

# Opinion

## How To Select A Candidate

**M**any of us get a ballot to vote for a candidate for our Housing Mutual, and then we try to decide for whom to vote. If the candidate has been active in attending board and committee meetings, you may have seen them there or on the taped program on our local TV6. There is a "Meet The Candidates" TV presentation and there are statements published in the Globe by each candidate, illustrating their reasons for wanting to be a Director and their qualifications.

Then too, we have ex-directors who run again and we have a track record to look back at in our selection decisions.

Many resident/owners do not follow the governance activity and rely on other means to get some insight on the candidates. One means of understanding what an individual will do as a Director is to look at the effort that is expended by those who would endorse the candidate.

As an illustration, check out those who endorse the Third Mutual slate of candidates called "Positive Solutions." The endorsees are all residents, directors and ex-directors who want to keep "Business as Usual."

They do not want to elect a candidate who questions such items as; Credit Card bill of \$834.31 at Lawry's Five Crowns; Employee Expense Reimbursement of \$40.34 mileage expense to attend Clippers basketball game; Unpublished Incentive Plan Bonuses totaling millions of dollars; The General Manager's statement that PCM had nothing to do with creating the Third Mutual Management Agreement when the document number proves that the document was not created by the attorney that was hired by the United Mutual, but completed by someone else.

In the United Mutual we see similar trends by the "United 4 United" slate of candidates. This "Smooth Running Board" accepts PCM's suggestions without question and condemns anyone who would ask for an audit to verify that our monies are being spent correctly. Oversight on the Housing Mutual expenses, and, GRF's expenses are a Fiduciary responsibility that we should expect from our elected candidates. Statements like, "if you can't afford to live here, MOVE OUT" by one of the ex-director candidates illustrates that they would rather increase your assessment without contention, than to fight for us to get more for our money than we are currently getting.

It is also interesting to listen to influential individuals who endorse increasing our assessments by additional service levels and/or facilities. You might ask yourself what GRF plans to do with the reserves that are allocated to CH#2. There is a large number of people who would like to see a 2-3 story CH#2 including an incorporated starter shack and restaurant. Why? To entice new buyers with an expanded "Country Club Atmosphere".

Country Club Members historically have to subsidize their restaurants. This is a service level that can only lead to increased assessments?

"Is this what YOU want? Vote Carefully!"

### Contact;

#### Residents Voice

24100-D #296 El Toro Rd

Laguna Woods, CA 92637

(949) 683-7317

[rvoice@rvoice.org](mailto:rvoice@rvoice.org)