

August 19, 2026 NWNA grievance panel meeting DRAFT NOTES

Grievance submitted June 30, 2026 by Andra Fletcher and Joel Kastel (complainants) against NWNA Land Use Co-Directors John Bildsoe and Tricia Bootzin

Christian Burgess, Laurie Monnes Anderson, Britt McConn: grievance panel members

Others in Attendance:

NWNA Secretary Barbara Adams, notetaker per request of panelist

NWNA President Kat Todd, NWNA VP Chris Fast, NWNA Land Use Co-Directors John Bildsoe and Tricia Bootzin, 2 other NWNA members

Carol Rulla, bylaws helper for the panel

Started by introducing the panel members

Christian acknowledged that Barbara would take notes, disclosed that the meeting was being recorded and reviewed the panel's tasks:

1. Review the matter that was submitted in the grievance
2. Talk through if the complainants have standing
3. If there's standing, attempt to resolve the grievance
4. Compile a report based on what the panel decides/talks about including whether or not the board should schedule a hearing

The complainants were not present, but there is a scheduled meeting tomorrow and the complainants will be notified. If the panel has additional questions, the panel can ask Tricia and John as well as the complainants if there is a meeting tomorrow.

Britt: who are the interested parties? Should the board be considered an interested party? One of the complaints is about whether or not we can have two land-use directors, and if the board is going to be asked to respond to the grievance, then she thinks we should recognize them as an interested party.

Laurie: her interpretation, according to the bylaws, is the land-use committee should be made up of three members. She does not think we have a land use committee. We just have a land-use director. Asked Carol to clarify.

Carol R: Said the bylaws allow a land use committee, but others must be appointed to the committee for it to exist. The bylaws also allow the membership to create any positions they want and assign duties in a membership meeting. Two places in the bylaws under Board of Directors allow this. If there were a land use committee, then the two co-directors would be co-chairs, but you do not have a committee.

Laurie: Thanked for the clarification. She said it's legal for having two co- directors, and that the complainants should be made aware.

Britt: said that during a meeting in 2025 the membership approved the creation of two co-land-use directors.

Christian: Said some of the bylaws are confusing and this adds to the confusion of the roles.

Standing: Because the complainants own property in NWNA, they do have standing to make a complaint. Britt noted that someone outside NWNA would not have standing.

Complaint 1 [Co-Land Use Directors under Article VI, Section 9 (Powers and Duties) and Section 9.E (Land Use Director)]: resolved that co-land-use directors are allowed and there is no violation on that point. Report will clarify that both Tricia and John were voted in as co-land-use directors. (Christian suggested that this be clarified in the bylaws)

There was a discussion about committee vs. co-land-use chairs. Christian asked the question, What are the responsibilities of co-chairs to document when they do co-chair work? Britt noted that they were acting as co-directors, not a committee or subject to committee rules. Laurie pointed out that they were information gathering, not having a meeting—she said she thinks that the bylaws don't necessarily need to be changed for information gathering. Britt suggested that we do have some written list/resource/guidelines for board members to refer to, even when they are information gathering. Christian suggested that the board take a critical look at the bylaws to see if they can offer clarification. Britt agreed.

Complaint 2 [Conflict of Interest under Article VI, Section 9]: Laurie said because Tricia lives on the street that there was a conflict of interest. Christian said that it wasn't a formal land-use meeting, that their purpose was to collect information about how trash and recycling might impact the neighbors. Laurie said they could have, instead, contacted the sanitary company. Britt asked for clarification about what Laurie considers a conflict of interest. Laurie pointed out that just to be on this panel, she was told by Kat that, to avoid a conflict of interest, she couldn't live on the street in question. Britt said the land-use directors have no power over the property in question, so her interpretation is that there is no conflict of interest. Christian wondered if actions taken by the co-directors warrants a conflict of interest label. Britt said she doesn't see a bias of appointment to the position (Tricia). Laurie pointed out that as a land-use co-director Tricia can do work related to her appointment. Laurie said if the consensus is that it was "information gathering" rather than decisions being made then there was no conflict of interest.

The intent was to gather information not to make any decision or take any course of action. There was no conflict of interest that would have influenced the outcome of the moment.

Complaint 3 [Conduct under Article VI, Section 9]: Board and committee members must act professionally as members of the NA board. The complainant said John and Tricia did not act professionally.

Christian: The grievance language is subjective and reflects the complainants' characterization of their perception of how they received Tricia and John's behavior.

Laurie: According to Tricia's response, Tricia was reacting to the confrontation of the property owner, and Tricia became defensive. Laurie said it is subjective, and that it appears that both sides

reacted negatively in the moment. Ideally Tricia would have just walked away. Tricia even says in her response that she wished she could have reacted differently.

Britt: She read Tricia's comment as an acknowledgement of unprofessional conduct and taking accountability for the conduct. If Tricia is there in an official capacity then she probably did not act professionally. The property owner was not there in an official capacity.

Christian: This behavior does not necessarily warrant recommending to the board or a hearing that Tricia be removed from her role. That's not for the panel to decide.

Laurie: The complainants asked for an apology. Even though Tricia was responding to the property owner's behavior, it might be appropriate for Tricia to offer an apology.

Christian: Suggested it could be left up to the board or Tricia and John. An apology implies guilt, which he's not sure is justified based on the information he has.

Britt: Said she wouldn't recommend that an apology be given. It's not within the scope of the panel's duties to recommend that. Was it unprofessional, yes, Tricia said that herself. She would leave it to Tricia or the board to decide on an apology.

Laurie: The complainants want an apology from the board and that the board impose appropriate action.

Laurie: Said she does not think they trespassed, they were in the right-of-way.

Britt: said she does not have enough information to know for certain that they were not trespassing.

Christian: If they were on the property or the property line is not clear. He said it's a defensive posture of the complainants that they were trespassing. When John and Tricia were confronted with the accusation that they were trespassing, they moved.

Laurie: the intent was that they were information gathering. Tricia did turn a cone, but only for John to take a picture of the signage on the cone.

Britt: More goes to professional conduct vs. trespassing.

Christian: Suggested that it will be beneficial to outline in the bylaws what board members, committee members, etc., can do during unofficial business, or information gathering.

Laurie: Suggested that in the future the bylaws reflect that property owners should be notified before visiting a property. This is just something to consider since she's not sure how specific bylaws language should be.

Complaint 5 [Conduct under Article VIII (Committees)]

Britt: Said the last complaint is not a point the panel should respond to. The co-directors are not a committee. Because it wasn't a committee, this violation is not pertinent.

Christian: Even though there was no violation because there is no committee, he still wants to recommend that the board appoint a bylaws committee to review this section.

Complaint 4 [Conduct under Article II (Purpose)]:

Christian: the property owner's view is that John and Tricia's interactions were confrontational and inconsistent with cooperative citizen involvement. Christian asked if Tricia and John should be asked to clarify since they are in the room, but since the complainants are not present it was decided not to.

Christian: Because the incident was not a formal meeting, does this apply? John did try to cooperate and communicate with the property owners. Tricia and John's presence there was to educate and gather information to better inform people in the association.

Laurie: Matters of common concern is listed under the bylaws purpose. There is a common concern about housing developments in the NA.

Britt: Did they act unprofessionally? Maybe, but I don't think they were acting against fostering community.

Laurie: There have been some changes at the state level that make some really painful changes to understand. Any information gathered to educate is appropriate.

Laurie: The panel believes that the co-directors were trying to gather information to act on behalf of the NA.

Complaint 1 [Land Use Director Duties under Article VI, Section 9]:

Carol: the complaint about the duties of the land-use director has not been addressed at this point. Article VI, Section 9 (Powers and Duties) has general duties of the board including "board members shall work together to manage the affairs of the association between membership meetings and to assign or reassign any duties or tasks among board members to ensure a well-functioning board." This is a general duty in addition to the specific duties under Section 9.E for the land-use director.

Laurie: (read some of Article VI) Not sure where it states that they can gather information, but it does say to manage the affairs of the association.

Christian: Said this is another point to creating a committee to look at the bylaws to clarify this. The bylaws should be clearer to the lay person. The panel should clarify to the complainants that land-use director duties aren't limited to ENN and public comment.

Britt: The complainants acknowledge the purpose in Article II as part of the grievance. It would be a contradiction to apply Article II but then limit the land-use director to only the specific duties in Article VI, Section 9.E.

Christian: Did they have an ENN?

Britt: No, they were not required due to newer state legislation.

Christian: The panel should go through the complainants proposed remedies. Remedy 1 was to convene a panel and conduct a review, which we have done. I don't know if we are confirming any violations.

Britt: There was one, unprofessional conduct.

Laurie: Said she thinks it was unprofessional.

Christian: Not sure it was unprofessional, but the majority opinion is that it was unprofessional. Remedy 2 was to impose appropriate corrective measures, including potential removal. Doesn't think that imposing corrective measures are within the scope of the panel.

Britt: The grievance asks the board to do this, not the grievance panel, which goes back to the question of whether the board is an interested party.

Christian: Remedy 3 was for a written apology. He thinks that should be at the discretion of the respondent.

Britt: Remedy 4 is to clarify duties or role of land-use director(s). Remedy 5 was to provide confirmation in writing of the resolution.

Christian: Asked if the complainants were notified of the panel meeting. Chris F. said the complainants were not directly notified, but the meeting was posted on the city's website. Chris F. had assumed they were on the email list because they came to the board meeting about the panel, but when he checked now, they were not on the list. As a courtesy, there should have been a direct invitation.

Laurie: Since she recorded the meeting, she asked Chris F. if he might be able to get the recording to the complainants.

Chris F. agreed.

Christian: no comment or testimony was required, asked of either party.

Laurie: suggested no meet tomorrow

Britt: pointed out that since this meeting was noticed and a report needs to be created by the panel during a noticed meeting, then the meeting should stand tomorrow.

Christian: Said a process should be agreed on to create the report. Possibly a Google Doc, then have a meeting to finalize. Does the writing of the report need to be made public?

Britt: When there is a discussion, an exchange of ideas, those need to be made publicly.

Carol: Generally, one person writes the report, then come together to discuss and finalize the report.

Christian: The report should be short. Address alleged violations, then panel's findings/thoughts. Proposed remedies by the complainants, panel's recommendations.

Britt: agreed to write the draft report.

The consensus was that there will be no meeting tomorrow. Another panel meeting will be scheduled to review and finalize the report, then the report will be passed onto the board and the board will take action.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:31 p.m.