

Should Advisers Vote?

An inordinate amount of time was wasted on this question at the Third Board Meeting April 15. For some reason, there is confusion about the role of *Adviser* vis a vis the role of *Director*. An *adviser* is "One who offers advice.", says Webster, "advice" defined as "an opinion or recommendation offered as a guide to action, conduct, etc." A *Director*, says Webster, is a person who is chosen to control or govern the affairs of a company or corporation.

By definition, the adviser's role is to advise and the director's role is to control or govern. For the most part, this idea works well. For those unselfish and dedicated advisers who want nothing more than to help the community, voting is neither an issue nor desire. However, for those advisers who perceive themselves to be "superior" to the directors they advise, and whose egos are more important than helping the community, the power of the vote is an absolute necessity.

From our Residents

Tail Wags Dog

It has become apparent that the Boards behave as if they are dependent upon PCM for direction. Mr. Johns sits up front with the board members at every meeting. The board members seem to rely heavily on his interpretation of the rules of conduct as well as business to be discussed and solutions offered. Does this not seem backward?

The idea for members sitting on one of the Boards is to monitor and direct our management company according to the rules governing non-profit corporations.. One of the regulations for non-profit corporations is that they stay arms length from the for-profit companies with which they do business. This means that our management company is not only hired by the GRF Board (hopefully after competitive bidding), but is watched to make absolutely sure that our monies are spent and resources managed according to the Board's criteria rather than according to the whims of the management company. That is not to say that the Boards should not confer with PCM, but it appears that the Boards are only too happy to defer to Mr. Johns direction.

Serving as a board member is obviously no walk in the park. Would it not be an ideal situation if board members would take the lead and provide well conceived and astute direction to PCM/ this may then lead to transparency of our financial records as is mandated by not-for-profit corporations, just decisions regarding management of our real estate and timely responses to manor concerns resulting in increased confidence in the Board from residents.

Dlaura Loughrey

Ramblings

Drectors: We go thru life taking various options and when we hit a problem we can:

1. Try to solve it, or
2. Ignore it via the "Rose colored glasses" syndrome, or,
3. Let someone else solve it.

In the latter two cases you will remain "willingly ignorant" of the problem, and the apparent tendency lately is to ignore problems that are becoming evident to more and more of your constituents, the resident/owners.

If you would delve into your area or responsibility with an open mind, and look at the problems that have been brought to light over the past months, you will find that many problems are of your own doing. With the signing of the 2007 Management Agreement, you have created a monster. By removing from that document any controls on PCM you have become the "enabler". You are the only control that the resident owners have over the costs of the Mutual and you have elected to default on your oversight responsibility.

PCM has absolutely no incentive to reduce our assessments. This is why the residents must elect responsible Directors. We need a new way of looking at budgets and costs. A Managerial Audit in addition to a Financial Audit is in order.

Connie Grundke

Letters should limited 250 words and mailed to Residents Voice, 24100-D 296 El Toro Rd., Laguna Woods, CA 92637. They will be published in the order they are received, space and time permitting.