

Verbal Testimony / Cindy Haase / 12/20/2024

Hi my name is Cindy and I can be referred to as such.

My association has had many of the same experiences as those already shared ...

1. Affiliated businesses not held to accountability for poor workmanship because of conflicts of interest
We had a leaking brick wall that on 2 sides of the house was replaced 3x at the expense of the association and the cause was determined to be an incorrect plastic barrier instead of a felt wicking barrier
2. Neighboring associations electric bills paid with our funds to the tune of \$13K
3. Property Mgmt failing to do site visits, reply to homeowners timely if at all, and inaccurate financials.
4. Insurance premiums increasing and the fear that we are moving closer to the "Yr Built" restriction every year.

We don't need to hash these out any further ...

I want to quickly share my concerns about the undefined "reasonableness" standard.

My first big concern going forward is the suggestion that daycares/work trucks/short term rentals may be allowed on property. And how there needs to be this undefined "reasonableness" standard applied.

First, whose standard of reasonableness is right? Yours, mine?

Too often reasonableness is thought to mean feelings of compassion, sympathy, and sensitivity.

What I see is factual overwhelming risk and more costs to all, for the benefit of 1

Additional risk needs to be considered, such as foot traffic where there are no sidewalks, inattentive guests, exposure to more slip fall incidents, personal injury, theft of work equipment, and damage to buildings and roads.

Some associations just aren't built for business operations.

In addition, property managers are on site less and less, so who deals with the parking complaints, the grounds damages, littering, and noise complaints. The Board?

This is setting up a Board and HOA to fail, and exposure to even more contentious situations.

My second big concern is the suggestion that there should be more action to delay foreclosures.

Again, the suggestion that this undefined "reasonableness" standard is missing.

As though Boards are insensitive, lacking heart, and out to take someone's home.

What I see are the facts, that delaying does not set the homeowner up for success, and in fact harms them.

What I see is the other homeowners being expected to function as lenders, carrying other's debt.

Is it reasonable to ask Board members to listen to explanations and consider payment plans when they are not licensed collections agents? Isn't this a conflict, illegal, and unreasonable to put them in this pickle?

Attorneys should be involved to negotiate payment plans as soon as any "dues related debt" hits 90 days, no matter the amount.

My third big concern is the submission to restrict fees and fines ...

If I recall correctly the fines were being applied to homeowner accounts when the homeowner refused to act reasonably in a board meeting? Not all of these accusations seem to be correct, but there must be a portion that are.

Am I correct that there is already legislation that states a homeowner can be fined for being disruptive during a Board meeting? It seems reasonable that there was a basis for this original legislation.

If the right to fine when they are legit is taken away, how does the board regain control of board meetings.

Thankfully our association has not had this experience. But reality is sometimes the Board doesn't inform of the next board date, sometimes they meet in a garage, or sometimes they have closed meetings.

This is not transparent, but again how does the Board conduct business and also serve the other 99%.

In closing, I am not a fan of the undefined "reasonableness" verbiage which I feel has been weaponized against Boards and used to shame. In my experience, Boards work hard to nurture a community with like interests and diverse wants.

Thank you for your time,

Cindy