

Recent discussions about changing the organization of the Greater World from an unincorporated entity to an incorporated one bring up more than just the details involved in the process of incorporating. As far as I can tell, most informed community members as well as the board are all for incorporating. What has not been talked about, however, is that the process of incorporating presents an opportunity for the community to change some of the existing documents and procedures. It is no surprise that after 20+ years, members of the GW may feel that it is time for a change.

It seems to me that there are two competing views of how the Greater World community should proceed were we now to incorporate. It's not productive to see this situation as one of "us against them" (read "for or against Mike"); that seems to me just a way to dismiss open discussion and information sharing about the situation. Rather than seeing this as a fight, I would frame it simply that the community and its members have evolved to a point where the way in which things have operated in the past is not seen as optimal now.

Here are two mutually-exclusive options:

OPTION ONE

Continue with the status quo: The current by-laws and the existing board remain.

1. By-laws are seen as a document that is "static" – there is no reason to question or revise the stated restrictions.
2. Decisions made by the board may be invalidated by Mike if he deems it appropriate and if, in his opinion, it is in the best interests of the community.
3. Board members may or may not represent the community members' differing views.
4. Violations of by-laws may or may not be "enforced".
5. Landowners who own more than one lot/earthship get more than one vote on any issue requiring community members' votes; and members who do not actually live in the community vote on issues that affect residents.

This option allows community members to remain as uninvolved as they wish in the details of the community; trust is put in Mike and the board to steer the community and determine its future. I think that many community members will agree with this view.

OPTION TWO

Make changes in order to reflect changing views of how the community organizes and conducts its business.

1. The by-laws are seen as dynamic – as the community grows and changes, there is need to revise the by-laws to meet new needs. Just as an example, storage buildings could be allowed that are not just of earthship construction; greenhouses could be located at members' sites. As

long as these projects are well-designed and well-built, and are not unsightly/ cause for neighbors' concerns, there isn't reason to outlaw them.

2. Each member of the community may have only one vote (regardless of the number of lots/e'ships they own), making all members equal in terms of voting.

3. Change the constitution of the board of directors: Establish new "term limits" for members, and determine how/if members can be appointed rather than elected; establish restrictions when there exist "conflicts of interest."

This option calls for some community members to "step up" and become involved in determining new ways for the community to operate. And although some members will not want to be involved, there are a growing number of members who welcome a new direction for the community and are willing to work toward that.

I plan to place this issue on the agenda for the June 5 board meeting, and hope that interested community members will attend to voice their opinions/views/ concerns.

Thanks for your time.

Respectfully,
Sally Margolin