

**Sunnyhill Housing Co-operative Ltd.  
787 Third Street NW  
Calgary, Alberta T2N 1P1  
403-270-8405**

**Notice of General Meeting**

**Thursday, March 2, 2021  
7:00pm – 9:00pm**

**Zoom**

[https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/  
tZckduqqpj8iHNaQelj\\_UgUmnuny63CBdFsU](https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZckduqqpj8iHNaQelj_UgUmnuny63CBdFsU)

**Agenda**

1. Call to order
2. Set adjournment time
3. Opening remarks and introductions
4. Approval of proposed agenda
5. A Matter of Minutes
6. Consent Agenda: Approval of past General Meeting minutes:
  - a. June 7, 2020
  - b. June 28, 2020
  - c. July 28, 2020
  - d. August 22, 2020
  - e. September 27, 2020
  - f. December 10, 2020
7. Investigation report
8. Adjournment

### **“A Matter of Minutes”: The 250 Word Summary**

Almost a year of discussion has been unable to resolve the debate over whether our minutes should record decisions or conversations. We have been left without General Meeting minutes since June, and, until recently, the previous Board without most of its minutes from February till the end of its term.

Minutes are necessary. Robert’s Rules, which govern Co-op meetings, produces workable, efficient documents that preserve the reasoning for committee decisions while protecting the confidentiality of individual in-meeting conversations.

Other than when documents are presented, or when individuals request to be quoted (with the consent of the meeting), with a few procedural exceptions, Robert’s Rules avoids quotation.

When minutes become selected quotations, the problem arises about the purpose to which the transcription will be put. The more individuals understand that their words are recorded in process for possible future review, the less likely they are to trust the committee they belong to – and from there, the community.

Not only does not transcribing meetings thus help protect freedom of speech and conscience, it meets the condition of efficiency of minutes as business documents, in part because conversation is imprecise. The more conversation is written down, the greater the need for interpretation.

Robert’s Rules-based minutes meet the conditions of transparency and accountability that committees, including our General Meetings, should adhere to. As such, as Chair, and thus responsible for the form of minutes, I’m going to rule that all unapproved minutes, including those from the June 7 meeting, be presented in Robert’s Rules format for General Meeting approval.

## **“A Matter of Minutes” : The Complete 2000-Word Essay**

With this essay and the attached documents, I am fulfilling my promise and responsibility as Chair to present the still unapproved minutes from previous meetings for your consideration and approval. These are presented in accordance with Robert’s Rules of Order, which are the rules the Co-op uses in its General and Board meetings. Under ordinary circumstances, this is a simple task with a single-meeting turnaround. And I had thought to have this done several meetings ago, but because we are dealing with legal obligations as well as recent Co-op history and practice, I had to get this writing reviewed before offering it to you.

This is my argument. Our Board and Membership Meeting minutes are the legal record of what we have chosen to do. As such, they are documents that we are required to prepare for publication both within and outside the Co-op. As well as our own membership, readers may include the governments with which we partner. As well, anyone with whom the Coop wishes to negotiate any long term financial commitment (as we are in the process of doing now) has a right to request them. Without approved minutes regarding Co-op decisions, particularly but not limited to financial ones, our auditing documents would be incomplete, which would put the approval of our books and our reliability as project partners, in doubt.

As things were left from the previous Board, there were no Board-approved minutes for the Board meetings of February 25, March 11 (a meeting relevant to the budget), May 13 and June 10. As things stand now, there are no approved minutes for the Coop General Meetings from June 7 onwards. The Board has taken the necessary steps to solve the problem of past Board minutes, and we still have time and the means to solve this problem for those relevant to our past General Meetings. The issue delaying minute approval, and that has divided us, is the purpose and content of minutes themselves.

With this in mind, *Robert’s Rules* indicates that minutes “should contain mainly a record of what was **done** at the meeting, not what was **said** by members” (11<sup>th</sup> Edition, 2011, Section 48, lines 17-18, emphasis *Robert’s*). Exceptions occur if a member requests that something they’ve said be recorded verbatim and the meeting approves the addition through an ordinary resolution. And documents that are prepared for and presented at a meeting are either included in the minutes themselves or, more often, included as attachments for reference.

Minutes are supposed to be direct, short, clear, and easy to read. Motions are made, votes are recorded, and a brief rationale for a decision is included. Done properly, minutes make it possible for a reader to take in a meeting’s worth of work in a short read; they make decisions transparent, as they should be, and keeps their deliberations, as they need to be, confidential.

That is the core of the problem. Approval of both Board and Co-op minutes has been deadlocked by the persistence of the argument that “transparency” entails that minutes become a record of what was said on the way to a decision, an argument that moves minutes towards being a selected list of quotations from a meeting’s discussion rather than a record of its decisions and supporting rationales alone. Taken to its logical conclusion, it’s an argument that would transform minutes into the full transcription of a meeting’s conversation, an unwieldy document which cannot be created without the consent of all involved.

**Sunnyhill Housing Co-operative Ltd.  
787 Third Street NW  
Calgary, Alberta T2N 1P1  
403-270-8405**

**Committee of the Whole meeting minutes**

**Sunday, June 7, 2020  
2:00pm – 4:00pm**

**ZOOM LINK – <https://us02web.zoom.us/join/92122738020>**

**Attended:** Andrea Bergen (Office Coordinator), Kiarra Spent (2), Mahlah Hansen (10), Ben Arkell (10), Richard Harrison (18), Lisa Rouleau (18), Philip Cox (22), Yvonne Sabraw (22), Dorrie Derbowka (24), Heidi Mithaug-Cook (26), Anna Barrett (26), Sarah Reimer (30), Vivienne Livingstone (32), Debbie Willis (34), Pamela Boyd (36), Mollie Mithaug-Cook (38), Dillon Jakovac (38), Aurica Bondoc (42), Tyla Cosgrove (44), Marion Gauzer (734), Bonnie Robinson (740), David Broadhead (744), Sarah Stephens (748), Don McCabe (755), Sarah McCabe (755), Rita Fields (762), Brenda Morgan (764), Jane Roberts (767), Peter Clyne (771), Gabriela Laszlo (783), Cindy Schnee (801), Eric Moschopedis (803), Mia Rushton (803), Buzz Viberg (805), Rachel Rose (807), Mike Whittington (807), Brenda Willman (809), Jenny Tzanakos (813), Jaime Muneoka (815), Sherry Kozak (817), Janice Way (819), Herta Fidler (821), Coeur Riley (823), Belle Auld (825), Bob Bott (837), Helen Wirrell (839), Sabine Schlichting (841), Mark Terrell (849), Ann-Marie L'Arrivee (849)

**Special guest:** Carol Daw, Mediator

**Call to order by Richard Harrison: 2:10pm**

Reading of agenda by Richard Harrison

Preamble by Richard Harrison and Rachel Rose:

As the Facilitators of this meeting, we just to take a few moments to outline the context and spirit in which this meeting has come together. The resignation of the Grounds committee was the catalyst for this meeting however the request was to explore the broader underlying issues. As such, we will find that this meeting will cover broader more wide-reaching issues as the discussion unfolds.

Early on we knew that we needed to have the support of an outside mediator to ensure that the conversation was productive, cooperative and generative in its outcome. We reached out to SACHA and are thankful to have Carol Daw as our mediator today. In a few moments she will outline her role and the content of the agenda in greater depth so that we are all clear about how this mediation process will unfold.

We acknowledge that there are many big feelings, questions and important concerns that people are experiencing right now. Our hope is that this virtual space we are sharing here together can be a safe place for all our feelings to be heard and listened to with respect and

patience.

We also recognize that this meeting is just this first step of a larger process. We likely won't reach a place of clarity at the end of this meeting but rather have started the work of bringing people together so that we can care for, and heal, the social fabric that is at the very core of the coop. The goal of this process is to support people to once again trust and collaborate in good faith.

Long-time member Yvonne Sabraw has some wise words that perhaps summarize this special meeting and its placement in the broader context of life in Sunnyhill. She says:

“Co-op meetings are an absolutely essential part of our community's democratic process and participating in this process is what we all signed up for when we became members. Meetings can appear messy and at times painful. They can be confusing, and we know that we need to do better at educating our members about how SHC meetings work. This one is an unusual meeting, following a process outlined in our Bylaws, made by special request from members to address a specific issue. So, as this meeting unfolds, please keep in mind that it is not a typical General Meeting, but it is very much deeply rooted in the grassroots level democracy and community-building that is the essence of SHC.”

#### **Approval of proposed agenda as amended:**

- Amendment – remove item #1 from Carol's stages of mediation and change it to “Reading of the letter from concerned members and the invitation of others to speak so that members can add to the issues”. Item #1 will be Identification and clarification of the issues
- Some members felt that they would have liked to have a copy of the concerned members letter before the meeting for background

**M/S/C Mollie Mithaug-Cook/Sabine Schlichting**

#### **Carol Daw introduced herself and outlined the below listed stages of mediation:**

- Carol has been asked to come today to help mediate the issues that were raised by some members at the Co-op
- Carol's goal as a mediator is as an unbiased 3rd party is to help the parties to hear and understand one another. It is key for everyone to listen well; listen to understand, not listen to agree.
- Goal is to move to resolution of the issues that have been raised
- Rules of the meeting: 1) ensure everyone is respectful of each other. 2) Be assertive, not aggressive. 3) everyone given the opportunity to say what they want to say, while being mindful of the time
- Remember that we are all just people that are trying our best with the skills that we are

given to work towards a common goal

**Discussion opened with reading of the Letter from Concerned Members: (attached)**

Discussion ensued with the aim of creating recommendations for the Co-op and the next Board to follow up on problems identified in the round-table discussion of the breakdown of the relationship between the Board, the Board Chair, certain committees whose members spoke of in the meeting

**Sarah Reimer, Chair of the board, presented the following document (attached)**

**Recommendations were made as follows:**

- a. The Board needs to rebuild trust with the Membership
- b. Can we design a method for people to share “going forward” suggestions and present at AGM?
- c. Put on the AGM agenda that we explore the possibility of creating a committee or task force to explore the amendment of the by-laws where the by-laws would become a tool in these circumstances instead of a weapon and the by-laws would cover those circumstances where personality comes into play and we can rely on the by-laws as a tool.
- d. Lack of respect and tonal issues must be addressed. The conversation today didn't acknowledge the hurt that people feel
- e. Complete by-law/policy revisions
- f. Board have a direct email address for Members to contact the Board directly. Archived conversations would be available for the next Board
- g. Board to plan a retreat to fully discuss the outcome of this meeting
- h. The Board asks that Membership understands that they need time to reflect on the outcome of this meeting as a whole. They have heard what Members are saying
- i. There is a disconnect between the guiding documents that we follow and what is actual practice. Guiding documents need to reflect what we actually do and care about. Communication needs to happen so that the Board knows what Members wants and needs are

Final words from Carol – It's not all about black and white and bylaws and policies, it's also about people's feels and important for them to feel heard. Communication must be respectful. This has been step 1 in a process that she hopes we will continue with

Adjournment: 4:35pm

Respectfully submitted by Andrea Bergen



There are several problems here. As anyone who has looked at transcribed conversations knows, people express themselves in incomplete thoughts or in phrases that only make sense once the context is known. Words said in conversations, unlike motions, are rarely meant to, and often do not, stand alone. The more words there are in a conversation, the more decisions the transcriber has to make (when the transcription is incomplete) about what to include and what to leave out. In the resulting documents, the greater the necessity there is for the reader to figure out what speakers really meant; thus, the more open to interpretation those documents become. In many ways, then, such an accounting of what was said in a meeting in the name of pure transparency can in fact lead to pure obscurity. When we speak, we don't dictate sentences the way we do when we are wording motions. Nor do we often know where our thoughts are leading until we talk our way to what we want to say. Because of these features of conversation, we don't need to follow what everyone says in a meeting in order to be clear about what the meeting decided.

This year, we have dealt with difficult subjects and problems. We are still dealing with them. If we have an obligation to be sincere and co-operative in solving our problems and planning our dreams, we must be free to speak our minds as best we can within the bounds of discussion determined by the meeting as a whole. Having our meetings become places where people's every word is transcribed and judged works completely against that principle and our goals.

We have, as a Co-op, always done our best to negotiate positions within our rules of practice rather than solve differences of opinion by decree. So we're here, with the Co-op as a whole needing clarity about its past to move into its future. As clearly important to us as finding a process that is both fair and accommodates differing needs among the membership might be, and as much as we value consensus, we cannot let it interfere with the proper administration of Co-op business to the point that it threatens the health of our community.

For these reasons, as Chair, and thus responsible for the minutes, I am going to break an impasse that ordinary discussion has failed to end. I have asked the recording secretary to take out from the as-yet-unapproved minutes all attributable conversations surrounding motions except for those that *Roberts Rules* deems necessary. These minutes, are presented here for your consideration for approval in our upcoming General Meeting. Further, in accord with provincial co-operative practice, and with the approval of the current Board, the minutes left unapproved from the meetings of the previous Board have also been reformatted in the same way and approved by those members from that Board who have continued to serve.

I apologize for the length of this letter; I'm trying to unravel a long standing conflict in as few words as possible, but a conflict can grow a lot of heads in that kind of time. So before I sign off, I want to address three significant objections to this action. The first is the argument that if something said in a meeting doesn't appear in our minutes, it means we are pretending it was never said. This is untrue. We are all witnesses to what is said in meetings we attend. We are all free to take notes of whatever we hear. We are all free to follow up with each other on any conversation that we have had. But these records and discussions are separate issues from what needs to be recorded and published regarding meetings.

The second argument is that an omission from minutes mean words have no meaning or value when they are spoken. This is also not the case. *Robert's Rules* doesn't permit just *anything* to be said. There is a standard of respect. There is such a thing as unparliamentary language which can be called out by the Chair of the meeting (either by the Chair as an individual or acting on the request of a member of the meeting) at the time it is said. A member can be asked to withdraw such a comment or asked to leave the meeting if they do not. But putting something said in a meeting in the minutes implies more than



that it was said. It implies that it is necessary to break the confidentiality of the deliberations of a committee, that the person who said it wants it published for further use – and, once the minutes are approved, it is accepted by the meeting as a whole and can be put to any purpose any published document is put. For most of what we say, quoted verbatim among ourselves, none of that is the case.

And that comes back to the ultimately protective property of minutes. When we are in committee, our conversations are confidential to that committee for all the reasons I've mentioned: we have to be free to speak our minds, and not everything we say ends up being included in the reasons of committee (including Board) decisions – some things that are said are deliberately rejected by such decisions. As such, nothing said in that context should be published; it is, within the committee, with the exceptions noted above, a conversation had in confidence.

This consideration brings me to our meeting of June 7. This was special meeting, co-facilitated by a representative from the Board and the Members who had requested it. It was held under the guidance of a professional mediator recommended by SACHA and approved by both the Board and the representative of the petitioning group. As I said in my opening remarks to that meeting, in order to fully explore the reasons for Grounds' resignation, and other issues in the Co-op, we were invited to share our perspectives in the interest of making recommendations for how to solve the existing problems in the Co-op and set a course for the future.

That is what that meeting was for: to achieve a greater understanding of what happened and to come up with recommendations to solve the problems that made the meeting necessary. No motions were passed. Even though the meeting was open to the entire Co-op, nothing was decided in that meeting that was binding to the Co-op as a whole. Though I, and others, made it clear that that meeting was different in kind from other General Meetings, what I regret not doing at the time was frame that meeting in the language of *Robert's Rules*. I should have. Under *Robert's Rules*, when a General Meeting wants to stop being a general motion-passing meeting and discuss something with the aim of providing nonbinding recommendations for future action, the move to make that possible is called "Moving to the Committee of the Whole."

Such a move is relatively rare. I'm not sure we'd ever done this at the Co-op until June 7, so I missed attaching that label to what we did. Nonetheless, that is what we in fact did, and it should be recorded appropriately. This means that, with the exception of the letters presented by Bob Bott on behalf of the concerned members, and by Sarah Reimer, the then Board Chair, at the meeting, the minutes will be structured around *Robert's Rules* for Committees. Included will be the introductory remarks outlining the meeting as a mediation session, a brief description of the nature of the discussion, the two letters, as attachments, and a list of the recommendations.

The recording secretary and I have been working for several weeks to prepare all the previously unapproved minutes according to these guidelines. Thank you for reading all this. I hope this is the last discussion we will have to have about minutes, and that, once this package is approved, we can get to the business of making decisions in our co-op in as free and co-operative way as we have for most of our history while we set the course for our future together.

Thank you,

All the best,

Richard.

## **Background notes for June 7 SHC general meeting**

### **Introductory note from Bob Bott**

Several current and former members of the Grounds, Planning and Development, and Communications committees, as well as individual members, asked me to summarize the concerns about the Board, governance, and the committee system that led up to the mass resignation of the Grounds members April 6. That resignation is the proposed subject of the June 7 general meeting, but the concerns are much broader and need to be addressed to restore co-operation and harmony.

I have been a member of Grounds since I moved into Sunnyhill in 2002, and I have been on Planning and Development since its origin as the Vision 2020 Task Force around 2008, so I have had a front-row seat during the recent conflicts. I have also observed over the years the strengths and weaknesses of our systems of governance and management.

However, these notes are not just my own observations and opinions. They are based equally on what I have heard and read from other members. Some have reviewed and helped to edit this document, and they have added their signatures to it. Others are welcome to add their signatures or add their own commentary.

### **The Grounds resignations**

The mass resignation of Grounds members in April was to protest the long string of edicts issued by the Board that seemed to undermine every action and decision that we made. The last straw was the announcement, without consultation, that the Board would take over part of our budget for a particular ice-clearing task. We simply could not stand to spend yet another meeting discussing the Board's demands rather than the plans and projects we wanted to pursue for the benefit of the co-op.

The breakdown in trust and communications between Grounds and the Board began soon after the election of the current chair and directors. Instead of conveying member concerns and complaints to the committee, the Board often chose to adjudicate matters itself and hand down its judgements in legalistic missives. Committee members described some of the interactions as inquisitions.

Grounds has long been one of the most active and engaged committees in the co-op. Members joined and stayed because it was immensely satisfying to maintain and improve our shared environment and quality of life. You could actually do things, whether planting shrubs or pulling weeds or distributing mulch under trees. We consulted experts and researched products and practices. We looked after equipment in the tool shed. We also managed contractors for lawn care, snow clearing, pruning, and irrigation, and sometimes we undertook other projects such as paving, waste collection, and signage. We tried to fulfill our responsibilities and stay within budget. At the time of our dissolution, we were interviewing possible alternatives to Curbside for our lawn maintenance and snow clearing.

We may have become over-confident, and we may have dismissed some member concerns without sufficient explanation or accommodation. These issues were legitimate subjects for discussion and compromise. Instead, the Board simply dismissed our experience and expertise and handed down its rulings. These interventions broke down relationships and communication between the committee and

the membership. In the case of the Food Forest Pilot Project, we had to call a special general meeting to get approval for the project. Some committee members felt the Board's behaviour amounted to

harassment. When this acrimony continued through the winter, we unanimously agreed that we could not take it anymore.

Grounds was not alone in its desire to resign and end the confrontations.

### **Governance and management**

We have since heard from members of at least three other committees about what they consider "aggressive, condescending, and bullying behaviour" by the Board and specifically the chair. This lack of respect for fellow co-op members is unacceptable. Communications committee has experienced stress and turmoil caused by a Board member's behaviour. Members of Planning and Development have considered resigning several times because of the uncooperative behaviours of the board. Buildings committee has experienced conflict due to micro-management. One-bedroom members have felt disrespected by Board members' cavalier attitudes towards their probable displacement. We have seen Board members quit. Some members have actively investigated moving from Sunnyhill altogether. This is all deeply concerning.

Some of this problem may just be a clash of personalities, and some is undoubtedly due to misunderstandings and miscommunications. However, there are also structural issues that need to be addressed.

The Board has overall responsibility for governance and finances of the co-op. Historically, the committees have then handled the management of the areas within their member-approved mandates and budgets. Until recently, one director also sat on each of the major committees and provided liaison to and from the Board. One other significant change has been the hiring of a professional manager, who took over some responsibilities of Buildings, arguably our most important committee.

The Board and committees provide important means for members to fulfill their responsibility to participate in the operation and decisions of the co-op (which we all agreed to do when we joined). If we do not have active and effective committees, most of the membership will be left out and subject to the whims of the Board and its dominant personalities. Such a situation is contrary to co-operative principles.

Quoting from one committee member: "Trying to work with this Board has been difficult, confusing, and emotionally exhausting. I have stayed the course because I am dedicated to the membership and work to serve them. Our directors have a moral obligation to lead our cooperative and to represent the membership. The aggressive and abusive behaviour exhibited time and again is not representative of Sunnyhill Housing Cooperative, nor is it leadership. We are a generous, trusting, and kind community. We are not suspicious, accusatory, and mean spirited."

### **Recommendations**

Sunnyhill is a 42-year-old housing co-op with a strong history of community. We are caring, considerate, and cooperative. The last year has exposed the cracks in the foundation of our community.

As we move to secure the long-term future of the co-op by purchasing the land, rehabilitating our buildings, and potentially constructing new housing, it is beholden on us, the membership, to establish a

solid social and organizational infrastructure that the co-op will need to remain kind, affordable, and cooperative. We cannot do to our community what we have done to our physical infrastructure—defer dealing with it until we are further in crisis.

As a membership we need to learn from what has occurred. This is an opportunity for reflection. It is also the time for us to ask what kind of housing co-op we want to be tomorrow, five years from now, and 50 years into the future.

What SHC needs now is leadership that works with the community and eschews power grabs-- leadership that brings members together around common goals, leads us through difficult decision making, and works to strengthen our community relationships.

We need a Board that trusts and works collaboratively with committees. We need a Board that is transparent about its decision making, confines its activities to membership needs, not personal agendas, and shows respect towards the membership. We need a Board that is future-focused and can plant seeds today for tomorrow's harvest.

For today's meeting we are recommending that we focus on some major themes to help guide our discussions:

1. Transparency between the Board and the membership
2. Improved communication between Committees, the Board and the membership
3. Intentional steps to rebuild confidence and trust in the Board

Signed,

Bob Bott 837  
David Broadhead 744  
Cindy Schnee 801  
Eric Moschopedis 803  
Pam Boyd 36  
Anonymous  
Janice Way 819  
Don McCabe 755  
Helen Wirrell 839  
Bonnie Robinson 740  
Dorrie Derbowka 24  
Mike Whittington 807  
Sarah McCabe, 755  
Sharmeen Ajmal, 751  
Mia Rushton, 803  
Kris Wenzel 34  
David Sargent 801

When I first saw Rachel's article in the newsletter, I wanted to sign the petition myself because I truly believe that open dialogue of the deeper issues affecting the co-op will be the most effective means by which they can be addressed, but hesitated due to 'optics' of also being the board chair. I was on the cusp of informing the rest of the board of my decision to join the petition, when the completed request was presented. So thank you Rachel for starting the conversation and to all the signatories who brought it about.

There is a vast difference between the role of the board and the personalities of the individuals that serve or the resulting group dynamic. I am not a 'board', I am not a 'role', I am a person, a concerned co-op member, neighbour and friend, as we all are.

The orientation to the board, and the SACHA led board course emphasised that a director's main responsibility is to ensure the co-op operates according to the member agreed bylaws and policies. Phil's parting words to the current board were an admonition to focus on and influence the process and to leave the outcome up to the members. That has been my beacon and guiding light this past year as chair. My understanding is that as board director I represent the interests and concerns of a diverse population, and not simply those whose opinions reflect my own. In my time as a director and as chair, I have endeavoured to diligently represent this diversity. I believe that a co-op isn't about only like-minded people living together but about diverse people working to understand each other, especially when our ideas diverge, to create a community that accurately reflects the whole, to bravely create a more just and sustainable society than we see modeled anywhere else.

My main concerns in the co-op are systemic rather than personal- there is great confusion about our organisational structure and related responsibilities, and accountability. This is further complicated by lack of transparency in communication, in all directions- from board, from property manager, from committees, from members. There is also confusion around agreed processes and frustration with the pace of work completion, especially when it is slowed when parties are required, possibly quite late in the day, to adhere to these processes. And of course, in all dealings, there are personal and emotional interactions and ramifications which affect both what happens and the perception of those events. Communicating too much or too little can have unfortunate outcomes, and I'm sure we all struggle with maintaining the right balance. But personally, I will answer any direct question about my performance, decisions or understandings, without prejudice.

The current tension is not the result of one event, issue or indeed year, but about an accumulation of issues over time, their intersection and growth. It is about different people having different understandings of what various roles and responsibilities entail, of differing information and of multiple people being hurt and frustrated about different things and not feeling or having the freedom to speak openly and be heard authentically, of fear of reprisal ... this is the natural result of people with all these differences attempting to live together cooperatively; this is not the first nor the last time that misunderstanding will cause the community to feel stretched, but then to come together, reevaluate and be faced with difficult conversations and choices.

The current situation is also about change management, about the speed of change and about adjusting to the dynamic reality that is cooperative living; In 2019, the composition of the board changed dramatically, and the resultant group dynamic and process, although ahistorical, was well-intentioned, supported by education provided by SACHA, and we believed supported by the collective will of the membership. But even positive change that comes too quickly can have negative results.

I believe that the first step to moving forward is a re-commitment to and understanding of common ground, a recommitment to a process of dialogue that invites all members to be heard, to work with members and ideas that challenge us and to welcome scrutiny as a tool to sharpen a blade, so that we can move forward truly unified. This will require active member engagement- and all members, committees and the board will need to foster both a willingness to speak hard truths/ critiques and to hear and accept them. To value each other's contribution even when we disagree with it; to honour the right of each person to hold dissenting opinions and the humility to accept that our understanding / vision is not the one right way.

Log, rock, river, ice flow- the rock is not wrong for being immovable, the river is not wrong for flowing, the log is not wrong for floating along, and the ice is not to blame for riding the waves, crashing into the rock, breaking, and/or getting caught up with the logs to create a backlog, but the backlog can be dangerous, and yet if any one element were removed, the ecology of the river is destroyed. When we learn to value what each element adds to the mix and allow the warmth of vulnerability

We can see individual people/ committees like these elements, and with that, we can agree that all parties have valuable information and insight to share, but it can also become tricky if we fall into personality politics. I suggest that the analogy be used to visualise our core tenets- what is the rock that is immovable in our community? Is that an understanding or agreement that remains unchanged regardless of who joins? What is the river that moves things along? Is that our organisational structure, communication, relationship - 3 elementary molecules bound together? What about the logs and ice flows that sometimes get tangled together, break or melt or get carried off by beavers, but either way, look much different at the end than they did at the beginning? Are these our plans and policies? If any one part is removed or disregarded, we all lose.

If we are honest with ourselves, we would admit that most of us have both hurt people with our choices and been hurt by others choices and been failed by an imperfect system. While this meeting may be insufficient to deal with all personal hurts and still address the systemic challenges, both aspects need to be examined bc both pieces contributed to the issue. We will see that we all have not treated others as we would want to be treated, we all have been motivated by selfish ambition, and while it might feel safe to point finger and apportion blame, we all need to be prepared to be evaluated with the same level of scrutiny; That does not deny the need for personal responsibility, but if we are able to separate the systemic challenges from persons, hopefully we can improve the system and repair personal relationships.

I, for one, am prepared to reveal the decision making process behind any board decision that I participated in. If my personal position or preferences are asked for, I will reveal them as well, in the interests of transparency; I believe that i acted impartially, but I am willing for the membership to assess and analyse my process, research and method and will submit to a membership decision about whether I, individually or as a part of the board, was unduly biased, or self-interested, at fault in part or in whole of each and every decision membership wishes to examine.

Thank you for your patience.

**Sunnyhill Housing Co-operative**

787 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Street N.W.  
Calgary, AB T2N 1P1  
Phone/Fax: 403-270-8405

**ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING**

*SUNDAY JUNE 28th, 2020*

*2:00PM – 4:00PM*

*ZOOM - [https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZMud-6tqzwoH91M-bY8Z0c671FukskwVhN\\_](https://us02web.zoom.us/join/https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZMud-6tqzwoH91M-bY8Z0c671FukskwVhN_)*

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Attended:** Kevin Chaney (4), Ben Arkell (10), Nathan Erickson (12), Marzena Czarnecka (14), Richard Harrison (18) Lisa Rouleau (18), Zahaurul Islam (20), Philip Cox (22), Yvonne Sabraw (22), Dorrie Derbowka (24), Heidi Mithaug-Cook (26), Anna Barrett (26), Sarah Reimer (30), Debbie Willis (34), Pam Boyd (36), Mollie Mithaug-Cook (38), Dillon Jakovac (38), Aurica Bondoc (42), Tyla Cosgrove (44), Marion Gauzer (734), Jacky Durrie (738), Bonnie Robinson (740), James Jordan (740), David Broadhead (744), Sarah Stephens (748), Don McCabe (755), Brenda Morgan (764), Jane Roberts (767), Rose Ing (768), Peter Clyne (771), Cindy Schnee (801), David Sargent (801), Mia Rushton (803), Eric Moschopedis (803), Buzz Viberg (805), Rachel Rose (807), Mike Whittington (807), Brenda Willman (809), Greg Doram (811), Laura Doram (811), Jenny Tzanakos (813), Sherry Kozak (817), Coeur Riley (823), Belle Auld (825), Bob Bott (837), Helen Wirrell (839), Sabine Schlichting (841), Romelia Geamanu (847)

**Regrets:** Herta Fidler (821)

**Special Guest:** Anda Frusescu (Auditor)

1. Call to order: 2:08pm
  
2. Approval of Proposed Agenda as amended:
  - a. M/S/C            Cindy Schnee/Pam Boyd
  
3. Approval of meeting minutes:
  - a. April 26, 2020 Budget vote meeting:
    - i. M/S/C            Pam Boyd/Cindy Schnee



b. June 7, 2020 General meeting:

- i. David Sargent was present at the meeting but is not indicated that he was there
- ii. Point 1, a,13 – delete the wording “addressing some of the issues”. Should reflect that it was not a response
- iii. Point 1, a,17 – add the wording “Some” before Members
- iv. There were some comments and concerns that were raised but were not included in the minutes. One of them states that the main problem in the co-op is the tone of the communications, particularly from the Board Chair. There were also other comments personally naming the Board Chair as the problem using words such as abuse, harassment, bully. The minutes do not reflect the personal naming of the Board Chair
- v. Suggested there be an item 1, a,26 – the comment was made that the main problem in the co-op is the tone of communications coming from the Board, specifically the Board Chair
- vi. Instead of saying that the Board Chair was bullying, maybe say that some members felt that the tone was in a certain nature rather than saying that the Board Chair did something or said something, because it’s about perception. Then it would be how it was actually perceived to acknowledge that. To acknowledge that is not putting it on a person but acknowledging that people felt a certain way
  1. The issue is that isn’t what was said. Perception is important but when the comment was made that the main problem in the co-op is the tone of communications coming from the chair. If that was the comment, we can take it verbatim from the recording so that it is present for future evidence
- vii. MOTION – that we do not accept these minutes, and that they be transcribed exactly as they were recorded
  - a. M/S/C          Yvonne Sabraw/Heidi Mithaug-Cook
  - b. Jenny Tzanakos has agreed to look into transcribing the meeting minutes for future membership approval

4. Presentation of the Audited Financial Statements by Anda Frusescu:

- a. The Board of Directors met with Anda on April 14, 2020 to approve the Audited Financial Statements
- b. 2019 was a good year for Sunnyhill
- c. Anda is very happy with Sunnyhill's internal controls
- d. Total assets \$2,716,055. Not much has changed except for the addition of the office computer
- e. Total liabilities \$1,733,309
- f. Total revenues \$788,329
- g. Total expenses \$580,190
- h. Total restricted net assets \$307,730
- i. Unit fund beginning of year \$37,944; end of year \$36,258. \$17,100 transfer to operations
- j. At the end of the audit Anda provided Sunnyhill with 2 letters. 1 is a representation letter from Sunnyhill and the other one was the audit finding letter that was presented to the Board and signed. The audit finding letter usually includes recommendations from Anda. This year there were no recommendations as Anda was very pleased with the way that the books were handled
  - i. Questions:
    1. It appears that the unit fund goes down each year. Is this a concern?
      - a. There was a transfer of \$17,000 this year. There was not much change from last year. Members are using their unit fund more
    2. It says that we did not spend any money on kitchen cupboards this year. Does this mean that we are done replacing all the cupboards?
      - a. No, there was not anybody on the list for requested renovations. The Buildings Committee now has to go over the tracking spreadsheet and offer renovations to Members with the oldest kitchens. Some Members have declined renovations as their kitchens are due but still in good condition
    3. It appears on page 11 that there was a huge increase in the mortgage, why?
      - a. A change in the mortgage. It went down to zero because we changed providers so it was showing outstanding at

the beginning of 2018. Started with new mortgage in 2019. Page 11 shows the details of how the mortgage was paid out

b. The balance sheet on page 3 under liabilities shows exact details of the mortgage

4. Utilities and waste removal on page 5 more than doubled last year, why?

a. We knew there was a big increase coming from the city so we switched companies

5. MOTION:

From the Board of Directors, Ben Arkell (Treasurer) moves that the Audited Financial Statements presented today by the offices of Anda Frusescu be accepted as a real and true presentation of Sunnyhill Housing Co-operative Ltd. financials for the year ending December 31, 2019

a. M/S/C Ben Arkell/Lisa Rouleau

6. Call for Motion to appoint Anda Frusescu 2020 Auditor

a. M/S/C Coeur Riley/Brenda Willman

MOTION to extend the meeting until 4:30pm M/S/C Lisa Rouleau/Coeur Riley

7. Committee Reports:

a. Report from the Board of Directors:

i. MOTION – The report was not approved by the whole Board so Membership should not receive this report as a Board report

1. M/S/C David Broadhead/Cindy Schnee

b. Buildings Committee:

i. Buildings Committee report was presented by Nathan Erickson for the Buildings Committee

c. Communication Committee:

i. Communications Committee report was presented by Mia Rushton for the Communications Committee

d. Education Committee:

i. Educations Committee report was presented by Belle Auld for the Education Committee

e. Finance Committee:

i. Finance Committee report was presented by Jane Roberts for the Finance Committee

- f. Grounds Committee:
    - i. Grounds Committee report was presented by Cindy Schnee for the Grounds Committee
  - g. Member Selection Committee:
    - i. Member Selection report was presented by Lisa Rouleau for the Member Selection Committee.
  - h. Planning and Development Committee:
    - i. Planning and Development report was presented by Eric Moschopedis for the Planning and Development Committee.
  - i. Social Committee:
    - i. Social Committee report was presented by Rachel Rose for the Social Committee.
8. Beginning the follow up to the June 7<sup>th</sup> General Meeting: Board Election
- a. **MOTION:** Sarah Reimer (Chair) moves that there be 7 directors on the Board of Directors for the 2020 – 2021 year.
    - i. M/S/C Sarah Reimer/Coeur Riley

MOTION to extend the meeting until 5:00pm M/S/C Coeur Riley/Yvonne Sabraw

- b. Elections:
  - i. Sherry Kozak/Peter Clyne nominated Mike Whittington – Mike accepted
  - ii. Eric Moschopedis/Bob Bott nominated Don McCabe – Don declined
  - iii. Rachel Rose/Coeur Riley nominated Kevin Chaney – Kevin accepted
  - iv. Jenny Tzanakos/Coeur Riley nominated Belle Auld – Belle accepted
  - v. Dorrie Derbowka/Buzz Viberg nominated Richard Harrison – Richard accepted
  - vi. Yvonne Sabraw/Rachel Rose nominated Dorrie Derbowka – Dorrie accepted
  - vii. Brenda Willman/Sarah Reimer nominated David Broadhead – David declined
  - viii. Sherry Kozak/Eric Moschopedis nominated Mollie Mithaug-Cook – Mollie accepted
  - ix. Cindy Schnee/Sarah Stephens nominated Buzz Viberg – Buzz accepted
  - x. Sarah Reimer/Sarah Stephens nominated Coeur Riley – Coeur accepted
  - xi. Sarah Reimer/Helen Wirrell nominated Sarah Stephens – Sarah accepted
  - xii. Coeur Riley/Belle Auld nominated Yvonne Sabraw – Yvonne declined
  - xiii. Sarah Reimer nominated Sherry Kozak – Sherry declined
  - xiv. Eric Moschopedis/Coeur Riley nominated Jenny Tzanakos – Jenny accepted
- c. A few words from all the nominees on what they can offer to the position of Board of Directors

d. Elections took place via anonymous Zoom poll

i. Results:

1. 2020 – 2021 Board of Directors:

- a. Richard Harrison
- b. Mike Whittington
- c. Kevin Chaney
- d. Mollie Mithaug-Cook
- e. Buzz Viberg
- f. Sarah Stephens
- g. Jenny Tzanakos

9. Comments:

- a. Thank you to the outgoing Board for working so hard this past year
- b. Goats will be coming back to Sunnyhill July 13-21. 265 goats

10. Adjournment: 5:11pm

Respectfully submitted by Andrea Bergen

DRAFT

**Sunnyhill Housing Co-operative Ltd.**  
**787 Third Street NW**  
**Calgary, Alberta T2N 1P1**  
**403-270-8405**

**General Meeting Minutes**

**Tuesday, July 28, 2020**  
**7:00pm – 9:00pm**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/join/zoom-join?meeting=register/tZEudeuupzsrGdMzWy-pXYf1wEZQeCiXqUeO>

**Attended:** Andrea Bergen (Office Coordinator), Kevin Chaney (4), Chris Taylor (8), Susan Russell (16), Richard Harrison (18), Lisa Rouleau (18), Phil Cox (22), Yvonne Sabraw (22), Sarah Reimer (30), Debbie Willis (34), Bonne Robinson (740), Jane Roberts (767), Rachel Jenzen (771), Cindy Schnee (801), Eric Moschopedis (803), Mia Rushton (803), Buzz Viberg (805), Greg Doram (811), Belle Auld (825), Bob Bott (837)

**Regrets:** Tyla Cosgrove (44), Brenda Willman (809)

1. Call to order: 7:14pm
  - a. Adjournment 8:30pm
2. Opening remarks and introductions:
  - a. This meeting was called to discuss a mural request as well as an update from the Board
3. Approval of proposed agenda as amended: approved
4. Business:
  - a. Meeting minute process update:
    1. The June 7, 2020 General meeting minutes cannot be transcribed as every member that was at the meeting must give permission. We do not have that permission so the motion that was carried to transcribe the meeting is out of order. The minutes need to be an effective summary instead of a transcription. These meeting minutes must still be approved
    2. Point of order – the June 7<sup>th</sup> meeting still needs to be discussed before being approved; what that meeting was, why it was different and what we want in the minutes
  - b. Board of Directors update from the Board retreat:

1. A Board Bulletin Board will be emailed to each member monthly as well as posted on the Sunnyhill website
2. Richard is setting up a process where the board chair is to meet with the committee chair-people monthly via Zoom to coordinate activities
3. TELUS Fiber optics upgrade:
  - a. Questions from Membership for Andrea to get answers for from TELUS to be discussed at the next General Meeting:
    1. Could TELUS provide a Fiber optics community cable, in the ground, that would provide Wi-Fi access to Sunnyhill grounds as well as in the homes as an add on?
    2. Ensure Fiber optics will produce better quality and reliable service
    3. Ensure SACHA Bulk purchase deal will remain
  - c. Sunnyhill Mural Project:
    1. The mural will be on the entire garbage enclosure, not just the path facing side
    2. MOTION – to approve Sunnyside Mural Project to paint the garbage enclosure by the Sunnyhill garage
      - a. M/S/C                      Yvonne/Susan
    3. MOTION – to make a \$500 donation from the Grounds Committee budget to Sunnyside Mural Project
      - a. M/S/C                      Cindy/Buzz
    4. MOTION – Sunnyside Mural Project to surprise us with the design for the garbage enclosure
      - a. M/S/C                      Belle/Cindy
5. Adjournment: 8:37pm

*Respectfully submitted by Andrea Bergen*

**Sunnyhill Housing Co-operative Ltd.**  
**787 Third Street NW**  
**Calgary, Alberta T2N 1P1**  
**403-270-8405**

**General Meeting Minutes**

**Saturday, August 22, 2020**  
**2:00pm – 4:00pm**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZ0oc-ygqj0rGtCNpmc2orUGSu9hpKTC408r>

Attended: Andrea Bergen (Office Coordinator), Kevin Chaney (4), Chris Taylor (8), Nathan Erickson (12), Richard Harrison (18), Lisa Rouleau (18), Philip Cox (22), Yvonne Sabraw (22), Heidi Mithaug-Cook (26), Sarah Reimer (30), Mollie Mithaug-Cook (38), Tyla Cosgrove (44), Jacky Durrie (738), David Broadhead (744), Sarah Stephens (748), Rita Fields (762), Jane Roberts (767), Rachel Janzen (771), Cindy Schnee (801), Mia Moschopedis (803), Mia Rushton (803), Mike Whittington (807), Rachel Rose (807), Brenda Willman (809), Jaime Muneoka (815), Sherry Kozak (817), Buzz Viberg (827), Bob Bott (837), Helen Wirrell (839), Mark Terrell (849)

Regrets: Cristian & Roxana Badea-Hasasian

1. Call to order: 2:10pm
2. Adjournment time: 4:00pm
3. Opening remarks:
  - a. The original agenda that went out for this meeting contained motions from P&D. Since the revision to the agenda only went out this morning P&D will only be providing an update today and the motions will be included in the next General Meeting agenda
4. Approval of proposed agenda as amended:
  - a. M/S/C            Lisa Rouleau/Bob Bott
5. Business –
  - a. MOTION – the board seeks the approval of membership for an additional \$4800 to correct the design flaw in the 1 bedroom units and vent the dryers to the exterior, the way the other units are, rather than into the crawlspace as they are currently. This has come as a recommendation from buildings committee
    - i. M/S/C            Mollie Mithaug-Cook/Eric Moschopedis



ii. Discussion/questions:

1. This work is recommended to protect the health and safety of Members

b. TELUS Fibre Optics:

- i. MOTION – to upgrade TELUS internet with Fibre Optic to be installed on the interiors of all units.

1. M/S/C Richard Harrison/Eric Moschopedis

2. Questions and answers that were asked of TELUS:

- a. Could TELUS provide a Fibre Optics community cable that would provide Wi-Fi access to Sunnyhill grounds as well as in the homes?
  - i. Yes, Ankit and team may look at the site and determine the best location to support this request.
- b. Ensure that Fibre Optics will produce better quality and reliable services
  - i. Yes, I have attached a few documents for you to review. There will be no issues with port capacity with the fibre upgrades.
- c. Ensure that the SACHA bulk purchase deal will remain with the Fibre Optics.
  - i. The SACHA agreement is a 40% discount on residential internet and TV services. All residents will benefit from the 40% discount with the fibre upgrades.

c. Planning and Development:

- i. Broad overview of where we are. Documents that were read to Members are attached to the minutes

- ii. Next MODA meeting with Members is September 3, 2020

6. Adjournment: 3:35pm

Respectfully submitted by Andrea Bergen

**Sunnyhill Housing Co-operative Ltd.  
787 Third Street NW  
Calgary, Alberta T2N 1P1  
403-270-8405**

**Sunday, September 27, 2020  
2:00pm – 4:00pm**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/join/9112837578>  
Phone in information: 587-328-1099 Meeting ID 896 0426 4451

**Meeting Minutes**

**Attended:** Andrea Bergen (Office Coordinator), Chris Taylor (8), Richard Harrison (18), Philip Cox (22), Yvonne Sabraw (22), Heidi Mithaug-Cook (26), Anna Barrett (26), Sarah Reimer (30), Kris Wenzel (34), Jacky Durrie (738), David Broadhead (744), Sarah Stephens (748), Jane Roberts (767), Cindy Schnee (801), David Sargent (801), Mia Rushton (803), Eric Moschopedis (803), Jaime Muneoka (815), Sherry Kozak (817), Herta Fidler (821), Coeur Riley (823), Belle Auld (825), Buzz Viberg (827), Bob Bott (837), Helen Wirrell (839), Mark Terrell (849)

**Special guests:** Dustin Couzens (MoDA), Lee Provost (Urban Matters)

**Regrets:** Brenda Willman (809)

1. Call to order: 2:10pm
2. Set adjournment time: 3:30pm
3. Opening remarks and introductions:
  - a. This is a specific meeting for the Planning and Development motion.
  - b. Previous meeting minutes are still being prepared. They will be available for the October general meeting for approval
4. Approval of proposed agenda:
  - a. M/S/C          Bob Bott/Belle Auld
5. Business – Planning and Development:

**Moved:**

**That Urban Matters consultants and MoDA architects be authorized to prepare detailed plans and cost estimates for a new 15-unit building on the site now occupied by units 762-768 based on the “Spaceship” design concept, as recommended by the Planning and Development Committee and the Design Reference Group.**

Background:

Our budget is only sufficient for detailed costing of one design option.

The recommendation is based on two months of consultation and collaboration that narrowed our preferences to two design options, the “Village” and the “Spaceship.” Sunnyhill participants found these two almost equally attractive in terms of aesthetics and amenities. However, taking all factors into consideration, including geodetic restrictions, ease of construction, the need to minimize displacement of our members, and the relationship between project costs and our budget, our final and unanimous choice was the “Spaceship” based on careful consideration of the Pros and Cons outlined in the attached documentation.

To summarize the key points, the attached geodetic survey, conducted Sept. 9, 2020, shows the “heights” area now occupied by one-bedroom units. The grade heights in the area are the closest on our land to the City of Calgary’s required minimum main-floor height geodetic (1046.7 metres in our part of Sunnyside). Building here results in the minimum of grade-fill and above-grade foundation work, substantially reducing construction costs. The “Spaceship” can be built in modules and shipped to the site for assembly, reducing construction time and costs. Demolishing any other buildings in the Co-op, even if we could meet the City’s other requirements by doing so, would take out many 2- and 3-bedroom units, which would displace more members, many of them families, than the recommended plan. Further, the new construction is 1 and 2-bedroom only with the potential for only one 3- bedroom unit, so some members displaced in any other plan would not be able to return to Sunnyhill. The overall cost in terms of moving and housing those members who could return from off site, and in terms of the loss of revenue from lost 2 and 3 bedroom units, would critically widen the gap between our income and project costs.

a. M/S/C            Bob Bott/ Eric Moschopedis

b. Questions:

Q - Concerns that the new building will block the sun for units #827 and #823

A – a shadow analysis shows that the impact to these 2 units will be minimal.  
We can soften the roof arch if required

Q – Coeur would like the elevations so that she can do a shadow study for the time period after 4pm

Q – Will we still have individual HVAC in all units, or will there be 1 HVAC system for the whole building?

A – This will be discussed during design development; we are not there yet. It comes down to budget and need

Q – If we vote for a design today and Membership isn't happy with the outcome of the costing or details, are we able to opt out of the design?

A – Membership makes the final decision. The decision today does not have to be final

Q – Who does additional design questions go to?

A – Planning and Development. There is a Questions portion of their section on the Sunnyhill website

Q – Would like to see the recommended elevations in regard to accessibility

A – The preference is to have the entry from the street in the form of a pathway that everybody could use

**MOTION** – to extend meeting until 4:15pm M/S/C Richard Harrison/Sarah Reimer

Call the question – Sherry Kozak – motion carried

6. Adjournment: 4:15pm

*Respectfully submitted by Andrea Bergen*

**Sunnyhill Housing Co-operative Ltd.  
787 Third Street NW  
Calgary, Alberta T2N 1P1  
403-270-8405**

**Sunday, December 20, 2020  
2:00pm – 4:00pm**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZludOisrD4vHtdZ20kUXLMuzbZX8i2YN97E>

Phone in information: 587-328-1099 Meeting ID 863 3142 5543

**Meeting Minutes**

**Attended:** Sean Lindsay (14), Richard Harrison (18), Lisa Rouleau (18), Philip Cox (22), Yvonne Sabraw (22), Dorrie Derbowka (24), Sarah Reimer (30), Debbie Willis (34), Pamela Boyd (36), David Broadhead (744), Sarah Stephens (748), Brenda Morgan (764), Jane Roberts (767), Cindy Schnee (801), David Sargent (801), Mia Rushton (803), Eric Moschopedis (803), Paul Stephens (805), Rachel Rose (807), Brenda Willman (809), Sherry Kozak (817), Coeur Riley (823), Belle Auld (825), Bob Bott (837), Helen Wirrell (839)

1. Call to order: 2:07pm by Richard Harrison
2. Set adjournment time: 4:00pm
3. Opening remarks
4. Approval of proposed agenda
  - a. M/S/C Cindy/Eric
5. Business – Planning and Development:

**MOTION:** Eric Moschopedis on behalf of Planning and Development Committee moves that SHC amend motion 5avii from June 14, 2019 as follows:

- a) change spending limit from \$200,000 to \$290,000
- b) change Urban Matters to "Urban Matters or Boundary Design".

So that amended motion reads as follows:

**MOTION:** Eric Moschopedis on behalf of Planning and Development Committee moves that SHC approve up to \$290,000 in spending to contract Calgary-based Urban Matters or Boundary Design to project manage an evidence-based "due diligence" process that will confirm or discredit the viability of:

1. the environmentally and economically sustainable rehabilitation of our housing stock;

2. aging-in-place/accessibility.

The resources to contract Urban Matters or Boundary Design will be allocated from the remaining balance between amounts of the old and new mortgages, grants, and Planning and Developments annual operating budget.

Urban Matter's or Boundary Design support and management will include, but is not limited to: lease negotiations with the City of Calgary, feasibility studies, asset management planning, development of pro formas, accessibility study and planning, funding applications, and membership engagement and communications.

M/S/C Eric/Bob

Discussion:

1. Who is Boundary Design?
  - a. Lee's company
2. The feasibility extension proposal, the budget is \$68,900. This is close to the \$90,000. Is that why we have the \$90,000, as their estimate cost plus a bit?
  - a. The breakdown is on the attached spreadsheet, sheet 2 workplan extension has all the additional things listed there
3. Urban Matters no longer wants to be involved in affordable housing. Boundary Design is subcontracted by Urban Matters
4. Should Urban Matters not have been required to honour their contract?
  - a. We prefer to work with Lee as he already has the required experience and knowledge. Boundary Design is the subcontractor
5. Why was Membership not given the opportunity to decide if we want to continue the project with Boundary Design?
  - a. This is a Board decision
6. Has the billing history been turned over to Lee and Boundary Design and is it up to date?
  - a. Yes, it is outlined in the spreadsheet provided in this agenda package
7. Was there an RFP for Boundary Design? It feels like we are repeating steps. We must follow the Co-ops guidelines. Wants to ensure the appropriate steps are being followed
  - a. The steps that were taken are outlined on the P&D section of the website
  - b. Urban Matters subcontracted Boundary Design so an RFP was not required
8. We are contracted to Urban Matters. We have not signed a Boundary Design contact.

Once this spending motion is approved, we will sign the Boundary Design contract. We are asking for spending approval to move to the next phase

9. Urban Matters is still very much engaged with us

10. Motion should be amended to stated Urban Matters or Boundary Design

a. Amendment made

11. Is there any logic to specifying Boundary Design instead of saying "other contractor"

a. It will only be Urban Matters or Boundary Design

12. Obtaining 3 quotes is a requirement that was made in the CMHC Operating Agreement. Even though we no longer have an CMHC Operating Agreement we did motion to adopt their guidelines

a. 3 bids is a requirement for construction

13. Call the question – Jane

a. M/S/C          Eric/Bob

6. Adjournment: 3:05pm

RE: Agenda Item 7, for the General Meeting March 2, 2021

Dear Fellow Co-operators,

I'm writing to you today about the Board's follow up to the June 7, 2020 meeting of the Co-op. As most of you know, that meeting, which 48 co-op members attended, was held under the joint chairship of Richard Harrison from the Board, and Rachel Rose from those members who had petitioned for the meeting to be called to discuss the resignation of the Grounds Committee and related issues. As well, it was mediated by Carol Daw, a professional in conflict resolution recommended by SACHA.

As anticipated, the meeting was emotional and difficult. After it was done, some thought it did too much, others, not enough. But as Carol pointed out in her remarks, the meeting could only be a start on the work made necessary by the ongoing uncertainties and conflicts within the Co-op. And Co-op members came up with nine recommendations for action to remedy the situation that brought the meeting together. All of these are listed in the minutes to that meeting included in this package.

Many of these are still works in progress. I do want to say, though, on behalf of the Board, that much of the best of what's been done in light of the meeting, particularly its primary recommendation to rebuild trust within the Co-op is being done in and through the day-to-day life of Co-op members themselves. Our committees have been well-staffed by a dedicated blend of veteran and new members and have been working with great energy and efficiency to handle, among other things, our grounds care, our clean-up project, our building maintenance, our days of celebration, the moves in and out of members, and the major project of securing our land and thus our future. For the first time in years, the Board was put in place through a competitive election. Our finances, while still problematic in terms of our long-term goals, are continually well-managed. I could go on with details, and I know things are not perfect and there is important work to do. But on the whole, I see, in the way we live, a persistent desire to maintain the underlying commitment of co-operative life to define who we are by the good we do for each other.

Still, June 7 left us with in need of healing, with many of us with hurts to address. For that work to be done, we needed to work together and address these issues within a common framework. This work is ongoing.

Interpersonally, some of the conflicts that led to the June 7 meeting persisted afterwards. A breakdown of trust between the Board and certain members in conflict undermined any ability of the parties to find a common ground of facts from which to work towards a solution.

The Board consulted with SACHA and NACHA. We learned that what was happening here was also happening in other Co-ops in Alberta, at great cost to their political, social and financial well-being, as well as the personal well-being of the Co-op members most directly involved. All parties agreed that we had exhausted our abilities within the framework of the Co-op to solve the problems and do the necessary work which, if not done, would leave the health and well-being of the Co-op at risk.

In light of that unanticipated risk to the Co-op, under Section 20, Financial Management, clause 20.4 of our By-laws, the Board engaged the services of the Co-op's lawyer and an investigator experienced in institutional conflict, to determine the facts, and provide advice and recommendations on how to move forward from them. Since the investigation was legally bound to work in confidence, only those involved as complainants or witnesses were aware of it. The investigation has done its work, and appropriate action has been taken under the Cooperatives Act and other governing legislation. However, the confidentiality conditions of the investigation still apply, so this is all I can report. What I can say, though,



is that the investigation has given us an education in both what the laws are in matters such as this, and some insight as to how to complete two other recommendations from June 7: the revision of our by-laws and the reconnection between our practices and our guiding documents.

I look forward to feedback and useful discussion at our upcoming meeting.

Co-operatively yours,

Richard Harrison, for the Board.