

Re: Follow-up on ACC Guidelines Discussion- open forum

From: Hochstedler (th80128@aol.com)
To: re.36251@gmail.com
Cc: president@cepoa.org; cepoa1978@gmail.com
Date: Friday, April 24, 2026 at 05:04 PM MDT

Ryan,

Thank you for the response.

To clarify, I was not claiming that Section 8 contains a separate subsection titled "Open Forum Rules." That appears to be a narrower reading than what I actually wrote. The open-meeting conduct rules are listed directly below the opening paragraph in Section 8.

My point was that the Conduct of Meetings Policy governs member participation during meetings, including recognition by the chair, time limits, relevance, and disruptive conduct. Those provisions are included in Section 8 and the alphabetical list that follows.

If speakers were recognized and allowed to continue, then any concern about time limits or recognition falls under the chair's real-time application of the meeting-conduct rules. That is different from applying an undefined "intent of open forum" standard.

Your explanation confirms the distinction I was asking about. You stated that your concern was members speaking more than once, speaking without recognition, and exceeding three minutes. Those are time, recognition, and meeting-control issues. They are already addressed in the Conduct of Meetings Policy.

That is different from saying the open forum had strayed from its "intent."

So my original question remains: is "intent of the open forum" a defined standard in any CEPOA policy, or was that simply your personal characterization of conduct issues already covered by the meeting policy?

Mark

I appreciate you expressing your comments on the April Board meeting. Your position is duly noted.

As to your question regarding open forum meeting policy, I assume you are referring to the **Conduct of Meetings Policy**, effective 11/25/23, which replaces and supersedes all previous policies, rules, and regulations regarding the subject matter of conduct in meetings. Section 8., Etiquette / Remediating Disruptive Behavior, provides procedures for Members to speak specifically to motions; however, I am not aware of an "outline" specific to the matter of open forums in this Section or Policy. Section 8., merely states "... the agenda for Member and Board meetings will include an open forum during which a Member or his/her representative may speak." To my knowledge, this is the extent of relevance to open forums in this Policy. Being new to the Board, I apologize if I have missed the outline you are referring to, or if there is an alternate Meeting Policy,

and ask that you please direct me to it/them so I may familiarize myself.

With that said, I addressed my comment to the other Members of the Board, whereby I conveyed my opinion that the open forum had strayed from its intention. My recollection for doing so was because Members spoke on multiple occasions, without being acknowledged by the Chair, and for greater than 3 minutes without the consent of the Chair.

Regards,
Ryan

On Friday, April 24, 2026 at 04:04:08 PM MDT, Ryan Edwards <re.36251@gmail.com> wrote:

Mark,

I appreciate you expressing your comments on the April Board meeting. Your position is duly noted.

As to your question regarding open forum meeting policy, I assume you are referring to the **Conduct of Meetings Policy**, effective 11/25/23, which replaces and supersedes all previous policies, rules, and regulations regarding the subject matter of conduct in meetings. Section 8., Etiquette / Remediating Disruptive Behavior, provides procedures for Members to speak specifically to motions; however, I am not aware of an "outline" specific to the matter of open forums in this Section or Policy. Section 8., merely states "... the agenda for Member and Board meetings will include an open forum during which a Member or his/her representative may speak." To my knowledge, this is the extent of relevance to open forums in this Policy. Being new to the Board, I apologize if I have missed the outline you are referring to, or if there is an alternate Meeting Policy, and ask that you please direct me to it/them so I may familiarize myself.

With that said, I addressed my comment to the other Members of the Board, whereby I conveyed my opinion that the open forum had strayed from its intention. My recollection for doing so was because Members spoke on multiple occasions, without being acknowledged by the Chair, and for greater than 3 minutes without the consent of the Chair.

Regards,
Ryan

On Fri, Apr 24, 2026 at 1:52 PM Hochstedler <th80128@aol.com> wrote:

Ryan,

I want to respond to your comments after mine during the open forum.

I agree that clarity has value. That's not really the issue here. My concern is expanding control beyond what the Declaration supports. Here's one example:

The Declaration already requires plans and specifications and provides a defined 30-day review period. The ACC also has the authority to deny incomplete applications within that structure.

If those requirements weren't consistently enforced, that's an ACC policy or enforcement issue. Adding more language doesn't fix that. It changes how the system operates.

For example, tying the 30-day timeline to a “complete application” doesn’t clarify anything. It either duplicates what already exists, or it shifts when the review period begins, giving the reviewer control over timing. That structure introduces the potential for abuse over time.

That is a functional change, not just clarification.

We’ve already seen projects proceed without proper submission or approval, which points to an enforcement gap rather than a lack of clarity.

Separately, I wanted to follow up on your comment, “I feel like we've gotten a little bit away from the... uh, intent of the open forum...”

The meeting policy outlines how open forum is conducted, including time limits, relevance to the meeting, and the role of the chair in managing participation. It does not define a standard for “intent,” nor does it appear to authorize limiting comments on that basis.

Can you clarify what you meant by “intent,” where that standard is defined, and how it is being applied in practice during open forum?

Mark