

My name is Bob Griffin, and I am the President of The Villa's of Highcroft in Woodbury, MN. After looking at the highlights of the proposed bill MN Senate 1750, I felt inclined to write to express my displeasure with this misguided and inconceivable bill.

- Prohibition on Associations Taking Any Enforcement Action Prior to a Member of the Board "Meeting and Confering" with the Violating Owner – I have been a member of several HOAs and a Board member as well. It is a well-accepted practice not to "meet and confer" with a violating homeowner due to the potential for physical confrontation and potential legal issues. If the homeowner is not available to meet this could prolong the outstanding issue indefinitely and would create even more problems.
- Assessment Cap on Costs of Enforcement/Collection to \$1,500 – This arbitrary amount and then the requirement for all the neighbors to foot the bill for the offending homeowner is beyond comprehension. No reasonable adult would have suggested this provision, and it is hard to imagine a scenario where this would be a reasonable proposal.
- Mandate Requiring Homeowners (and potentially tenants) to Participate in Meetings of the Board – Mandate homeowners attend and participate in Meetings of the Board? We are fortunate to get 30% of homeowners to attend any meeting. All are invited to at least (5) Board meetings per year and we are working on having virtual meeting options. Also, homeowners can submit requests and have their feedback shared with the Board on an as needed basis.
- Rules (and Bylaws) Can be Removed by a Majority Vote of Owners at a Board Meeting – Again, imagine a process such as this going into effect. It would be untenable. A Board is elected to represent the membership at large much like we do with government. Taking votes at Board Meetings on Rules and Bylaws would be a circus. Not to mention the costs of legally changing the HOA Governing documents multiple times per year. Again, did an adult really suggest this?
- Cap on Fines at \$100.00 (Single Violation) or \$2,500.00 (Total) – Another arbitrary figure suggested by someone? A homeowner with plenty of resources can simply break the rules and consider the \$2500 cap as an acceptable price to pay for any violation. For example, opening a dog breeding kennel in their backyard. Or, putting in a hobby farm in their backyard. The examples are endless and the person that suggested this provision clearly didn't think about the ramifications and consequences of their misguided ideas.

Please share these comments with those in authority to act on this bill and vote "NO" to its passing.

Thank you!

Bob Griffin  
9865 Arrowwood Trail  
Woodbury, MN 55129