

WILLAMETTE TOWERS CONDOMINIUM

Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors October 22, 2001

Introduction of Board Members:

Douglas Cochrane-President (not present)
Joanne Gulsvig-Vice President
Marge Catha-Treasurer
Carol McCarthy-Secretary
David Goth-Member

Also present were:

Mr. and Mrs. Roy Pearson	Ann Miles	Ryan Marshall
Ruth Lutz	Bobbye Sorrels	Uldine Summers
Joan McCornack	Doris Wohlers	Esther Erford
John and Dorothy Quirk	Laverne Edwards	Bob Huntley
	Janine David	

Acceptance of the Minutes of the Meeting—September 10, 2001

Marge moved to accept the minutes of the meeting as submitted. David seconded the motion. The board voted unanimously to accept the minutes of the meeting.

Financial Report

Marge Catha noted items on the financial report (see attached). Joanne asked if anyone has any questions about the financial report. There were none.

Laundry Room

Painting: Diana presented a bid for painting the laundry room in the amount of \$430. This bid will be given to Lillian Rarick since she has expressed an interest in having it done.

While the painter was here, Diana got bids on other possible jobs, including the stairwells (\$1,550 each), the elevators (about \$50 to \$75 each), the elevator frames on each floor (\$22 to \$25 each). All painting bids include materials and labor.

(Diana had previously been authorized to spend up to \$300 for the following laundry room improvements.)

Covering pipes behind driers: Diana presented a bid to cover the exhaust pipes behind the driers with sheet metal. This bid was in the amount of \$595.

Clothing rack: This bid for this was \$264.

Other options were discussed. More information will be looked into and a decision will be made at a later time.

Windows

Window Replacements

Diana has contacted Mercer Industries who specializes in installing windows in high rises. They have looked at the windows in one unit, and can provide us with a price, per window, but that they recommend replacements be done with vinyl windows. They said we could buy the same color as the aluminum frames we have now so that they would match, but that they will not have the metallic sheen of the aluminum. They said that vinyl frames would be much more energy efficient and less expensive, and might get a better rebate offer from EWEB.

The board can give interested unit owners permission to use vinyl as a replacement (Article 7, section 7.2d). Diana will meet with the Lane County Glass and Mercer Industries before the next meeting and get a bid per window.

Window Safety Issues

Diana reported that the window in #304 fell out recently. Other unit owners have had complaints that their windows are not safe to open—1105, 704, 702. Diana explained that there is a small vinyl “clip” that holds the windows in. When it breaks, the windows will fall out. She thinks that Eugene Glass can get them.

Carol made a motion that Diana get in touch with window people and get a bid so that the board has some idea of the cost, and send out that information when she gets it.

David seconded the motion

Joanne asked for a vote—unanimously passed.

Electrical

Update Repairs

Diana reported on the electrical repairs. Some replacement fixtures may be needed. Phillips is trying to find us replacements that will match what is already in the halls. She reported that all other repairs, except the exit light on the 6th floor, have been completed. A new light has been ordered, and the one in use there now will be used for replacement parts for others that need a piece.

Service Plan

Phillips will come out once a month for \$36 to inspect all emergency lights and replace any batteries needed. This price is for the first half hour only, and does not include parts. We can buy parts/materials from Platt Electrical Supply ourselves, or we can buy from Phillips at a 20% discount of the regular price.

The board voted not to engage this service. Sandi will continue to monitor the emergency lights (batteries).

New lighting on the main floor

Diana will get bids from Phillips and EWEB.

Property Management

Review Proposals

Joanne opened the discussion about property management, and the proposals that the board has received. There was discussion on both of the proposals that came back. Some board members thought the proposals were confusing or not complete. Joanne said that it is important that we all understand what costs are involved and suggested that the homeowners association be provided with a summary of what property management would do for us. She said that the cost of property management might be less expensive than what we now have in place.

IPM Property management would also set up a budget through Dan Huntley of Western States who spoke to the April meeting of the board.

Many association members shared their ideas/opinions on this issue, and on the proposals that the board has been provided with by IPM and Bennett Property Management, sometimes with differing points of view.

Joanne suggested that a property management company might be willing to come to a meeting and make a presentation so that all homeowners understand what property management does.

Bobbye Sorrels' comments

Bobbye shared her point of view on this matter. She feels that property management is not an appropriate choice for this building. She pointed out that her comments are contained in a report that she prepared and distributed to this meeting. The report includes a summary of her findings from questionnaires returned by forty-three homeowners who responded to a letter she

sent out to all homeowners. Bobbye requested that this report, and the findings be included with the minutes of the meeting to all owners (see attached). She provided and signed an affidavit swearing to the validity of this report/summary.

Discussion continued with many participants questioning/commenting on many aspects of this issue, and on the use of executive meetings. Further discussion will take place at a later date.

Leak in roof—1302

The owner of unit 1302 reported to Diana that the roof had a leak in her unit. Diana will contact the company who did the roof upkeep last year, and find out if it is covered under our warranty—and have it repaired.

Illusions to move

Illusions Salon has given notice that they will be moving out of the building. Their lease is up on December 1, but they would like to extend it one month to January 1, 2002. Carol made a motion to let them stay an extra month. Joan seconded the motion. All board members voted to give them the extension.

Diana suggested that it might be a good time to get the lighting updates done on the entire first floor, with the Bottom Line already out and Illusions to leave. If we have the whole job done at once, we could get a better rebate. Diana will get a bid from Phillips Electric on this job.

Unit 206 to vacate

Diana reported that the renters in unit 206 have given their notice to move out as of November 9, 2001. She asked if the board wanted her to find a renter or have a property manager find us a renter as we did last time we rented that unit. Marge mentioned that Maxine Schmaltz (renter, unit 1105) might be interested. She has lived in the building for 18 years. She does not like to live up so high. When the current renters move out and we view the condition of the unit, this decision will be made.

Meeting called to a close by Joanne Gulsvig.

Respectfully submitted,

Secretary, Board of Directors

Prepared by,

Diana Drake,
Assistant to the Board of Directors

WILLOW LAMETTE TOWERS CONDOMINIUM AND PROFESSIONAL MANAGEMENT
A QUESTIONNAIRE-BASED REPORT TO THE BOARD AND ASSOCIATION
Bobbie D. Sorrels, October 22, 2001

When I acknowledged former board members in my October 5 report to the association, I inadvertently left out the name of Peg Rhodes, no longer an owner, who served for many years. Thanks go to her as well as to all of the others already named and any others whose names I may have omitted.

Heartly thanks also go to the 43 association members who completed the questionnaire included with my October 5 report. That is a 45% return from all 91 owners and a 47% return from the 87 owners who actually received the questionnaire. (Four envelopes came back as undeliverable to the addresses shown.) A 45% return is excellent for surveys. Respondents gave thoughtful, informed responses and comments. I have included a copy of a summary of the answers to the questions and representative comments at the end of this report.

I sent a memo and copies of a 29-respondent summary to respondents on October 18. Afterwards, six more questionnaires came in. On October 19 I sent to the board of directors a memo and a summary of 35 respondents' input. By 2:45 p.m. on October 22, eight additional completed questionnaires had arrived.

Thumbnail Summary of Questionnaire Results for Forty Respondents

As the summary of 43 returned questionnaires shows, respondents voted overwhelmingly against professional management (98% against, 0% for, and 2% no answer). Of the 42 respondents who answered either yes or no 100% voted against professional management.

In answer to the question about whether to retain Diana Drake as assistant to the board, respondents also voted overwhelmingly for retaining Diana, 41 (95%) to retain, 0 not to retain, and 2 (5%) no answer. Of the 41 who voted either yes or no, 41 (100%) voted to retain Diana.

Also quite strongly, respondents voted for keeping the position of assistant to the board, with the requirement of residence in the building, whether WT has property management or not. Thirty-three (77%) voted to keep the position, 2 (5%) voted not to keep it and 8 (19%) gave no answer. Of the 35 who voted either yes or no, 33 (94%) voted to keep the position.

On expanding the assistant's work to include that now done by the Office Aide [Eric Peterman], 28 (65%) voted yes, 2 (5%) voted no, 11 (26%) gave no answer, and 2 (5%) placed question marks by the question. Of the 30 voting either yes or no, 28 (93%) voted to expand the position.

In answer to the question about whether to retain Sandra Hansen, 20 (47%) voted to retain, 11 (26%) voted not to retain, 8 (19%) gave no answer, 3 (7%) placed question marks by the question, and 1 (2%) said to put the janitorial job up for three bids and to allow Hansen to bid. Of the 31 who marked either yes or no on the question, 20 (64%) voted to retain, and 11 (35%) voted not to retain.

The answers to the questions on costs showed that owners prefer to keep costs low on refurbishing the first floor and to pay nothing for property management. These summary statements use category percentages, sometimes include only the highest percentages, and

sometimes combine categories: Seventy-seven percent were willing to spend only \$0 each month on professional management. Seventy percent wanted to keep costs under \$10,000 for refurbishing the first floor, and 44% said they would be willing to pay \$0 extra assessment each month for refurbishine. 19% said \$5, and 26% gave no answer. Responses to the question on how much one is williniz to spend on a one-time special assessment yielded 28% who said \$0 14% who said \$50, and 28% who gave no answer.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE FIVE YES/NO QUESTIONS

	<u>Perce nt of 43 Respondents</u>			
	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Other</u>
Contract professional management	0	98	2	
Retain Diana Drake	95	0	5	
Keep position of assistant to board	77	5	19	
Expand board assistant position	65	5	26	5
Retain Sandra Hansen	47	26	19	9

Recommendations

The views held by the association members who responded to the questionnaire suggest these recommendations to the board:

- (1) Do not contract with professional property management.
- (2) Whether or not the board contracts with property management, retain the position now titled assistant to the board, with the current job description and including the requirement of residence in the building.
- (3) Expand the job description for the position of assistant to the board to include the duties previously performed by Office Aide Eric Peterman.
- (3) Whether or not the board contracts with professional management, retain Diana Drake in the expanded position of assistant to the board (administrative assistant, site manager).
- (4) Whether or not the board contracts with professional management, probably retain Sandra Hansen as janitor.
- (5) Refurbish the first floor only if it costs less than \$10,000 and only if either monthly assessments for refurbishment are less than \$5/month or a one-time special assessment does not exceed \$50.

I add these recommendations extrapolated and expanded from the findings:

- (1) If the board retains Sandra Hansen, either require that she become a true independent contractor, with both Hansen and the board observing all requirements necessary to maintain that designation, or hire her as an employee. Making her an employee would give WT a great deal more control over the work and the requirement of professional behavior. Many problems at WT are rooted in the loss of control over the janitorial position. WT has the right to expect and the authority to require a janitor who does the job well as described in a job description; one who assiduously remains detached; one who does not engage in gossip, WT politics, derogating others, sharing WT business with vendors and other outsiders, playing power and popularity games, inserting herself/himself into the business of WT, and mixing private accounts with the WT account; and one who takes directions from the board or the board's designated supervisor without

question, retribution, or rancor. Sandi Hansen does not meet these requirements. That is not to say that she cannot, but it is to say that she has not and she is not, in spite of years of repeated counseling.

If the board hires Sandi as an employee, keep the total expenditure for her employment, including employee costs (taxes and insurance), at or below \$18,600/year, the amount she currently receives. Require her to maintain a high standard of cleaning and professionalism, disentangle herself completely from all improper personal involvement with WT factions and interests, and graciously take direction and supervision from the board or a board-designated supervisor (logically the board assistant whose job description already includes supervision of contractors). If Sandi does not meet the requirements, obtain another janitorial service, preferably at a lower rate.

Using a ballpark estimate of a 30% employee cost, one that yields estimations that differ slightly from the estimations reported in the October S report, \$18,600/year would provide a gross wage of \$275/week = \$14,300/year. That amount + \$4,290 (0.30 of \$14,300) = \$18,600/year. If Sandi works 25 hours/week as an employee, she would be earning \$11/hour. Including the employment costs, WT's cost would be \$358/week or \$14.32/hour. For 20 hours/week, the numbers would be a gross receipt to her of \$13.75/hour at a cost of \$17.90/hour to WT.

I think WT can find a good janitorial employee for \$10/hour, which would cost WT \$260 (\$200 + \$60) for 20 hours/week, or \$13,520/year. That is a savings of \$5,080/year over the \$18,600 WT pays for Sandi's work. Even at \$11/hour for 20 hours/week, the savings would be \$3,728/year.

(2) Expanding Diana's current position as assistant to include Eric's work would require about 25 hours/week. At \$14/hour, she would gross \$350/week (\$18,200/year). Including the 30% employee costs, the cost to WT would be \$455/week, \$23,660/year, or \$18.20/hour. If the janitorial cost reduces by \$5,080/year, the WT cost for the assistant of \$23,660/year + the WT cost for the janitor of \$13,520/year = \$37,180/year. That is only \$988/year more than \$36,192 [the \$18,600 Sandi currently costs + \$17,592 (the \$12,792 Diana currently costs + the \$4,800 Eric currently costs)]. Other possible combinations exist, of course. [Note: The two best operational setups have occurred when resident assistants have assisted the boards: Wanda Twomey as administrative assistant and now Diana Drake as assistant to the board. I was pleased to see that both property management companies who submitted proposals also recognized the importance of an "on-site manager" ("site manager").]

(3) If needed, the board could engage some professional help with developing reserve schedules and budgets, calculating assessments, interpreting bylaws, etc. Specialists can provide such services for much less than paying a property-management company a general fee month after month for occasionally providing such services plus the additional high hourly fees mentioned. I would provide such services free of charge.

(4) The board needs to recognize the serious financial problems for WT that the current economic conditions create. For example, interest rates on WT investments are down more than half, and commercial unit income is or will be down more than half unless WT finds renters for three lease/rental units (1309 Lincoln Street is empty, and 1311 Lincoln Street and Unit 206 will be empty soon). EWEB costs are going up. Mandated elevator improvements will cost a great deal. Reserves need to build significantly. The

board should deal with these problems before adding expenditures for property management, refurbishment, etc., and it should begin by developing the budget for 2002.

(5) The board should consider the legality of its current policy of using executive sessions to discuss such things as the possibility of contracting with professional management (and please avoid spending \$200/hour or more of the association's money to consult an attorney). Basically, the Oregon Statutes and thus the WT bylaws require that board meetings be open to association members, except for a very few limited topics. With my recent reports, I have deliberately aired most of the topics, including salaries, etc. that you must have been discussing behind closed doors with, I assume, no record

kept. Basically, association members have a right to know how their money will be spent. I personally plan to refuse to be excluded from so-called "executive sessions" unless I am convinced the board is meeting the requirements of the law. Here is the appropriate citation from the Oregon Revised Statutes, Chapter 100, 1999 Edition, Condominiums: (Subsection (4) does not apply and is omitted):

100.420 Board meetings. (1) All meetings of the board of directors of the association of unit owners shall be open to unit owners except that, in the discretion of the board, the following matters may be considered in executive session:

(a) Consultation with legal counsel concerning the rights and duties of the association regarding existing or potential litigation, or criminal matters:

(b) Personnel matters, including salary negotiations and employee disciplines [Solutions: This subsection reasonably include decisions about adding or subtracting positions and the determination of salary ranges, but only the salary negotiations with an applicant if the decisions have been approved in open meetings; otherwise a board could decide in closed session to hire, for example, to hire any number of full-time personnel and then bill the association/or them]: and

(c) The negotiation of contracts with third parties. (Solutions: This reasonably include the decision to contract, but only the actual negotiation of contracts with possible contractors, for the decision to contract has been approved in open meetings.)

(2) Except as provided in subsection (3) of this section, board of directors' meetings may be conducted by telephonic communication.

(3) In condominiums where the majority of the units are the principal residences of the occupants:

(a) For other than emergency meetings, notice of board of directors' meetings shall be posted at a place or places on the property at least three days prior to the meeting or notice shall be provided by a method otherwise reasonably calculated to inform unit owners of such meetings.

(b) Only emergency meetings of the board of directors may be conducted by telephonic communication.

Professional Management Proposals

The board has received two proposals for professional management, one from Bennett Management Company and one from Income Property Management (IPM). I did not have time to do a thorough analysis of them. However, a quick review did show that both companies based their proposals on the presence of an "on-site manager" (for which WT would pay and the job description for which WT would have to design to cover the many duties the management companies do not do).

The "site manager" position as roughly described by the companies seems to be somewhat janitorial (Sandi), a tiny bit grounds-maintenance based (pulling weeds), in addition to covering many of the duties now covered by the position of assistant to the board (Diana). However, it could be designed to parallel exactly the position now held by Diana, to which has been added the work previously done by Eric Peterman.

Both proposals refer to housing at WT (undoubtedly Unit 206, for which WT currently receives rent of \$450/month) for the "site manager." Apparently, the companies (both of which had met with board members before the board sent the RFP) understood that they could plan to use 206 to provide housing for a "site manager" who had previously not lived in the building. Diana lives in the building.

Basically, both companies' proposals leave a great deal to be desired in terms of quality of presentation, content, and clarity one could reasonably expect from manaitement companies. However, they both seem to offer services virtually the same as those now provided by The Bottom Line, which charges \$280/mo. Both companies would "help" with such things as budget development, would supervise the "site manager," and would attend quarterly meetings of the board. The things they would not assign to the "site manager" would require hiring a janitor, grounds service, and other services to do the myriad tasks listed in the descriptions now covered by the grounds-maintenance contract with Dan Reese, the assistant's position., the office-aide position., and the janitorial service. Thus, the costs for covering grounds maintenance and Diana and Sandi's current work likely would go up. In addition to a professional manager, such a plan would involve at least four contractors/employees/services: an "on-site" manager, a janitor, a grounds service, and a clerical/board-assistance service.

BeMett's basic charge is \$17/door + 5% of gross income from commercial property + "no more than \$50/hour" for doing such things as posting notices and sending newsletters. Without any additional charges, WT would pay BeMett, month in and month out, \$1,638. Even reducing that by the \$280/month Bottom Line charges to do a significant number of the things on the property managers' lists, the monthly cost before substantial additions would be \$1,358/month (\$16,296/year). That alone would mean an average increase of \$15/month for each owner (more for two bedrooms, less for one bedroom). I cannot emphasize enough that the additions would increase that amount substantially. For example, BeMett has additional charges of \$28.50-.\$31.50/hour for responses to emergency calls, with charges for the supervision of outside contractors "to be negotiated." For preliminary preparation of minutes of meetings (for approval *by* the Secretary), BeMett would charge \$30/hour. A reserve plan would cost \$50/hour.

Lifted from the RFP, BeMett simply bounced back items 2, 4, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 21, and 22 as falling under the site manager's duties, leaving it to WT to work out the job descriptions(s). These listings include everything from janitorial, landscaping, and maintenance services to management of programming of the Entraguard door security system, management of building keys, management of locker assignments, etc. This long list does not even include many tasks covered by present job descriptions for Eric and Diana. Thus, the approach just tosses into one category many, but not all, of the duties now performed by the janitorial service, the yard service, and the assistant to the board.

The IPM proposal has some variations on the Bennett "plan," including additional charges of \$70/hour for some of its added work. It would charge (before additions) \$13.75/door/month, for \$1,265/month. Subtracting Bottom Line's \$280/month leaves \$985/month (\$11,820/year), for an average increase of \$11/month for each unit. However, I am not sure how IPM would handle commercial units, and many other additional charges would make the total monthly increase per owner much larger than an average of \$11/month.

Again, after removing the duties now performed by Bottom Line included in the \$280/month already subtracted, the payment to Bennett would be \$16,296/year for other services. It appears that for \$16,296/year, WT would receive from Bennett (1) one walk through the building a month, with reports made at quarterly board meetings, (2) oversight of maintenance, janitorial and landscaping duties performed by the "on-site manager," (3) hiring, negotiating agreements with, supervising, and discharging personnel in accordance with the budget, job standards, and wages "previously approved by the Association," with such personnel serving as employees of the Agent, and all salaries, taxes and other expenses payable to or on account of such employees accruing as operating expenses of WT (the cost of those "other expenses" bothers me). (4) negotiating contracts for " water, electricity, gas, telephone , garbage & recycling" subject to the direction of the board, (5) purchasing equipment, tools, appliances, etc., at the direction of the board and at the expense of the association, (6) maintaining records of insurance. (7) notifying residents of any violations of "Covenants and Restrictions" of WT, under the sole direction of the board. (8) attending one board meeting a quarter, and (9) dealing with only the one board member authorized by the board ("Agent may, but is not required to, submit any matter, direction, instruction or the like to the Board and shall then follow the direction of the Board.") About fifteen sections on four pages identify protections of the property management company; e.g., "Agent assumes no liability." Another provision requires WT to pay a cancellation fee of the total management fee for a period of two months if WT cancels the agreement, even with a 60-day notice.

It appears that for its \$11,820/year (exclusive of the tasks included in Bottom Line's \$280/month), IPM would (1) generally make weekly property visits, (2) provide emergency numbers to residents for their use 24 hours a day (3) instruct site personnel to "maintain common areas ... in very clean and well maintained condition at all times," (4) act on the direction of the board, (5) prepare agendas for four meetings a year, (6) attend four board meetings a year, (6) prepare for annual meeting of association, (7) assist in the establishment and enforcement of rules and regulations, (8) assist in resolving individual owner problems, (9) manage contact lists of owners, tenants, and mortgagors, (10) advise WT about tenant management, (11) help develop annual budget.

In summary, the proposals indicate that for a large fee a property manager gives a little help and advice, along with minimal hands-on work.

As stated in my earlier report, professional management is not a panacea. These proposals simply do not support some board members' dreams that they will have no work to do if WT hires property management. Instead, the board will still have the same work to do, with a little help and advice provided by the property manager, but at a huge cost to the association members who pay the bills. It is a cost that is just too much to pay for the little bit received.

Board members could cut their work significantly under the current organization simply by clarifying and following lines of control, authority, and responsibility and by referring owners, contractors, employees, and other entities to the appropriate personnel instead of doing the tasks themselves. One of the responsibilities of the board is to clarify to residents, employees, and contractors who reports to whom, and who is responsible for what, and to require that participants operate consistently within those lines and that framework. Otherwise, unnecessary friction often exists.

SUMMARY OF FORTY-THREE RESPONDENTS' ANSWERS AND COMMENTS

Bobby D. Sorrels, October 22, 2001

1. I think WT should have professional management. Yes 42 (98%) No 1 (2%) No answer
2. I would be willing to pay this much extra assessment each month for professional management: 33 (77%) \$0 2 (5%) \$10 1 (10%) \$20 1 (10%) \$40 0 (0%) \$50+ 7 (16%) No answer
3. Whether WT is managed by professional management or not.
 - (a) Keep the position of assistant to the board with the current job description and with the requirement that the position be filled by someone who lives in the building. 3.(a) 33 (77%) Yes 2 (5%) No 8 (19%) No answer
 - (b) If yes on 3.(a), expand to include work now done by Office Aide. 3.(b) 28 (65%) Yes 2 (5%) No 11 (26%) No answer 2 (5%)!!?*
 - (c) Retain Sandra Hansen as janitor. 3.(c) 20 (47%) Yes 11 (26%) No 8 (19%) No answer 1 (7%)!!? 1 (2%) Put janitorial job up for three bids; allow Hansen to bid
 - (d) Retain Diana Drake as assistant to the board. 3.(d) 41 (95%) Yes!! No 2 (5%) No answer
4. Keep first-floor refurbishing costs under: 15 (35%) \$5,000 15 (35%) \$10,000 4 (9%) \$20,000 2 (5%) \$30,000 1 (2%) \$40,000+ 7 (16%) No answer
5. I would be willing to pay this much extra assessment each month for first-floor refurbishing: 19 (44%) \$0 8 (19%) \$5 3 (7%) \$10 1 (2%) \$15 1 (2%) \$20 1 (2%) \$25+ 11 (26%) No answer
6. Instead of paying extra monthly assessment, I would be willing to pay for first-floor refurbishing a one-time special assessment of: 12 (28%) \$0 6 (14%) \$50 7 (16%) \$100 2 (5%) \$150 2 (5%) \$200 1 (2%) \$250 1 (2%) \$300 1 (2%) \$350+ 12 (28%) No answer

*Percentages not equal to 100% because of rounding.

COMMENTS

On Professional Management

(The first two comments were made by two of the four respondents known to work in real estate, all of whom voted against property management)

1. "Professional management is a huge mistake for this building."
2. "I have been in the Real Estate Business over 30 years. We will not get better management by hiring a professional."
3. "In the three condos I have experienced, the majority have not been happy with property management. They generally are not responsive to individual problems, are unavailable when you want them and are stubborn about what they want to do as opposed to what the residents would like. My opinion is they are not worth the price."
4. "Anyone who has had personal experience with 'PROFESSIONAL' management knows you can't really be happy after the fee is paid - it's too impersonal and you can't trust concerns would be taken care of like the board wished."
5. "From my experience these services have a very impersonal interaction with their customers due to the volume of customers they manage. I would be very disappointed to lose an in-house assistant who really understands and cares for our building and who also sees what is going on daily, for a service [without] the same background."

On Refurbishing

1. "Use some cash reserves for refurbishing all the floors."
2. "Keep as is or keep cost low. As long as we have renters there will be vandalism."
3. "Complete refurbishing of 1st floor is unnecessary. Possibly carpet and do elevators."
4. "To me the murals are attractive, timeless, restful and are befitting of the space. Carpeting, yes, and restoration of wood is needed. The lounge is perfectly presentable at this point"
5. "Any major refurbishing should be BUDGETED! not special or extra/increase assessments."
6. "What we do need is new carpet on every floor (Berber) and the elevators up graded and cleaned up - carpet removed off the walls and doors painted."
7. "Unable to designate cost since don't know options being considered."

8. "Don't refurbish until the management is scolded and you have some money."
- On Sandi
1. "I would favor keeping Sandy 2!! If she improves and is willing to give monthly check list of duties completed."
 2. "I have seen the building going down . . . Sandy does less work as time goes on. Does sloppy work. Needs to be replaced."
 3. "I think we should accept bids on Sandy Hansen job."
 4. From an owner who voted not to retain Sandi: "It is not uncommon for condos to change service providers such as yard care, janitorial, tree service and others. This can be a benefit to everyone. The ones leaving have gained C:\()Crieoee and often say **the** change was the best thing that could have happened."
 5. "Sandi - has her time run out? She could do a better job. It seems she has too many distractions. If she works for residents (OK) but it should be separate from W.T. job."
 6. From one who voted not to retain Sandi: "I stand up for employee 'NON Fraternizing' with the residents of the WTC."
 7. "I'm in favor of the dismissal of Sandi unless she really will keep things up."
 8. "It is hard to understand how Sandi's mediocre work is still paid for - and that this is still a problem for this board to deal with as many have before."
 9. From one who voted to retain Sandi: "We believe (Sandi) should qualify herself as an independent **conuactor**"
- On Diana
1. "She not only provided the information I needed to make my decision to move to Willamette Towers, she was also very personable and I felt comfortable contacting her with my questions."
 2. "I work in management and recognize her ability to have excellent diplomacy and a tone that can defuse conflict and leave people smiling and still managing to resolve problems."
 3. "Diana seems to have done a very good job."
 4. "As a condominium owner I strongly do not wish to have Diana replaced by professional service. She has done an excellent job."
 5. "My contacts with Diana have all been prompt, positive, professional and helpful. I am impressed with her excellent duties."
 6. "Diana should be here full time - to be paid enough so as to live on onesalaty."
 7. "It is a big plus that (Diana) is willing to do the things she does, and that she does live in the building."
- On other subjects
1. "I am uncomfortable with the concept of closed executive meeting in the context of multiple housing decisions. I see no reason for such meetings to be closed."
 2. "Janitor should be hired as an employee."
 3. "Money is a big problem, and it strikes me that approx. \$36,000 per year for janitorial service and assistance to the board is a healthy debit for us."
 4. "It seems to me that things ran well (economically and on a sound basis). I question the prices and added costs that are being proposed - it will be a hardship on some."
 5. "I am also opposed to selling assets that bring in money - especially to finance a cosmetic project. It's like killing the golden goose."
 6. "Is it possible to retrofit the roof to cable or cell phone satellites?"
 7. "We feel people on the board should live in the towers so they will know what's really going on."
 8. "I am supportive of adequate reserves in lieu of assessments."
 9. "We wish to commend the Boards . . . who we feel have done an outstanding job of managing the condominium and the reserves that have been set aside for future needs."
 10. "I'm also supportive of the policy of 'if it ain't broke don't fix it' and the present situation may fall into that concept - in that it appears that the system is working, but may need a little timbering . . ."
 11. "What we feel is we need more security (lower level) . . ."
 12. "Diana's job/service is worth of RETENTION, to the board and the owners"
 13. From one who voted no on property = gcmem: "Cenaioy. I suppose doing what is necessary to eliminate whatever work by the Board that becomes drudgery for them."

