



# WESTCHASE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

## Voting Members Meeting Minutes

*Date: February 10, 2026*

*Time: 6:30 PM*

*Location: S&T Center Activity Room, 10405 Countryway Blvd, Tampa, FL 33626*

### I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:43 pm by Michiel Oostenbrink.

**NOTICE OF MEETING:** The meeting notice and agenda were posted on the bulletin boards at the community pool, uploaded on the Westchasewca.com community website and date and time were also posted on the WCA marquees.

### II. Roll Call

Roll call was taken. **QUORUM ACHIEVED:** 3,119 units represented at 87.8%

<u>Neighborhood</u>	<u>Units</u>	<u>Voting Member</u>	<u>VM</u>	<u>Alt</u>	<u>Staff Members Present</u>
Abbotsford	40	Alan Shabott		x	
Arlington					Michelle George
Bennington	106	Russell Crooks	x		Karen Marero
Berkeley Sq.	122	Isis Quaglia	x		Katie Ivanicks
Brentford	85	Michiel Oostenbrink	x		Kathleen Reres, HOA Attorney
Bridges	235	Dawn Gingrich	x		
Castleford	69	Jennifer Anderson	x		
Chelmsford	100	Joanne Maurer	x		
Classic TH	94	Ken Cellupica		x	
Enclave	108	Christine Hennes	x		
Glenclyff	48	Shirley Boyd	x		
Glenfield					
Greens	420	Steven Splaine	x		
Harbor Links	172	Nancy Sells	x		
Keswick	64	Jason Jozefiak	x		
Kingsford	132	Andrew Amenta		x	
Radcliffe	154	Eric Holt	x		
Reserve at WPV					
Saville Rowe	36	Bill Carey	x		
Shires	235	Barry Anderson	x		
SFH	150	Mary Griffin	x		
Stamford	61	Jamie Kolev	x		
Stockbridge	68	Ian Walters	x		
Stonebridge	66	Christine Lindsay	x		

TH of WPV	59	Jeff Clemente	x		
Traditional TH	51	Scott Stephens	x		
Village Green					
Villas of WPV					
Vineyards	120	Pam Senk	x		
Woodbay	164	Cal Hargreaves		x	
Woodbridge	40	Eric Goldstein	x		
Worthington	90	Chris Elias	x		
Wycliff	30	Terry Lanzar	x		

### III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

### IV. MINUTES FROM VOTING MEMBERS MEETING

**(M)** Motion made by Eric Holt to approve January 13, 2026, Voting Member Meeting Minutes. **MOTION PASSED 28-0.**

### V. OTHER BUSINESS - BOARD UPDATES

Michiel Oostenbrink reported that multiple meetings were held with Inframark regarding staff evaluations. The Board considered feedback from both residents and voting members during this process. A broadcast email was sent to the membership advising that Jennifer Jordan is no longer serving as the Community Association Manager (CAM). An interim action plan has been implemented to ensure continued operational coverage while the search for a Senior CAM replacement is underway. Michelle George and Christian Judy, Directors with Inframark, along with Katie Ivanicks, Vice President at Inframark, have been onsite providing support to staff. The Board is currently reviewing applicants and determining candidates for interviews. A meeting was held with TAC, S&T, Jack, Terry, and staff to review usage of YourCourts for the tennis and pickleball facilities. It was determined that previously established processes will be reinstated and enforced. The Board is evaluating opportunities for improvement, including updates to procedures and consistent enforcement of existing policies. Gate technology has been installed, and a formal check-in process is now in place. Discussion reflected concerns regarding clarity and adherence to rules. The Board is seeking to better understand resident versus guest usage of amenities and to ensure appropriate accountability for facility access. The Board expressed appreciation to the volunteers who participated in the meeting.

A lifeguard survey was distributed to obtain resident feedback. Preliminary results were shared, with 425 total responses received: 179 respondents favored eliminating lifeguards, 137 supported lifeguards during summer months only, 101 preferred no change, and 8 indicated no preference.

The Board will discuss the summer camp program at the upcoming meeting to determine whether the Association should proceed with planning or suspend the program for one year.

The Board worked with Brown & Brown, the Association's insurance broker, to consolidate insurance policies. INSG updates and related communications will be addressed at a future meeting. A special meeting will be scheduled to review reserve funding and replacement priorities. A CPA representing Glencliff will attend to provide information regarding financial services.

### VI. NEW BUSINESS

**Appoint Alternate Voting Members** – Bennington, Greens

**(M)** Motion made by Eric Holt to appoint Rachel Camilla as the 1<sup>st</sup> alternate and Bruce as the 2<sup>nd</sup> alternate as the vote count indicated for Bennington and Jeff Sibble for the Greens. Cal Hargreaves seconded. **MOTION PASSED 28-0.**

Kathleen Reres, Association Counsel, clarified that pursuant to the governing documents, the President may cast ballots on behalf of those who submitted votes, but may not vote on behalf of members who did not submit a ballot, as a Voting Member representative may. This clarification was provided in relation to the Glenfield alternate.

Kathleen Reres further clarified that the Board President does not have authority to vote in place of members who failed to submit a ballot. That authority rests solely with the designated Voting Member representative.

### **Vote on Amendments to CCR's, Articles and By-laws**

**(M)** Motion made by Christine Lindsay to delay the vote on the proposed amendments. Rick Goldstein seconded the motion.

Discussion: Christine Lindsay stated that significant time and effort had been invested in reviewing the amendments in detail and that approximately 15 errors were identified on the ballot, some of which were documented by Matthew Rice. She indicated no response had been received regarding those concerns. She further stated that she had identified approximately 26 items requiring clarification and expressed discomfort voting in favor of the amendments without a clearer understanding of their potential impact on the community. She also noted difficulty accessing the correct draft version of the amendments and indicated she did not feel adequately prepared to cast her vote, requesting additional time.

Michiel Oostenbrink acknowledged the feedback and recognized the volume and complexity of the amendments. He stated that context had been provided to residents within his village and that feedback was reviewed through legal counsel. Consideration was given to statutory changes that could potentially conflict with existing language, as well as input from management regarding operational concerns. He stated that there had been an extended review process and multiple opportunities for feedback.

Kathleen Reres, Association Counsel confirmed that she reviewed the concerns submitted by Matthew Rice and provided a written response for distribution. She reviewed the concerns that were brought up by Mr. Rice, noting that many of the identified issues were typographical errors that could be corrected. She referenced Florida Statutes Chapter 720, explaining that immaterial omissions or scrivener's errors do not invalidate a vote. She further referenced applicable case law indicating that errors must be material in nature, meaning they would prevent the membership from understanding the substance of the amendment to invalidate a ballot. In her legal opinion, none of the identified errors rose to the level of material defects, as the nature and intent of the amendments were discernible. She also noted that certain underlined language reflected stylistic or formatting changes and did not substantively alter existing provisions.

Kathleen Reres identified one exception: Ballot Item #110, relating to the noticing of committee meetings. She explained that a miscommunication occurred between legal counsel and the Documents Committee, resulting in language being included in the ballot that did not match the draft amendments posted on the website. As a result, Ballot Item #110 would not be effective and could not be voted upon due to the discrepancy.

Christine Lindsay noted she had inadvertently been removed from the email distribution list after switching representative roles and did not regain access to documents until late in the process. She reiterated that she did not feel adequately prepared to vote and requested additional time. Michiel Oostenbrink apologized for the oversight and noted that ballots were mailed to all owners in early January.

Rick Goldstein expressed appreciation to the Documents Committee for their extensive work. He echoed concerns that the process felt cumbersome and frustrating for many residents, with numerous questions raised and uncertainty about how to proceed. He indicated a desire to hold a workshop within his village to review the amendments in detail, potentially with participation from the Documents Committee, to properly address residents' concerns.

Kathleen Reres acknowledged that preparing amendment ballots is not an exact science. She explained that the Committee's intent in presenting over 100 pages of amendments across 112 ballot questions was to provide Voting Members with flexibility and transparency by allowing line-by-line consideration, rather than presenting broad or vague revisions. She noted that the Association's unique voting structure serves as a fail-safe, enabling Voting Members to act on behalf of their neighborhoods when quorum challenges exist.

Terry Lanzar asked how many other Voting Members shared similar concerns regarding readiness to vote; three voting members raised their hands. Another member inquired what postponement would entail in terms of reissuing mailers or ballots.

Kathleen Reres advised that adjournment to a later date was possible but noted that the timeline was deliberate. Certain amendments, including leasing restrictions, have an effective date of March 1, requiring approval prior to that date.

- Steve Splaine expressed similar concerns, stating uncertainty about where to begin reviewing the materials. He noted that approximately 8% of ballots had been returned and that many owners had already voted.
- Eric Holt, speaking from the DRC perspective, stated that the amendments had been visible and discussed publicly for at least six months, with updates provided at meetings for approximately eight months. Multiple communications were distributed, and the vote had already been delayed once. He stated that while full consensus may not be possible, decisions must ultimately be made.
- Bill Carey stated he had informed his community six months prior that amendments were forthcoming and had encouraged participation, resulting in approximately 20% turnout. He noted that apathy remains a challenge despite significant review opportunities.
- Mary Griffin stated the discussion had been ongoing for a considerable time.
- Christine Lindsay expressed appreciation for the DRC's efforts but reiterated her desire to fully understand the amendments before casting her vote, noting that her vote represents 57 homeowners. She inquired about prior voting procedures related to Amendment #111. M confirmed that a prior vote had occurred.
- Rick Goldstein stated he understood both perspectives but emphasized that the amendments directly impact how residents live within the community. He expressed concern that voting without sufficient additional input from his neighborhood could be viewed as disenfranchising his HOA and reiterated his request for additional time.
- Michiel Oostenbrink commented that reduced participation may reflect apathy, which affects overall turnout.

**(M) Motion Outcome** – Motion made by Christine Lindsay to delay the vote to a later date. Rick Goldstein requested that she consider a date prior to March 1 due to statutory timing concerns. Christina Lindsa amended her motion to delay the vote until March 1. A vote was taken and 22 were opposed. **MOTION FAILED 6-22.**

Kathleen Reres concluded by clarifying the distinction between Unit Owner ballots and Voting Member ballots.

### **Video Conferencing Policy**

Eric Holt led a discussion regarding Voting Member (VM) Meeting Video Conferencing Protocol. Key points discussed and consensus are as follows:

1. Shall we offer live streaming access of all VM meetings to homeowners? If so, posted via Vantaca communications only, or also the WCA website? Majority agreed to offer live streaming access.
2. Shall homeowners be given the opportunity to speak/engage if attending electronically? Majority agreed to allow electronic attendees as spectators only.
3. Shall VM's be given the option to attend VM meetings via conferencing with the same rights and status of being considered "present" as if physically attending the meeting in person: Monority support; eight (8) members agreed.

4. Shall publication of post-meeting links to view the recorded VM meetings to the community be standard protocol? Is so, for how long and/or how many meetings shall be posted at any given time? Majority agreed to post recordings.
5. How long do we retain the VM meeting recordings (note: may best be determined by the Board with legal counsel). Kathleen Reres noted that the Condo Act does not specifically apply, but retention is often done voluntarily by HOAs. Recommendation is to maintain recordings for at least 12 months from the date of approval of the minutes.
6. What other considerations must be discussed before drafting a formal policy for approval? Kathleen Reres highlighted that the Bylaws contain conditions to verify attendees' status as members or VMs when participating remotely. Streaming to allow members to watch only is treated differently than remote participation for VMs. Verification measures must be considered for remote voting members to ensure compliance.

### **WCA Capital Reserves – Component vs. Pooled Method**

Michiel Oostenbrink mentioned that the board is considering a transition from the component method to a pooled reserve method.

The component method maintains separate reserve accounts for each project and annual funding is calculated as the unfunded portion of the replacement cost divided by the estimated years until replacement.

Example provided by Eric Holt: If \$5k allocated for a specific item but only \$3k is available, the Board cannot spend the full \$5K unless additional funds are located.

The pooled method combines all budgeted reserve contributions into a single account and provides greater flexibility to allocate funds as needed across projects.

#### **Discussion Points:**

- Eric Holt emphasized flexibility and the ability to avoid special assessments or having to make up funding shortfalls.
- VM expressed concern regarding “robbing Peter to pay Paul”; noted that the current component method prevents this.
- Kathleen Reres noted that the straight-line component approach is more conservative. Annual reserve studies allow a “true-up” each year.
- Discussion included whether annual audits are required by the governing documents; Eric Holt referenced the relevant section confirming requirements.

**(M)** Motion made by Eric Holt to transition from component to pooled reserve method and to authorize the use of previously collected reserves for any purpose, which shall include all previously reserved items. Rick Goldstein seconded. **MOTION PASSED 26-2.**

## **VII. VM COMMENTS**

Rick Goldstein thanked the DRC for all the work that has been completed. Michiel Oostenbrink expressed appreciation to Brad Swindell for his service on the TAC. It was noted that he was not present at the meeting due to travel. He also gave recognition to staff for their time and efforts in ensuring the referendum votes were tallied. Eric Holt added that additional personnel were reassigned from other areas to assist in completing the work. Voting members encouraged residents to remain self-aware and mindful of safety concerns within the neighborhood.

## **VIII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEM REQUESTS**

Eric Holt asked that DRC be placed on a future agenda.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

**(M)** Motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 8:56 p.m. Meeting adjourned.