From: Dominick Reis <dominickreis3@gmail.com>
Date: October 28, 2026 at 6:17:34 PM EDT
To: BOG
Subject: Re: New BOG Inquiry

Dear Ms. Foley DeAngelis:
Thank you for reaching out and sharing your concerns regarding the ongoing boundary expansion initiative.
With respect to your first question, five owners representing six of the 13 identified properties expressed interest in joining the updated Association boundaries; four owners representing five properties opted out; and two owners did not respond despite repeated contact attempts. After consulting Association counsel on best practices, the Charter Revision Commission asked the Board of Governors to contact owners who declined or could not be reached to confirm that their properties would be excluded. A second, certified letter serves three purposes:

1. To obtain a definitive, tracked receipt. The letter will give owners 30 days to opt in and explicitly state that silence or non-response will be legally and formally recorded as an affirmative opt-out;
2. To document a definitive answer and help establish a permanent boundary rule, ensuring that no owner can later claim to have been overlooked or inadequately notified before the Charter amendments are finalized;
3. To create a conclusive record of refusals, protecting the Association against later piecemeal requests or disputes from current or future owners of these properties once the new boundaries are legally established.

Regarding your second question, members voted 111-28 at our May 23, 2026 annual meeting to support the Board's exploration of boundary expansion. The Board then reviewed the merits and potential issues and consulted outside counsel on the legal and statutory procedures for amending the Charter and establishing a Charter Revision Commission. At its August 27, 2026 meeting, the Board voted to create the Commission, appoint its members, and define its mission.
The Commission was appointed to review the existing Charter as related to the Board's directives concerning potential boundary expansion, inclusion of the Association-owned parcel west of Old Black Point Road, and any other Charter matters it considers necessary or desirable. Through public hearings and regular meetings, it will consider member feedback on these proposals and any other Charter-related matters and submit proposed Charter amendments to the Board. The Board—not the Commission—decides which proposed Charter amendments to present to members for a final vote. Each amendment submitted to the membership will receive a separate vote at our May 2027 meeting before being adopted into the Charter.
As related to the border expansion issue, beyond a broader tax base and increased revenue, the reasons for pursuing boundary expansion were outlined in our response to

another member's inquiry, attached to our October 22, 2026 meeting agenda. Those reasons are excerpted below for reference:

- The Association's boundaries were established in 1931, when the properties at issue were still actively farmed. James J. Smith and his Lake and Shore Company were unable to acquire those lots for inclusion in his development. Had he been able to do so, the properties likely would have been within the original boundaries. This raises a fair question: why should today's owners of *contiguous properties accessed by roads within the Association's existing boundaries* be disadvantaged by decisions made nearly a century ago?
- The Charter boundaries must be updated in any event because the Association property on Old Black Point Road, which provides access to the approved estuary kayak dock, is not currently included;
- Including these properties within the updated boundaries would make their owners subject to Association Zoning Regulations, giving the Board some influence over future development. They are currently governed only by East Lyme Zoning Regulations, which provide the Association no regulatory authority over their ongoing use and development.

We recognize that you may oppose any effort by the Board to put the boundary expansion Charter amendment to a vote at next May's annual meeting. Please bear in mind that the Board must balance the interests of all Association members, which may differ from those of an individual or small group. Further, the Board is solely comprised of Black Point property owners who share your commitment to this community—it would not move forward a proposal it believed would in any way harm the Association or its members.
We appreciate your ongoing engagement and understanding.
Regards,
Bill Bayne
Chair, BPBCA
Dominick Reis
Vice Chair, BPBCA

From: 'Patty DeAngelis' <formreply@blackpointbeachclub.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2026 11:16 PM
To: BOG
Subject: New BOG Inquiry

Your Name

Patty DeAngelis

Your Email Address

pattyde1981@gmail.com

Your Black Point Address

56 Sea Spray Avenue

Your Phone

(860) 463-8511

Your Comments/Questions

In attending last week's BOG meeting, it was stated that the Charter Revision Commission has heard from 6 of the determined contiguous properties that they are interested in joining BP. It was also stated that the Commission would be sending out another letter to the remaining 7 properties that either did not respond at all to the first solicitation letter or initially said no to the invitation.
My question is exactly how many properties responded with a "no" and why would we go back to those properties at all for them to have another chance to respond? I understand that this new letter going out will be certified to ensure that the parties have gotten the correspondence from us, but WHY would you do this for those who already said "no"? In doing so, it certainly could be interpreted that we are almost begging these properties to join. Again, just really TRYING to understand the REAL REASON for WHY we are doing this? I can't seem to get any defined answer…..

Secondly, I did, in fact, go back to previous meeting and also to the May 2026 meeting where it was voted to put together the Charter Revision Commission to investigate the possibility of widening our boundaries. This was to include the stated properties mentioned. After that, the Commission was to report back to the BOG and then on to the Members for a vote. As an Association member who tries to keep up with all that is occurring, it was my understanding from that May

meeting, that the Commission would be a “fact finding body”, and would present ALL that they researched regarding this very big venture. That meant that the Commission would give the Association members the reason behind this potential move…the pro’s, the cons, and the legal ramifications of this possible venture, both currently and for the future. I am still hoping that all facets of these areas get presented in a public forum BEFORE this all goes to the BOG and especially goes on to a vote by the Members. This Commission was formed to research the idea and NOT to determine what the Association should do. The BP Association Membership should be allowed to hear all that the Commission has gained in insight, prior to determining what the Association should do going forward. This move is a BIG DEAL and should be looked at that way, as it would be a possible change that will affect all of us for years to come.

Respectfully Submitted,
Patty Foley DeAngelis
56 Sea Spray Avenue