheduled for 7/23/2021

Page 2 of 2