

GLA Communications Committee 7-30-2015

This meeting summary/interpretation is being distributed to the GLA Board and Community as a volunteer service by GLFPC. Your suggestions are welcome should there be oversights or errors.

GLFPC Summary/Interpretation of GLA Communications Committee Meeting held July 30, 2015

Discussion on how to begin using email for GLA communication with members who will want to opt-into the email program dominated the phone conference meeting of the GLA Communications Committee Meeting held July 30, 2015. GLA members voted to approve the use of email for GLA communications over a year ago.

Volunteer Secretary, Alyssa Allen, went over an Email Opt-In form apparently developed by herself. Concern about a bogus “someone” going to the GLA website and using the email opt-in form to get GLA information sparked a discussion about how email applicants could prove their member identity. Discussion about whether the use of phone numbers, parcel numbers, or a unique number or code that could be assigned to each member would be the best way to verify the identity of email users followed. When the discussion bogged down on how these proposed ID measures would affect members who own multiple parcels, non-board member and volunteer Secretary Alyssa Allen said she “knew what the committee wanted” and that she would update the opt-in form, based on discussion, for their further review.

To address repeated landowner concerns that not all GLA meeting notices get posted on the GLA Calendar, the committee accepted Debbie Blais (landowner) and Kevin Newby’s (Board Member) offer to post the notices. Blais volunteered her service during the Special Board meeting on July 27, 2015 – a meeting that had not been noticed on the GLA calendar.

No action was taken on whether the Secretary’s or Treasurer’s member data base would be used to generate the new email mailing lists. Web master Ross Brunson said business logic calls for the use of just one master database. It sounded as though the landowner data (USPS mailing addresses, etc) kept in the Treasurer’s Quick Books program is currently used as the master “database”, and that the Excel spreadsheet used by the Secretary for GLA mailings is generated from Quick Books. While the committee is on record as wanting to tie everyone’s job together and make the paid Administrative Assistant the “hub” of GLA communications, no decision was made on whether to end the relative autonomy of the Secretary and Treasurer who use different software to maintain their respective membership lists.

Action to begin a trial use of software (Freshdesk) that will “ticket” each issue that the board needs to address and assign someone to handle the matter was reached by consensus. A letter from Karleen McSherry, GLA’s paid Administrative Assistant, asking who on the board she should talk to about four unresolved issues, appears to have prompted this decision.

Addendum: Immediately after this teleconference meeting a landowner expressed her concerns to the GLFPC as seen below:

I gathered last night that Communications Committee was concerned about “someone” posing as a landowner, and using their lot number, to get information through e-mail, etc. How will they safeguard a nosy or vindictive board member from accessing landowner information even with a special number? They’re concerned with Debbie having full access to the website not just the calendar.

What concerns me is that the treasurer does not have autonomy. The accountant and the treasurer should be the only ones dealing with financial matters and not have to run matters by the secretary (let alone a volunteer Secretary) or anyone else. Answer questions certainly, but the jobs are separate. That’s why it takes so long for decisions to be made. Example: the board does not have to approve a billing of an assessment that should have been assessed all along. What’s to approve? It’s in the Covenants!!

For heavens sake, we have a non-Board Member (Alyssa Allen) who has access to every landowner’s information, financial and everything else, which she shouldn’t. Did she sign a confidentiality clause? What’s to keep her from giving out information to an interested person. She will and has access to all landowners “private” information & codes! You see how ridiculous this is getting?

I guess what I’m getting at is the more the Communications Committee continues to take it upon themselves to tie everyone’s job together the harder it is to get things accomplished. The term is “micro-manage.” Not everything should be going through the volunteer secretary, ad-min, communications committee, etc. I hope I’m making sense here?

Without question, this landowner is making sense. Many landowners share the concerns of this landowner and question the numerous legal ramifications of the Communications Committee and a non-board member (AA), together with a non-landowner (KM), being the ones setting policy and procedure within the framework of our Landowner Corporation.