

**Minutes of the
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
Held October 27, 2022**

Approved December 8, 2022

Columbia Association's Board of Directors held a hybrid meeting on Thursday, October 27, 2022. Participating were Chair Eric Greenberg, Vice Chair Virginia Thomas, and members Dick Boulton, Lakey Boyd, Brian England, Janet Evans, Alan Klein, Bill Santos (virtual-joined at 8:15 p.m.), Andrew Stack, and Shari Zaret. Kevin Fitzgerald was not in attendance.

1. **Call to Order**

The Board of Directors Meeting was called to order at 7:09 p.m. by Chair Eric Greenberg. Mr. Greenberg announced the procedures to be used to conduct the meeting and took a roll call of the Board members present.

2. **Announcement of Closed/Special Meetings Held/To Be Held**

No announcements were made.

3. **Approval of Agenda**

Action: Ms. Thomas moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Mr. Stack.

Prior to the Chair calling for a vote, Mr. England moved that the topic of "Adding the 'Lake Elkhorn Stream Restoration Mitigation Bank Project' to the November 10, 2022 BOD meeting agenda" be discussed as item 7g, with a time allocation of 10 minutes. Mr. Boulton seconded the motion. The Chair asked if there were any objections to the addition. Hearing none, the topic was added.

Mr. Boulton then moved to add two minutes to item 6, Board Votes, to discuss a congratulatory letter. Mr. Klein seconded the motion. Hearing no objections to the addition, the topic was added.

Ms. Thomas inquired if any votes were expected from the discussion on the proposed ethics policies. If votes were anticipated, time would need to be added to the agenda. Mr. Greenberg indicated the ethics policies were for discussion only.

Action: Mr. Greenberg asked if there were any objections to the amended agenda. Hearing none, the amended agenda was approved.

4. **Verbal Resident Speakout**

(a) Jessamine Duvall – Hickory Ridge – Community letter from Lakey Boyd; Board subcommittee meetings; and the proposed ethics policy for CA Board members

(b) Richard Bannister – Spoke about the Lake Elkhorn Stream Restoration Mitigation Bank Project

(c) Rashel Taylor and Dan Pontious – Columbia Housing Center – Racially-integrated housing in Columbia

(d) Sharon Boies – Protect Our Streams – Spoke about the Lake Elkhorn Stream Restoration Mitigation Bank Project

(e) Nina Basu – Inner Arbor Trust – Spoke about the current season which is coming to an end and about community engagement for next year

5. **Consent Agenda**

(a) Approval of Minutes – September 22, 2022

The minutes were approved by consent.

Ms. Zaret's request for information on the County Council Bill on the environment, sponsored by Liz Walsh, was confirmed not to have been made at the September 22, 2022 meeting. Ms. Zaret will furnish the bill number to the Board and Mr. Aniton, who will follow up with more information at the next Board meeting.

6. [Board Votes](#)

(a) Congratulatory Letter – Ms. Nina Basu – The Daily Record's Most Admired CEO's

Mr. Boulton referenced a congratulatory letter from CA's Board of Directors to Ms. Nina Basu and other local winners of The Daily Record's Most Admired CEO's, noting that Ms. Nina Basu was named a Most Admired CEO in the "Non-Profit Less Than \$10 Million in Annual Revenue" category.

Ms. Thomas read the letter in its entirety, which detailed Ms. Nina Basu's accomplishment and also offered congratulations to the other three local winners (Troy LeMaile-Stoval [TEDCO]; Ms. Elizabeth Rendon-Sherman [LG-TEK]; and Creig Northrop [Northrup Realty]), as well as Dr. Daria Willis [Howard Community College], who was selected as one of Maryland's Most Influential CEO's.

Action: Mr. Boulton made a motion to approve the letter, seconded by Ms. Zaret. The motion passed by a vote of 8-0-0.

For: Messrs. Boulton, England, Greenberg, Klein, and Stack; and Mmes. Evans, Thomas, and Zaret
Against: None
Abstain: None

7. **Board Discussion**

(a) [Board FY24 Budget Discussions \(draft operating budget and capital project allocations\)](#)

Ms. Boyd introduced the discussions with an overview of the budget process, the materials which have been provided on CA's website and how to use them; and the pre-budget work done to-date. Ms. Boyd reviewed the graphic of CA'S FY24 budget process, noting that an on-line survey will be available after the October 27, 2022 meeting and will be available for about one week. A special information session for the community will be held on November 1, 2022, with additional discussion at the November 10, 2022 Board meeting. The Board will consider input gathered from the community and finalize the FY 2024 budget priorities and draft parameters at its December 8, 2022 meeting. A draft FY 2024 budget will be presented to the Board and community on January 20, 2023. Further community engagement via surveys and Board discussion will take place in January and February 2023, with the Board vote on the FY 2024 budget scheduled for February 23, 2023.

Ms. Boyd provided [framing comments](#) under which CA and the Board are operating to prepare the FY 2024 budget. She noted that CA is leaner and more nimble than it was before the COVID-19 pandemic, and that the global economy is markedly different now than it was pre-COVID and more year ago. Challenges facing CA include fewer employees; less revenue; changed consumer behavior; and assets which are getting older and needing more repair and maintenance. Opportunities arising from the pandemic include greater ability to manage revenue to expenses; emphasis on process improvements, with a focus on efficiency; and a renewed emphasis on community engagement.

Ms. Boyd provided in-depth information on bullet points on the [Complex Assumptions](#) page and the [Major Assumptions](#) section of her presentation. She concluded her remarks with a slide entitled [Where We Are Now](#), emphasizing that the pre-budget materials are not being presented, nor voted upon, as a draft budget. Rather, they are the first step in putting the materials and estimates together so everyone can get the information.

Discussion was held on questions raised by Board members. Questions were asked about how residents could find the survey being disseminated on CA's website; an administrative position in Community Services; the meaning of the word "subsidy" in one of the slides; the percentage of credited open space

required in New Town zoning; the possible impact if the County eliminates New Town zoning; purchasing from local companies versus companies in other locations to avoid supply-chain issues; whether CA has a full-time position dedicated to the website; a possible return to pre-COVID staff levels; and whether a summary of FTE's by department would be provided in the FY 2024 budget materials.

Mr. Santos, who joined the Board meeting at 8:15 p.m., noted that the percentage of land in New Town for open space is 33.

[Ms. Krabbe](#) provided an in-depth review of CA-wide income vs. spending in the FY 2024 proposed budget; an explanation of the difference between changeable expenses and fixed and administrative expenses; the FY 2024 Pre-Budget Analysis including income, fixed and administrative expenses, and other commitments; the FY 2024 operating budget; the FY 2024 proposed operating budget for Community Operations and Community Programs & Services; proposed capital budget allocations; accelerating capital improvements; financial impacts of possible capital spending acceleration; and key BOD decision framing factors.

(b) [Ethics Policy Revision](#)

Mr. Greenberg suggested that the Board divide the discussion into two parts – the first concerning the code of conduct and the second concerning the enforcement policy. He also suggested that, once approved, both sections go into effect at the same time.

Mr. England suggested that the three parties working on the revision work as a committee. In this way, when the final draft document was presented, Board members would know it is non-conflicting.

Mr. Boulton said he was not trying to write the document; rather, he was trying to edit comments he had received from other Board members. Mr. Boulton said he would like Mr. Aniton to participate in the process so he could see what was being done. Mr. Boulton noted he had sent Mr. Stack a draft copy of what he had produced and that Mr. Stack provided two pages of suggestions for revisions.

Mr. Boulton commented that a series of questions would need to be answered before drafting the enforcement policy. Questions would revolve around who gets to vote, as well as the procedure for filtering out frivolous claims. Questions would be gathered and sent to Board members to consider. When the draft enforcement policy was presented to the Board, it would reflect as many opinions as are available.

Ms. Thomas indicated she was not sure the Board members were all in agreement. She thought the first document about which Mr. Boulton was talking was a Board of Directors ethics code and the second document was the enforcement of the Board ethics code. Ms. Thomas felt the remaining document was an ethics document for staff, for which the Human Resources Division had more expertise to draft. She concluded by stating she thought Mr. Greenberg wanted all documents to go into effect when they were completed.

Mr. Aniton interjected that the process described by Ms. Thomas was not what he was hearing from Messrs. Boulton and Stack. Mr. Aniton understood that there would be two separate documents – one an ethics policy for both the Board and CA staff that could be broken out by chapter and the other an enforcement process. He felt Ms. Thomas was describing a process that would have four documents – an ethics policy and enforcement process for the Board, together with a separate ethics policy and enforcement process for CA staff. Mr. Aniton noted he never disagreed with having two separate documents. However, having four documents is the process which has already been done and a component of this revision process has been to combine and streamline the documents.

Mr. Aniton emphasized his proposed base document contains all the changes on which the Board had reached consensus. He reiterated that he is amenable to splitting his base document into two parts – an

ethics code and enforcement process. The Board could submit its questions, comments, and concerns to Mr. Aniton and he could implement them into the base document.

Mr. Aniton noted Mr. Boulton said that he (Mr. Boulton) had added back a lot of the things on which Mr. Aniton had commented back to his (Mr. Boulton's) latest draft. Mr. Aniton stated that work produced a document which looked like Mr. Aniton's base document. Mr. Aniton suggested the Board and staff continue working from Mr. Aniton's base document and not reinvent material that already existed.

Mr. Greenberg stated that one area of concern was which parts of the ethics code applied to everyone (Board and CA staff), Board only, and staff only. He wanted to ensure the distinction was clearly apparent in the ethics code.

Mr. Aniton noted his base document has a very specific table of contents, with section headings in bold print clearly identifying the groups to which certain sections apply. He further stated the Board has equipment loaned to them by CA and is working toward the adoption of the budget for next fiscal year - official duties of the Board which have implied ethical responsibilities. These ethical responsibilities are encapsulated in Mr. Aniton's base document, from which the Board cannot be separated since the Board is part of the organization. Mr. Aniton again cited his base document as a sound document, reiterating he could take questions from the Board and integrate them into his base document, and not have to start the process over.

Mr. Boulton replied that there was a document put together that was an improvement over the previous one, but the Board of Directors voted not to accept it. That is why individual Board members have become involved. Mr. Boulton felt the content of his and Mr. Aniton's documents are pretty much the same regarding what can and cannot be done, but that the format has changed. Mr. Boulton felt the Board wanted a smaller, 8-page document that its members could sign rather than a longer, 20-page version that applied to everyone.

Mr. Aniton noted that several of the pages were signature pages and if the signature pages and the enforcement process were separated from the ethics code, the document would be smaller. Mr. Aniton also stated he felt that brevity should not be the metric which is being used to create the materials.

Mr. Boulton reiterated he would be willing to meet with Mr. Aniton to discuss the draft materials.

Ms. Boyd asked if Mr. Boulton were to meet with Mr. Aniton, would Mr. Boulton be representing the full Board of Directors and all its opinions. Given the number of differences that could arise during the discussions, she felt an arbiter would be needed to decide the point at which a difference could not be resolved and would need to be taken to the Board for a vote. Ms. Boyd preferred the General Counsel be the arbiter, stating she was unsure if Mr. Boulton would be acting on behalf of all Board members. Ms. Boyd wanted to avoid a situation in which the Board could not reach a consensus on how to move forward, should a difference be brought to it for a vote. Such a situation could lead to additional work, as well as the possibility of restarting the process from the beginning.

Mr. Greenberg suggested removing the enforcement sections from both Mr. Aniton's and Mr. Boulton's drafts to focus on the proposed codes. He felt that, if the contents of both proposed codes were fundamentally the same, they could be converted into a single document, which Messrs. Aniton and Boulton, and possibly Mr. Stack, could discuss and agree upon as an ethics code to bring to the Board for a vote.

Ms. Zaret suggested that a list of possible changes from the individual draft codes to the combined code be provided to the Board for consideration. Board members could decide which changes to accept and which ones were not needed. Ms. Zaret felt this process would provide a structure for further discussion.

Ms. Evans commented that the approach suggested by Ms. Zaret was started in March 2022. Few Board members offered comments and/or questions at that time, and she wondered how successful the process would be if followed again.

Ms. Boyd reiterated her concern that representation on the subcommittee needed to encompass opinions from all Board members. She noted there were vast differences in the drafts submitted, and that there was no easy comparison to do a simple merger of the documents. Ms. Boyd felt it was necessary to have an understanding of key issues from the base draft that Board members feel important to change. She also noted that Mr. Boulton represented his changes as only format changes, and that professional staff did not agree with that characterization.

Mr. Klein noted that, since October 3, he had not seen any staff response to the recent changes made by Mr. Boulton to his documents. Mr. Klein felt that Messrs. Boulton and Stack represented a wide swath of opinions on the code, and that other Board members who might want to join the meeting would be welcome. Mr. England agreed with Mr. Klein's comments.

Action: Mr. Greenberg summarized the discussion by stating the Board had decided to divide the draft documents into two documents - an ethics code and an enforcement code. The Board will focus initially on the ethics code. Mr. Greenberg asked Messrs. Boulton and Stack to prepare a new proposed ethics code that encompasses both Mr. Boulton's and Mr. Stack's initial drafts, and meet with Mr. Aniton to discuss it. Messrs. Aniton, Boulton, and Stack will work together to identify differences between their new proposed ethics code and Mr. Aniton's initially submitted code. Any differences between the codes which cannot be resolved will be brought to the Board to be addressed. Once differences are resolved, the final converged ethics code will be brought before the Board for a vote.

(c) [CA's Operational Practice for Votes in Village Elections](#)

Mr. Greenberg summarized CA's past practice of casting its votes for the winner in those village elections in which it has a vote. In April 2022, CA did not cast its votes and this abstention may have had an adverse effect on some villages needing CA's votes to achieve a quorum. The question before the Board was whether it should develop a policy for casting CA's ballots in those village elections in which it has votes.

Mr. Klein agreed that CA should not endorse or support candidates for the Columbia Council Representative, but felt this was not what was meant when CA cast its ballots. Rather, he felt it was in support of the candidate receiving the most votes and of the villages in achieving a quorum. He felt the process followed in April 2022 cast a cloud over every candidate.

Discussion then centered on whether a draft policy for casting CA's ballots in village elections had been prepared. It was clarified that Mr. Boulton submitted a document addressing CA's votes in village elections, together with two other voting-related issues, and that Mr. Aniton provided a memo in response to the three issues in Mr. Boulton's document.

Mr. Santos inquired if the villages had been contacted to ascertain whether they would accept ballots with no candidate specification or no candidate preference as legal ballots toward a quorum. Mr. Boulton indicated that each village has its own rules; he had not checked with them individually; and he agreed with the idea.

Attention was called to the last sentence in Mr. Boulton's document, which read "In those villages where CA is allocated votes, CA shall not vote for any candidate but shall instead submit blank ballots in order to allow any quorum requirements to be met." Mr. Boulton said he included the sentence because there was reluctance on the part of staff to follow the practice in which the candidate receiving the most votes would get the CA votes. Mr. Boulton felt the submission of blank ballots in order to achieve quorum was a way to ensure CA's votes were cast.

Ms. Evans asked if it could be verified that each village would accept blank ballots toward quorum only. If each village does, then she felt the matter was resolved and the discussion ended.

Mr. Aniton agreed with Ms. Evans' suggestion, but cautioned the Board against creating a policy addressing the issue. He referenced the last sentence in his memo which stated that "CA Board members should refrain from approving policies that govern how CA cases its votes for the very positions that the CA Board members hold due to conflict of interest principles."

Mr. Greenberg stated he agreed with Ms. Evans' suggestion, but felt it should be a policy so that it is clear. He expressed concern that practices can often become lost or changed, and felt having something written would be helpful.

Further discussion focused on the importance of contacting the villages and getting their input before proceeding further. It was also suggested that, as an alternative to a policy, an operational practice be created. That would avoid the Board of Directors making a policy about its own elections.

Mr. Klein said he was in favor of supporting the villages via submission of blank ballots to allow the villages to achieve quorum. He did not see a conflict of interest in creating a policy since the Board would not be directing any particular election or impacting any particular vote. It would just be a blanket policy in the hands of the voters in that village.

Mr. Stack felt it would be good for the Board to have something in hand similar to the operational practice suggested by Ms. Evans. It could be drafted by staff and brought back to the Board.

Mr. Stack also felt the Board was conflating two issues – CA's votes for a quorum and votes in an election. Individuals participating in a village election can show up and be counted toward a quorum, but they do not necessarily have to vote for a representative. Mr. Stack felt the Board wanted to support those villages needing CA's votes to achieve quorum, but the Board did not want CA to do any actual voting.

Mr. Greenberg stated he wanted to get the villages' input on this topic since there were different voting systems in different villages. He felt the best way to do that was to get something on paper that could be brought to the villages as a proposal. Mr. Greenberg recommended preparing a document similar to Mr. Stack's proposal reflecting CA's votes counting toward quorum, but not being cast in favor of a candidate.

Ms. Boyd posed a process question, noting that this topic was not moved by staff at the Board Operations Committee meeting in August. Rather, it was the Board Operations Committees that wanted it added as an agenda topic at an upcoming Board meeting. Ms. Boyd noted that staff felt it to be a conflict of interest for the Board to set a policy for their own seats. Staff responded to what the Board sent via Mr. Boulton's proposed policy, which includes three scenarios of voting; but staff did not go to the villages and inventory their comments on Mr. Boulton's proposal.

While noting that a vote was not scheduled, Ms. Boyd wanted to ensure there was consensus among the Board members that, when a vote did occur, it would be solely on the topic of CA's votes in village elections, and not include the other voting scenarios.

Mr. Boulton agreed that the Board needed to talk to the villages to determine what was needed from CA for their elections. Mr. Boulton then stated this also addressed the problem that arose in the last election – that there was staff interference in the elections; that information that most people on the Board felt was confidential was released; and that there was something of a statement about the quality of this...

Mr. Greenberg interjected himself into the comments, noting that there were ethics policies that covered the situation.

Action: Mr. Greenberg concluded the discussion by stating the issue to be addressed is how to approach the counting of CA votes for quorums only. Mr. Greenberg asked Mr. Aniton to draft a document quickly and sent it to the Board and villages, so the villages could respond and the Board could get input on whether the document met villages' requirements. Mr. Stack suggested this topic might be brought up at CA's regular meeting with the village managers. Mr. Greenberg preferred that the document be on paper and distributed to the Board and villages so everyone had the same information.

(d) [CA's Operational Process for Tree Maintenance](#)

Mr. Greenberg noted that upcoming possibly inclement winter weather has an impact on trees and said some residents are concerned about the hazards of falling trees. Mr. Greenberg asked Mr. Mattey how CA and residents can address that; and how can residents address a concern that a tree on CA's open space might, or possibly could, fall on their property.

Mr. Mattey responded that residents can call the Open Space number listed on CA's website and report the issue. CA has certified tree experts who will respond and do an evaluation. If a situation appears to be dangerous, CA will call an outside expert to perform an evaluation. Mr. Mattey also noted that Open Space crews who are in the field continually monitor trees on CA's open space.

Mr. Mattey also addressed the procedure for handling a tree branch hanging over a resident's property line that could potentially cause damage. Discussion also focused on air rights and the role it plays in determining financial responsibility for property damages to property caused by falling trees or tree branches.

Mr. Mattey was then asked if residents were notified if a large number of trees were scheduled to be removed; and if there was a replacement schedule for planting new trees. He responded by stating that residents were notified if a large number of trees were scheduled to be removed, but that such an event had not happened in several years. Mr. Mattey noted that villages are informed if smaller amounts of trees are being removed and that door hangers are used in some cases. Regarding replacement, CA is probably going to install approximately 500 trees this year.

Ms. Zaret noted that residents may not always know whose trees are on whose property, and who is ultimately responsible for them. She said that Kings Contrivance puts information in their newsletter regarding the correct group, with their phone number, to call with questions. Mr. Greenberg suggested that the information be provided to other villages.

(e) [CA's Operational Process for Encroachments on CA Property](#)

Ms. Thomas commented favorably on the flowchart provided and CA's very thorough system. She asked if data was available on how many encroachment cases have been declared; how long it took to get action; and what the results were.

Mr. Mattey responded some cases that were thought to be encroachment were determined not to be encroachment via surveys. He mentioned that encroachment situations started before COVID; the process stopped during COVID; and CA is ready to resume its work, focusing first on the largest and most egregious cases. In response to a question, Mr. Aniton confirmed that De Minimis situations are taken into account for some encroachments.

Mr. Mattey also confirmed that property owners are notified via letter if there is a possible encroachment violation. The notification process outlined in the flowchart was explained in greater details by Messrs. Aniton and Mattey.

(f) [Draft President/CEO Evaluation Process](#)

Mr. Greenberg stated he had been working with Monica McMellon-Ajayi, director of Human Resources, to incorporate suggested changes to the process and produce a revised draft. The current version has a 1-4

rating system, refined processes for the closed meetings, and a median system for determining the bonus calculation.

In response to questions and suggestions, Mr. Greenberg agreed to add information clarifying the topics to be discussed in the first and second closed meeting. Ms. Boyd noted that individual forms were submitted anonymously and that she preferred them to be identified by the person completing the form. Mr. Greenberg noted that the final scores would be overall Board scores and comments would be an overall summary of what was submitted.

Action: Mr. Greenberg will make the changes proposed and will submit a revised draft President/CEO evaluation process for a vote at the November 10, 2022 Board meeting.

(g) [Addition of the “Lake Elkhorn Stream Restoration Mitigation Bank Project” to the November 10, 2022 BOD Meeting Agenda](#)

Citing the concerns of residents and the report from Long Reach, together with the list of questions he assembled and submitted for a response from staff, Mr. England felt this topic should be added to the November 10 BOD meeting agenda, with a suggested time allocation of 30 minutes.

Discussion centered on who was responsible for answering the questions and how long the process would take. Ms. Zaret noted that answers for some questions may have to come from WSSI, who may not submit answers intermittently, but would wait to respond until they had all answers to all questions. She also felt that CA would not be able to answer all of Mr. England’s questions. Ms. Zaret suggested assembling a list of the types of questions to be answered by WSSI, and submitting the list to WSSI, together with a timeline for responses.

Mr. Stack noted that CA would not respond to questions from the Army Corps of Engineers nor from the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) since these were directed to the submitter, which is WSSI. Mr. Stack emphasized he did not want CA resources spent on answering questions to which WSSI should respond.

Mr. Greenberg asked for clarification of the goal of adding this topic to the November 10 BOD meeting agenda. Mr. England stated the goal was to review the responses from staff to the list of questions he submitted.

Mr. Stack stated that the Board should decide the questions to which it wanted a response, not necessarily all of the ones submitted by Mr. England. He also thought that a representative from Howard County had been invited to the November 10 BOD meeting. Ms. Boyd clarified that was correct and read the topics and time allocations approved by the BOC on August 29 for inclusion on the November 10 agenda.

Ms. Thomas expressed concern that November 10 might be too late to get information to the public and to ask questions, as WSSI might have already filed materials with the appropriate agency. Mr. Stack pointed out that WSSI indicated in their presentation on October 13 that, as part of their filing process, they would notify anyone who had submitted a comment that WSSI’s response was available.

Mr. Greenberg emphasized that groups of questions to which the Board wanted responses should be in line with processes noted in the flowchart.

Action: Ms. Zaret asked if this topic could be deferred to the December Board meeting. Mr. Greenberg suggested that the “Questions Only” section of the evening’s agenda include some time to decide upon the questions to be discussed in December, with a possible time allocation of 45 minutes. Mr. Santos reminded Board members that the Board Operations Committee, at which time the December BOD meeting agenda will be discussed and approved, will be held on Monday, November 28.

8. Questions Only

Ms. Evans noted that the “Quiet Pride” exhibit at the Columbia Art Center, which was mentioned in the President’s Report, was being assembled.

Mr. Klein inquired about the process for advocating for or against proposed legislation. He cited the CB52 Tax Credit Bill, which was passed by the County Council, as one in which the CA Board might have wanted to take a position, but had not had the opportunity to do so.

Ms. Boyd posed a question to the Board Chair. Ms. Boyd said that she had been directly informed by one of CA’s vice presidents that he had been approached by someone who asked if he would be willing to serve as interim president of CA with some sense of urgency. She also said that she had been contacted by members of the community who had heard about the conversation. Ms. Boyd then asked Mr. Greenberg if he could clarify her position at CA since she has a four-year contract. Mr. Greenberg responded that he was unaware of any such discussions and anything beyond would be a personnel issue.

Mr. Stack noted that the President’s Report referenced the Pickleball Tournament at the Owen Brown Tennis Club and he wondered how it went. Ms. Boyd replied it went incredibly well, with rave reviews. Mr. Stack asked if there could be a blog article, to which Ms. Boyd agreed.

Mr. England commented on the question on CA’s website about the village centers, noting it was one that received a great deal of attention. He suggested sending the results to the villages’ owners.

Mr. Klein spoke about Ms. Boyd’s blog post on diversity in the community, and expressed his appreciation of the data from all sides.

9. Proposed New Topics

No discussion was held.

10. Chair’s Remarks

Mr. Greenberg congratulated Columbia Association for being recognized as a top-ranked employer by the Howard County Commission on Disabilities.

11. Adjournment

Action: Ms. Thomas moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Boulton. Hearing no objections, the meeting adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet F. Loughran
Board Operations Coordinator