



## TAHITIAN VILLAGE

**TAHITIAN VILLAGE PROPERTY OWNERS' ASSOCIATION  
P.O. BOX 636, BASTROP, TEXAS 78602, (512) 321-1145  
TVPOA BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

The regular board meeting of the Board of Directors of the Tahitian Village Property Owners' Association – 7:00 P.M., Tuesday, July 20, 2021

**Zoom Meeting - ONLINE**

**In-person Meeting – 141 Tahitian Dr. Bastrop, TX**

**TVPOA Board Members Present:**

Jan Schwindt, David Carter, Erika McDonald, Stacy Savage, Jan Kuchel and Mary Jo Creamer  
Board Members Absent: None

Association Manager: Amanda Homesley (Absent)

Administrative Assistant: Tiffany Ferguson

**PUBLIC PRESENT:** Michele Anderson, Sandy Stigall, Greg Stigall, Jeffrey Dittrich, Jennifer Livengood, Scott Ferguson, Mel Hamner, Randy Hudgins, John Creamer, Robert Wallenhorst, Mary Wallenhorst, Jessica Zamora, Michele Plummer, Lisa Canady, Joe Schwindt, Stacey Cunningham, Jo Egitto, Rachel Duer, Steven Singer, Gwen Winter, Roger Jones, Diana Hugo, Kris Cook, Mac Simpson, Courtney Young, Sarah Pylant, Chris Miller, Mary Linda Corpus Asuncion, Courtney Kellogg, Charitty Alexander, Dora Gonzales, Anita (last name not identified), Charles Smith, Deena Eden, Susan Castro Reeder, Terry (last name not identified)

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:** Meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by President Jan Schwindt.

### **SECRETARY'S REPORT**

The minutes of the regular meeting of the Board held on June 15, 2021 were presented. One edit was noted by Erika McDonald and acknowledged for correction by POA Secretary, Stacy Savage.

**Mary Jo Creamer made a motion to accept the June minutes, as presented. David Carter seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.**

### **TREASURER'S REPORT**

Discussion and possible approval of May 2021 financials.

**Stacy Savage made a motion to accept the May financials. David Carter seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.**

### **OPEN FORUM/PUBLIC COMMENT**

Jan Schwindt opened the floor and noted that the questions Courtney Kellogg posed on a neighborhood Facebook post would be answered. Erika McDonald stated those questions would be answered at the

meeting:

1. Courtney – When will members get to review the bylaws rewrite, when will it be done, and what is the process for voting procedures?
  - a. Erika – These questions will be answered on the agenda item later in the meeting.
2. Courtney – How many committees does the POA have and who are on the committees? Each committee person should have a profile picture posted on the website.
  - a. Erika – The POA has 3 committees. The TVACC is made up of Greg Stigall, Marty Burnett, Pierre Wilson, and Aaron Sanford. The Bylaws Committee is made up of Stacy Savage, Deena Eden, Roger Jones, and Jessica Zamora. The Election Committee is made up of David Carter, Michele Anderson, Isabelle Zachary, and Kathy Menegay. The committee members are not comfortable with a profile picture posted on the website and the POA will respect that.
    - i. Jan Schwindt noted there was a 2019 Records Retention Committee that stopped meeting in 2020 due to COVID. The committee members were Jo Egitto, Pierre Wilson, Mary Jo Creamer, and Lois Hornbuckle.
3. Courtney – Make a breakdown of financials open to members for the costs of elections, disclosure of receipts, and documents to support costs on the Profit/Loss (P & L) statement.
  - a. Erika – On the December 2020 P & L statement you will find a charge for \$227.14 for supplies. There were 3 packages of clear label stickers and 5 packages of address labels. There were also 3 other charges on the January 2021 P & L statement – one for \$1,261.50 to G & C Printing and two charges to USPS, one for \$240.00 and another for \$1,050. On the February 2021 P & L statement you will find a \$500.00 charge to pay the Election Judge and a \$50.00 charge to upgrade our Zoom subscription to allow for a larger number of attendees. This totals \$3,331.99.

Courtney Kellogg stated she had requested a receipt showing the cost and date of the 2021 election mail out with the quantity of ballots sent. She said she was given receipt the POA had on hand from the USPS for \$1,050.00 which only shows money was put into the POA's mailing account to cover the costs of the mail out, but doesn't show what items the money was spent on.

Erika stated the P & L statements are backed up by multiple accounting documents and yearly tax returns, which are available to the public. If any inconsistencies were identified, the hired accountants would notify the POA.

Jan Schwindt stated the nonprofit and business industry standards are to have all financials posted publicly for review, but individual receipts and checks written are not normal standards of record available to the public.

Courtney said that producing the receipt from the election mail out would benefit members against fraud, theft, and other potential issues so the money is being spent the way the POA says it is being spent.

Erika stated that the POA Bylaws requires an annual financial audit, which has already begun for 2021 and that the P & L statements, available to the public at all times on the website, show all expense and income items. She suggested to Courtney to request a transaction detail from the office.

4. Courtney – Does the POA have any expectations or standards in regards to board member ethics regarding in-person meetings and emails.
  - a. Erika – We do have a Code of Ethics document that all POA/ACC members and staff must sign. Since both Jan Schwindt and David Carter were out of town when this question was submitted, it was forwarded to me for a response. I answered back to the email with “Yes, and while human error is made on occasion, we constantly strive to do the best we can.” No

request was made of the POA to produce this actual document at that time, but it is now posted on our website.

5. Courtney – Will the POA address the petition to remove Pierre Wilson, Marty Burnett, and Association Manager Amanda Homesley? Why didn't all of the signers of the petition get notification from the POA that the petition was received? Did the petition get verified and accepted or denied?
  - a. Jan Schwindt – The petition was submitted on July 12<sup>th</sup> and deemed sufficient to require a recall election. (Let it be known that an email blast went out to the membership on July 20<sup>th</sup> stating the petition had been received and verified.) The ACC members on the petition can possibly be removed by a vote of the membership, but no new candidates will be presented to replace them since that is an entirely different process and expenditure. At this time, we will not call a special meeting for this, but, since this is the first time the POA is needing to conduct a recall election, we will need to consult with our attorney on what a recall election process should look like and keep the membership notified so everyone has equal opportunity to vote for or against removal of the ACC members targeted on the petition.

Joe Schwindt noted that in his 13 years of living in Tahitian Village, there has never been a recall election. He asked the membership to please be patient with the POA in figuring out the recall election and ballot mail out processes.

Courtney stated she was trying to be proactive in notifying the POA that her signature gathering for the petition was already happening and that it should be a July POA agenda item since it was submitted and forwarded to legal counsel for review and confirmation of validity.

Jan Schwindt noted that the petition was indeed valid, but was not on the July POA agenda as the petition language specifically requires “a meeting to be called no sooner than 20 days or after 50 days from the date the petition is presented”. The POA received this petition on July 12<sup>th</sup>, so it has only been 8 days. The POA will get notification out to the membership about the recall election process within the timeframe stated on the petition so it is fair and equitable to every member.

Michele Anderson indicated she spoke at the July ACC meeting to request the petition be tabled indefinitely due to form as the petition was confusing and clauses were pulled from both the POA deed restrictions and the POA bylaws document, which were combined in order to address ACC members. She also noted that the petition requested the resignation and termination of the Association Manager when she is neither elected nor appointed to that position, but a paid employee.

Courtney stated she is appreciative of the open discussion, but is still confused as to what members are allowed or not allowed to do during POA meetings to address community issues. Whatever we decide to do needs to be listed with rules for consistency.

Erika stated she is in favor of an open public dialogue format, but it has to be done within reason to respect everyone's time.

Stacy Savage stated that the rules are always stated upfront just before the public comment period to adhere to 3 minutes per person and that members donating their time to a fellow member so they can speak for a longer period of time was acceptable. She reminded the audience of the pattern that has developed over the past several months where “abuse of time privileges” has caused frustration among the board and other attending members who would like to move on to actual agenda items posted for discussion and action.

Courtney reiterated that she was appreciative of the open forum discussion, but that it is still confusing as to what it allowed because in previous meetings, the public comment period is 3 minutes without board response. We should establish the meeting rules for consistency. If I have 3 minutes, then the board providing a remark during my 3 minutes should not counted against me and I should not be

blamed for a conversation that turns into a two-hour discussion. How do we participate in a cohesive manner when the rules change?

Jan Schwindt stated that the POA is trying to help Courtney by answering these questions so that we could go through this discussion in an Open Forum format and then open the Public Comment period to the rest of the membership in attendance. When we try to help you get answers to your questions through email, the answers we give are not the answers you wanted to hear, so you would deem them as incorrect, which spurs continual back and forth. We can close future meetings to any public comments, which is well within Robert's Rules and the board can decide to do that if they choose. But, we continually come back to your same questions and if they don't fit your parameters then it isn't sufficient.

Courtney stated that the reason that we go back and forth is because her questions aren't being answered. USPS officially confirmed the receipt the POA gave was for a cash deposit into the account. That does not show how the money was spent. The postal service will give a receipt for the ballots, what you mailed, the date it was mailed, and the cost for the mailing. What I got was a receipt showing a deposit into a cash account only.

Roger Jones noted if the POA has an account with the USPS and money was put into that account to cover the cost of the postage, then you wouldn't have an open account balance.

Jan Schwindt stated she did not know how to answer that and she will go to the post office in person and see if there is a resolve.

Courtney said she has asked for this repeatedly and that the USPS stated the POA should have received a receipt showing the amount, date, and number of items mailed.

Jessica Zamora proposed that the POA fully implement Robert's Rules of Order like the Bastrop City Council does. I understand that it is frustrating to not get an immediate answer to your questions, but this platform is ridiculous. As a Bylaws committee member, I do not want my photo blasted out there and my information should not be public. I am a volunteer trying to represent the members of our community. My face, my race, and my credentials are not relevant. We need to stop this and use the 3-minute forum like the City Council does so we can have an actual meeting. The POA staff have given nothing but great customer service and have always answered my questions promptly and accurately. This is a "catch 22" where a personal vendetta and retaliation is on display. We need to be a community of loving people no matter if we agree or not on politics. No more back and forth conversations as we have experienced 57 minutes of wasted time.

Roger Jones asked why Amanda Homesley is listed on the petition for removal from her post if she is a paid employee and not an elected official.

Jan Schwindt responded that he would need to ask the petitioner.

Courtney commented that Amanda was listed on the petition because she had been addressed in a disrespectful manner several times at the office, via email, and at public meetings. Several personal examples were given:

1. Being spoken to condescendingly when asking for several documents at the office
2. Being yelled at during the April POA meeting regarding a Facebook post from Courtney that accused Amanda of giving the Elections Committee a separate form that the candidates did not get and that no board member reprimanded her at that meeting.

(Let it be known that Amanda gave this form to the 2021 Elections Committee members as part of her job and received no instruction from the POA not to do so. Let it also be known that the board sent multiple real-time text messages to Amanda in order to deescalate the heated exchange with Courtney. Amanda then removed herself from that meeting for a period of about 20 minutes and returned to complete the meeting.)

Erika apologized on behalf of the full board and staff.

Jan Kuchel stated that the board was taken aback at the whole situation.

Erika stated that the event was not handled properly, but that after the meeting, Amanda was reprimanded and it was suggested she send apology letters to all members attending the POA meeting that evening. An apology doesn't mean much when it doesn't come from the person who made the offense, so in my mind, an apology did not need to come from the POA. Again, I apologize on behalf of the board for the unprofessional behavior.

Stacy Savage pointed out that the POA employees receive an internal annual performance review and that these types of employment concerns have been thoroughly discussed and addressed.

Jan Schwindt asked Roger Jones if his question was answered sufficiently.

Roger stated that he understands that Courtney has an issue with Amanda, but when you're talking about a petition to remove elected officials, why would a paid employee be listed on that same petition, especially during the trying times of COVID? It is not proper or correct in any way to include her on a petition for removal. They are separate issues and should be dealt with as such.

Isabelle Zachary said that it is unfair to speak about Amanda when she was not in attendance to defend herself. She stated that she has dealt with Courtney's argumentative nature in the past and that she needs to take accountability for her part in how volatile the situation with Amanda became during the April POA meeting. When Amanda apologized to the members for her behavior, that should have ended the discussion.

Jan Schwindt closed the Open Forum conversation addressing Courtney Kellogg's grievances and opened up the Public Comment period to the rest of the members in attendance.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Jo Egitto thanked Jan Schwindt for being responsive in sending information regarding the acceptance of the petition and Randy McDonald's ACC resignation. The messaging from the POA board was very different from what was given by the ACC and the realness of the POA's message was very much appreciated.

Michele Anderson stated that as a member of the Election Review Committee, she and the rest of the team have worked very hard to address every concern that Courtney Kellogg has raised with regard to inconsistencies of the 2021 election. She mentioned those concerns were very valid and she hopes the community can see the effort put in to remedy these situations.

Courtney Kellogg reiterated why she placed Amanda on the petition for resignation/removal stating that her behaviors have been brought to the POA's attention multiple times with no response given. Courtney repeated her personal examples previously given in the Open Forum discussion. She also pointed to a lack of processes and procedures in place to file a complaint against an Association Manager. There was no conversation had nor meeting scheduled to rectify this improper behavior. Why does the POA not find the 33 members who signed the petition a valid enough reason to have a conversation and why should Amanda not be fired by the board? The membership deserves a Manager who is respectful of all members and who follows the code of ethics and standards and the board has the power to hire and fire staff. What is the procedure to get her fired and removed? The POA's response said Amanda was invalidated on the petition because she was a paid employee, but the petition asks the POA/ACC to remove her.

Jan Schwindt re-read Courtney's petition language verbatim to the attendees and stated that there are no provisions in the deed restrictions that require a paid employee or an elected member to resign

immediately. The deed restrictions do allow for a Special Meeting of the membership once a valid petition is presented, however, Courtney's petition gives as specific timeline of "a meeting to be called no sooner than 20 days or after 50 days from the date the petition is presented". Therefore, immediate action was not required and the POA is still within the petitioner's time frame to take any necessary actions. The POA is still creating policies on how to facilitate a petition for removal since this is the first recall election and consultation with legal counsel is required. The POA will send out a notification to the membership on the process as it is developed.

Courtney retorted that the petition asks the POA to remove Amanda as an employee.

Jan Schwindt reminded attendees that the POA has internal operations and reviews for employees to remedy situations like these and that the POA, not the members, will decide if there is cause for termination.

Erika McDonald stated that the 33 people who signed the petition represent less than 1% of the entire membership and that it is not an accurate sampling to determine cause for termination of an employee.

Rachel Duer thanked the POA board members and volunteers for all the hard work put into the rewrite process for the Bylaws with special attention to the elections provisions. Since she has moved here and become more active in the POA meetings, she came with an idea of how POAs were supposed to function and learned that this is not how it is done in Tahitian Village. She stated she did not sign Courtney's petition herself, but helped gather signatures because she felt things needed to be changed. There are processes happening now that will make our community better, but she would still like to see more involvement and more outreach to newer neighbors who may want to get involved. With more people involved, the more we can get done collectively to make this a great place to live.

Isabelle Zachary stated she felt there was a very good reason to petition for the removal of Randy McDonald from the ACC due to the inappropriate verbal exchange with a member caught on the resident's doorbell video, but that it was wrong to lump a paid employee in with the elected members on the petition. This is a risky practice because the board does not know if the 33 members who signed the petition actually agreed or experienced any unprofessional behavior from Amanda themselves. This is not an appropriate conversation to have about an employee who is not here to defend herself. Thank you to the board for handling this internally. I hope we can move on and that people will treat employees and volunteers with respect. When we treat each other with respect and politeness, that is what we will get back in return and that is what I have experienced from Amanda.

Jan Kuchel stated the board is doing everything it can to meet Courtney's requests or issues with voting and that she spoke out months ago about the voting process and wanting the ballots to be changed. There are people on the board who already saw things that needed to be corrected and were currently working to rectify issues regarding transparency. Maybe a community meeting needed to be held before these issues were made public because the POA was already handling them as evident by the formation of the 2020 Elections Committee. The membership may not have been aware of our preemptive actions and we need to do a better job with the members at large in communicating what we're doing.

Jessica Zamora stated the Bylaws and Elections Committees have spent a minimum of 2 hours each week since April to correct processes and issues. Erika and Stacy have been fantastic in their leadership and wonderful to work with because they care so deeply for our community. Everyone should be made aware of this and we're working diligently to get this completed for member approval.

Courtney Kellogg agreed with Jan Kuchel that she was not the first to highlight inconsistencies in the election process, but that she has been calling for concrete solutions to be implemented and she is hopeful for the new revisions to the Bylaws. She also appreciates that Erika gave an apology on behalf of the board, but would like individual apologies from the rest of the board or at least to hear the board's stance on Amanda yelling at her during the April POA meeting and going unchecked by the board.

Jessica Zamora chimed in that Courtney already received an apology and her additional request was ridiculous.

Courtney asked David Carter for an apology.

David stated no personal apology would be given as he was not at the April meeting.

Jan Kuchel provided an apology and stated that she was in shock by Amanda's behavior and didn't have the wherewithal to immediately correct it on the call.

Courtney then claimed that David Carter called her a "nut".

David denied this accusation.

Stacy Savage and Randy Hudgins (respectively seated directly beside and directly in front of David) both indicated they did not hear this term being used by David toward Courtney.

Jan Schwindt apologized for allowing any occurrences where the Open Forum portion of recent POA meetings have gotten out of control and that she will make a concerted effort to do better at controlling the flow of board meetings.

Jan Schwindt asked for any other comments. As there were none, the Public Comment period was closed.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

1. **Treasurer's Report** – Report given by Erika McDonald [June 2021 P & L](#) shows a net income of \$12,817.86.
  - a. The Bylaws require an annual independent financial review not to be performed by the current accountant. This process for 2019 and 2020 has already been started and should be completed in the Fall. The results will be disseminated to the membership and posted to the website.
  - b. The POA has \$683,000.00 on hand in a mix of CDs, money markets accounts, and the POA checking account. We may need to open another CD, but we are maxed out at all the local banks. (Further research required.)
2. **ACC and Touring/Violation Report** – Report given by Erika McDonald (in Amanda's absence).  
Permits issued for June 2021:
  - 25 homes
  - 5 fences
  - 1 deck
  - 1 pool
  - 7 sheds
  - 1 drivewayTouring violation report showing a total of 36 letters delivered to residents:
  - 1<sup>st</sup> letters sent out were 30
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> letters sent out were 3
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> letters sent out were 7
  - Tiffany toured 8 hours during the month for a total of 109 miles.
3. **Discussion and possible action on Bylaws and Election Committees and Processes.**  
Erika McDonald demonstrated the new Bylaws review page on the website which holds the current 2016 Bylaws document, the 2020 Bylaws with updates on the election process, and the most recent

2021 working document with proposed changes. There is a contact form to leave public feedback on the proposed Bylaws revisions. Additionally, up for public review are the candidate nomination packet, ballot instructions, the election authority guidelines, and rules dictating the duties of the election judge. Members are also encouraged to review the supplemental documents, such as the POA/ACC Code of Ethics. The goal is to get feedback and address concerns prior to the 2 public forums in July and August. The feedback that comes from the public forums will also be worked into the document to ensure all responses are captured accurately for consideration. After the public forums are completed, a Special Meeting of the membership will be called to conduct final review, revisions, and voting for approval.

Jo Egitto asked if the 2021 Bylaws Committee folded in the recommendations from the 2020 Bylaws Committee.

Erika responded yes, that is the document we used to launch from with this current rewrite.

Courtney Kellogg asked about the purpose of the Bylaws public forums.

Erika responded that the goal of these public forums was to receive feedback from people who have reviewed the document. In order to keep all public responses organized for each Article of the Bylaws, we need a more structured environment when we meet via Zoom, so the website feedback form will capture all of this for us. The voting process will be discussed in depth at the public forums as it is the part of the Bylaws that needs the most attention and input from the community. The ACC's voting process is cemented in the deed restrictions and cannot be changed, but the POA's election process can be altered as it is part of the Bylaws. We can do "one lot, one vote", set a voting cap, or to allow business entities to vote or not. The proposed dates are July 31<sup>st</sup> and August 18<sup>th</sup>. Courtney asked if we should give more time for the public to review the documents and give feedback.

Erika stated the POA is on a tight timeline to be able to have the new Bylaws approved by the membership before the 2022 election process begins in early October.

There is also an email blast archive now on the website under the "News" tab and there is now a Clean Sweep volunteer sign up form.

**Jan Kuchel made a motion to set the new Bylaws feedback page live to the public. Mary Jo Creamer seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.**

#### **4. Discussion and possible action on Tahitian Village beautification project.**

No new information was provided.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **1. Discussion and possible action on traffic counts and vacant lots in Units 4 & 5**

Bastrop County Commissioner Mel Hamner gave a presentation on the vehicle counters placed throughout the community to provide a vision on development potential. The counters determined around 4,300 vehicles enter the Village daily from both the east and the west. The counter on Baseball shows all but about 800 of the 4,300 vehicles coming in from the east and on Tahitian Drive, south of Kaanapali, comes to about 2,200. Akaloa shows almost 1,400 vehicles. The subdivision was built in the 1970s as a "snow bird haven" and the lots should be half acre properties or larger, not quarter acre. There were no traffic or drainage studies done at that time. We have about 2,000 homes built between the city and county lots, meaning we have 3,912 lots still unbuilt. The



water district and the county have been working on roads, but the statewide freeze in February dislodged the tops off of 15 miles' worth of roads that were just laid. They will continue road work as long as the weather prevails. There are 2 drainage projects going on in the Village through a grant. A drainage channel is also being dug on both sides of Unit 3 as flood waters come off from Units 4 & 5, but we still need several retention ponds built.

## **2. Discussion and possible action on updating deed restrictions.**

Stacy Savage pointed to a need for modernizing the current deed restrictions to account for the expected growth in the Village. A scenario to consider is do we use our current legal firm or a POA legal specialist. The POA staff should begin research regarding different specialist firms and requests for bid quotes.

Jan Schwindt commented that the POA attorney recently performed an update on deed restrictions for a community in the area similar to Tahitian Village and that he would be able to take that draft document and insert "Tahitian Village" throughout.

Erika McDonald rebutted that the hard part is not the rewriting of the deed restrictions, it is the voting process among property owners. The current process requires  $\frac{3}{4}$  of all property owners' approval. There are processes through the state legislature that will allow circumvention of the  $\frac{3}{4}$  ownership voting rule to where it would look more like the Bylaws voting process of majority wins. Stacy Savage reminded attendees that the Texas legislature only meets once every other year for 5 months and that they do not reconvene until January 2023.

Commissioner Hamner asked attendees to remember that there are only 2,000 homes developed and another 4,000 undeveloped lots. Many of them are deemed "unbuildable", but developers are finding ways to develop the lots anyway. The deed restrictions are in desperate need of attention and updating to handle the explosion in population and developer technologies.

Courtney Kellogg questioned why the deed restrictions needed to be modified and if the POA has asked the membership if that is something they want to move forward with.

John Creamer stated they were originally written in the 1970s and a portion of the documents was updated in 1998 to get rid of annual fees.

Mary Jo Creamer stated that they need to be updated to handle things like building on tiny lots and more drainage problems as we grow.

Erika stated the deed restrictions are about how we want our community to look, what we want it to contain, parks, aesthetics, etc. It has nothing to do with the board and as we are finishing up the Bylaws rewrite process, we should keep the community input momentum going to the deed restrictions.

Gwen Winter stated that there are homes being built on lots that should not be built upon. Who is approving these buildings and lots? Does the ACC have the expertise to approve these ridiculous and dangerous builds?

Jan Schwindt said permit approvals still go through the ACC and the restrictions are even tighter now as the newest guidelines were posted in September 2020.

Commissioner Hamner said Texas law allows the builder to hire an inspector to inspect the engineer plans, foundation, framing, and the final product, but the builder gets to retain those reports.

Stacy Savage said this discussion cements the point that we need to begin the deed restrictions rewrite process for proper vetting and getting quotes for legal counsel.

Rachel Duer asked if any of the current lawsuits protesting the current ACC guidelines that could affect the deed restrictions rewrite process or if the POA should stall until any court decisions are made. How much work should go into the initial process if the lawsuits could alter the finalization of

the new deed restrictions?

Erika stated we're just looking into research right now and a final deed restriction document would not be available for another 3-4 years.

**No motion was made, but staff was directed to begin the research process.**

**3. Discussion and possible action on annual POA financial review.**

Erika stated this was discussed earlier in the meeting and that the Bylaws require an annual review. The POA has recruited an independent firm to provide this service for \$2,000 and the ACC will be mirroring this process for review of their own finances.

**Stacy Savage made a motion to initiate and fund the annual financial review for 2019-2020. Jan Kuchel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously via email on Jun 14<sup>th</sup>.**

**5. Discussion and possible action on removing an abandoned boat.**

Erika McDonald reported a dumped boat to POA staff on Aloha. Tiffany Ferguson investigated the site and determined the boat was stripped of all usable parts. Three different towing companies have been contacted for bid quotes. For legal and bonding reasons, no company is willing to remove the item due to assumed risks.

Joe Schwindt asked if the state serial/license tag is still on the boat.

Tiffany said the police department also investigated the site and they talked to the previous owners of the boat. The previous owner stated he traded the boat for some work performed years ago.

Commissioner Hamner stated the POA cannot dump the boat at the county facility.

Waste Connections was contacted to understand if the company could help.

Michele Anderson stated the POA should post the boat on Facebook Marketplace.

Courtney Kellogg asked if the boat is on someone's actual lot.

Tiffany said it is in an easement by the road.

Erika stated that if the boat is within 20 feet of the road, it is City of Bastrop property and the local government is responsible for removal.

Courtney said that the boat is either on city property, county property, or residential property and someone is responsible for removal.

**6. Miscellaneous**

Stacy Savage stated she sent an email to the POA regarding new legislation that was passed through the 2021 state legislature that affects HOA/POA organizations and compliance. The board requested the email to be resent for review and that any questions will be posed to the attorney.

Erika noted that a formal complaint form should be put on the POA website so members can report property violations and other grievances.

**The POA entered an Executive Session at 9:42 p.m.**

**The POA reconvened in regular session at 10:23 p.m.**

**Erika McDonald made a motion to hire Randy Hudgins to clean the Tahitian Village signs at the community entryways in Units for \$450.00. Jan Kuchel seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.**

Erika McDonald made a motion to adjourn. Stacy Savage seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:25 p.m.

[Redacted Signature]

8-18-21

Stacy Savage - TVPCA Secretary

Date

[Redacted Signature]

8-19-2021

Amanda Homesley Association Manager

Date