



TAHITIAN VILLAGE

TAHITIAN VILLAGE PROPERTY OWNERS' ASSOCIATION TVPOA BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The regular Board of Directors meeting of the Tahitian Village Property Owners' Association
Tuesday, February 22, 2022 at 7:00PM

Meeting held at the Bastrop County Convention Center and online via Zoom

TVPOA Board Members Present:

Jan Schwindt, Ruth Bullock, Mary Jo Creamer, Stacy Savage, Charles Brading and Deena Eden

Board Members Absent: None

Association Manager: Amanda Homesley

Administrative Assistant: Tiffany Ferguson

PUBLIC PRESENT: John Creamer, Tina Terry, Melodi Oltmann, Greg Stigall, Michele Plummer, Gary Williamson, Randy Hudgins, Courtney Kellogg, Joseph Clemmons, Patrick Canady, Pierre Wilson, Kris Cook, Steve Singer, Jackie Luna, Rachel Duer, Robert Wallenhorst, Charitty Alexander, Mallorie DePenning, Jessica Zamora, David Carter, Jo Egitto, Sandy Stigall, and Erika McDonald

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER: Meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by President, Jan Schwindt.

Jan Schwindt welcomed everyone that was present in-person and virtually into the meeting. We are going to go directly into Executive Session so that we can nominate our officers. We can't make any motions or vote while we're in Executive, but we'll come out and make those motions and votes in front of you. So, we ask that you all to step into the lobby and Zoom users will be put in a private room.

The POA entered into Executive Session at 7:03
The POA reconvened into Regular Session at 7:11

Jan Schwindt stated we have officers to nominate along with 2 at large positions. Do I hear any motions?

Mary Jo Creamer made a motion to nominate Jan Schwindt as President, Stacy Savage seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Stacy Savage made a motion to nominate Ruth Bullock as Vice President, Charles Brading seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Deena Eden made a motion to nominate Stacy Savage as Secretary, Charles Brading seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Ruth Bullock made a motion to nominate Mary Jo Creamer as Treasurer, Charles Brading seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

The two members at large will be Deena Eden and Charles Brading.

NEW BUSINESS

1. TVPOA 2019/2020 annual reviews

Jan Schwindt chose to rearrange the agenda order because of a guest speaker. Melodi Oltmann from Medack & Oltmann has been invited to speak on our 2019/2020 annual reviews.

Melodi Oltmann – My firm is Medack & Oltmann and we performed the financial annual review of the TVPOA financial statements for 2019 and 2020. The POA received a hard copy of the review. Just a reminder, a review is less in scope than an audit and is designed not to express an opinion on the financial statements. Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements; our responsibility is to conduct the review. As such, we're not aware of any material modifications for the 2019 or 2020 year ends to on those financial statements in order for them to be in accordance with the modified cash basis of accounting. Your balance sheet is called the statement of assets, liabilities and net assets that begins on the third page of that report. For 2019, you had total assets of \$593,164. The majority of that was cash and cash equivalents of \$592,958. The remaining amount was property and equipment, net of accumulated depreciation of \$206. So, you had some liabilities for payroll of \$1,803. So that left you with net assets, which is assets minus liabilities, of \$591,361. That's for the year 2019. For 2020, you had total assets of over \$627,000 and the majority of that was cash and cash equivalents again of \$621,291. And property and equipment, net of depreciation of \$5,752. You have payroll liabilities of almost the same amount \$1,804, leaving you with net assets at \$625,239. The following page breaks down into your statement of revenues, expenses and changes in net assets. And on the cash basis of accounting, you have total revenues for the year 2019 of \$117,550. The majority of that were fees of over \$96,000. Some interest, the Clean Sweep revenues, miscellaneous and some reimbursements from the ACC fund. So, your total revenues of \$117,000 less, you had total expenses for the year 2019 of right over \$85,000. The majority of that was personnel expenses, payroll, and donations of \$11,000. Payroll was right at \$46,000. That left you with a change in net assets, basically, you're in the black for the year 2019 of \$32,314. And then for 2020, your total revenues were \$147,948, which the majority of that one of these have \$135,900 and some interest earnings of \$1,725. Your total expenses for the year 2020 was \$114,069. The majority of that was personnel expenses of over \$46,000 in donations of \$37,500, leaving you with a change in net assets in the black of \$33,879. The next few pages are just required note disclosures that explain their required information that accompanies the financial statements to just give you some further explanation of what some definitions are. There is a note in here that breaks down your property and equipment between buildings, vehicles, and how much it's accumulated depreciation. Really, that's the lesson is just boilerplate. And that's for 2019 and 2020. Melodi Oltmann will send the 2019/2020 reviews electronically so they could be posted on the POA website.

Jan Schwindt introduced the new board members to all in attendance.

The assignment of the bank signatories will be tabled for next month's agenda to ensure all federal background check results are first received.

SECRETARY'S REPORT

1. Discussion and approval of the January 18, 2022 meeting minutes.

These minutes were tabled for the March monthly meeting.

2. Discussion and approval of the 2022 Annual Meeting minutes.
These meeting minutes were tabled for the March monthly meeting.

TREASURER'S REPORT

1. Discussion and possible approval of January 2022 financials.
Tabled for next months meeting so the new treasurer can review in advance.
2. Discussion and possible action on 2021 financial audit.
Mary Jo Creamer stated that there were 3 bids that Amanda received and distributed to the board. Montemayor, Bender, & Britton is an Austin firm or hub and they gave us a bid of \$11,000. I read everything on their bio, and it looks like they would be the firm that we might want to go with or that appealed to me. The second one that she had there was from Andrew, Merryman, Bumgardner, & Morrison, they were out in Victoria, their range was between \$10-\$12,000. All of these said they would give us a contract. But then the last one did not think we should choose was DK Partner. Their bid was somewhere between \$15,000-\$20,000. This was for 2021 and \$10,000-15,000 is about the going rate.
Jan Schwindt stated Amanda had sent this information out previously to the Board. Does the board have any comments or questions on any of these firms?
Mary Jo Creamer reminded everyone that none of these firms can start the POA's audit process until after tax season.

Mary Jo Creamer made a motion to hire Montemayor, Bender, & Britton to perform the 2021 annual audit. Charles Brading seconded the motion. A vote was taken, 4 yes votes with 1 abstention. Motion passes.

OLD BUSINESS

1. ACC and Touring/Violation Report – Report given by Jan Schwindt
Tabled for the March monthly meeting to update the report.

Touring violation report showing a total of 72 letters delivered to residents:

- 1st letters sent out were 52
- 2nd letters sent out were 12
- 3rd letters sent out were 8
- 35 resolved but could be from previous months
- Tiffany toured 6 hours during the month for a total of 84 miles.

Charles Brading asked what the most common violation is in our community?

Tiffany Ferguson stated it depends on the time of year. Sometimes it is mowing and other times it is construction debris that gets left in yards. It varies from month to month.

Charles Brading requested Staff email him that information.

Tiffany Ferguson stated she will email Charles that information and that it is also in the Pine Post.

Jan Schwindt asked the Board if it should keep the "Miscellaneous" line item on the agenda.

If the Board needed to address a larger discussion topic under Miscellaneous, then the Membership wouldn't know about it because it wasn't placed on the agenda posted six days prior. My recommendation is

that we get rid of it completely. I would like to discuss this amongst the Board.

Charles Brading said he is against having Miscellaneous agenda items.

Ruth Bullock stated you shouldn't have Miscellaneous on any agenda and stated that all items need to be in a category.

Stacy Savage stated that its important to keep them because the state law has us posting 6 days prior to the meeting and if anything comes up in between that is very important then we can use it. I don't see the harm in keeping it there if we have a pertinent agenda item that needs to be addressed after the agenda is posted.

Ruth Bullock asked if we are able to amend the agenda after posting?

Amanda Homesley stated not after we post it the 6 days prior to the meeting date. The problem is that the residents want to see what all the agenda items are.

Charles Brading asked if there was any way to add it under "New Business" on the agenda?

Both Amanda and Tiffany replied no.

Jan Schwindt asked what if there is an emergency?

Amanda Homesley stated the Board would have to call a Special Meeting.

Mary Jo Creamer made a motion to remove the "Miscellaneous" from the agenda. Charles Brading seconded the motion. A vote was taken with 3 yes votes and 2 no votes. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

2. Discussion and possible action on the POA website.

Stacy Savage stated this is about bringing our web developer, Mallorie DePenning, on as a contractor under a retainer agreement. Everyone has received Mallorie's proposal. This would allow us instant access to her time and effort focused on our website and updates when we need them. This is beneficial, especially in emergency situations, like wildfires and when we need rapid response information distributed to the Membership. The proposal is a reasonable price, she is very reliable and responsive, and she lives here in the Village, so she has a vested interest in getting accurate and timely information out. We will look over her proposal and pay rate in Executive Session. If Mallorie wants to jump in with any additional information, she can.

Mallorie had technical difficulties and wasn't able to respond.

Tiffany requested any additional comments or questions from the Board on this item to be sent to her to pass along to Mallorie.

3. Discussion and possible action on Membership email blasts.

Stacy Savage stated this is to discuss public email notifications distributed among the Membership. It is her belief that several sets of eyes are needed for review so that they are being vetted properly before being sent out. This way, there is no confusion, we present a very high level of professionalism, and they are being crafted in a way that is easy to understand so people can take away the key messaging being conveyed.

I always feel the Secretary should have the finalization, in conjunction with the President, when possible, to finalize any front facing messaging, whether it is a meeting invite, a community event invite, or an announcement to vote, etc. This would not include back end administrative email exchanges, such as communications with builders and contractors on permitting issues. Some say the previous messaging has been drafted in a manner that may have been delivered with minimal information given. It needs to be accurate and timely. I am now back in the Secretary position, and thank you to the Board for the re-election, and I want to work with staff to get everything put out to the highest possible standards.

Jan Schwindt stated it depends on what type of draft or email is being put out and we will take this to Executive Session.

4. Discussion and possible action on federal background checks.

Stacy Savage stated the new Bylaws require all elected or appointed Board/Committee members to perform a federal background check and that the Association will pay for or reimburse for that process. The Bylaws also state that if you have 2 or more misdemeanors, you cannot hold an Officer position. If your record shows any convictions of financial crimes, you can hold office, but you cannot be a bank signatory for the organization. If you have a felony, you can't serve at all. That's why we have added the federal background requirements for elected and appointed members to search for crimes in other states beyond Texas.

After the Annual Meeting and with the immediate seating of new Board/Committee members, we need a timeline to get the federal background check results. As you have all just witnessed, we went into Executive Session and elected Officers for 2022, but right now, we don't know who the Association's bank signatories can be because our federal results have not been received, as of yet. If we had checks to sign tomorrow, we couldn't do that. We need an agreed upon timeline for this so we can continue conducting Association business.

Jan Schwindt asked what are you suggesting the timeline be?

Stacy Savage stated that because this is the first time we are enacting this portion of the Bylaws, we haven't experienced this before. We are running into some obstacles in getting our results back from the FBI or being able to open the files sent that contain the results. I am hoping by the time our respective POA/ACC March business meetings occur that we can be set up correctly so we're able to know who can serve and who can serve in an Officer and/or bank signatory role.

Jan Schwindt suggested we have a deadline to submit for the report instead of one to receive the results, since that is out of our hands and we don't know how long it takes to get that information back.

Tiffany Ferguson made the Board aware that some people were also dealing with other types of issues on these background checks.

Charles Brading suggested working with Staff on setting up a general private account at a certain place so we call all just go in and get it done, we won't have to wait on getting reimbursed, and we can make it simple.

Jan Schwindt stated we need to figure out on creating a business account. Staff should research and see if we can do this.

Stacy Savage asked if a 2-week time frame after the Annual Meeting would be sufficient to at least get the process started for everyone.

Jan stated that this is a new process and we need to do more research in order to make an informed decision. Let's table this and come back next month.

5. Discussion on petition filed.

Rodney Strnadel filed this agenda item, but was not available to discuss it with the Board. Tabled for the March monthly meeting.

6. Discussion on "Meet the Candidate" questions.

Rodney Strnadel filed this agenda item, but was not available to discuss it with the Board. Tabled for the March monthly meeting.

7. Discussion on "Meet the Candidate" video publication.

Courtney Kellogg stated that in the past, several members have asked that they want all POA meetings to be video recorded, published, and made available to the public. The Board has said no because of concerns for potential editing and posting by others that could allow for misrepresentation.

Courtney asked why the "Meet and Greet" was published publicly. Do you not have the same concerns that we would be misrepresented or edited like you have said in the past? The response I got from the office is that this is not official Board business. To which I said, how are you differentiating? Because it seems is that we were

given notice that day and nobody asked if we were OK with it. Furthermore, the Board also said if you do choose to attend, you must be present with your camera on and in front of it. Then, the POA allowed Ruth Bullock (candidate) to attend by phone without video, which is the exact opposite. I am happy that Ruth got to be on the call, but I was specifically told if you were there you had to be on camera and so the Board stipulated a “must” rule but didn’t actually adhere to it. Please explain why the rules don’t apply to all.

Jan Schwindt stated the “Meet and Greet” was a public information forum, not a public meeting. It was strictly done as a service for our Membership.

Courtney Kellogg stated the concern was that you published it, but you don’t publish your own meetings. Where was the consideration for us?

Jan Schwindt stated the only reason we record the POA meetings to begin with is to make sure everything is reflected accurately in the meeting minutes. Instead of furiously writing and taking notes during the meeting, we have an operable timeframe to do those meeting minutes and go back over them if we have to and then delete them.

Courtney asked why the meeting recordings are deleted?

We had issues in the past where they were on the Facebook and edited and only part of the story was posted.

Courtney Kellogg stated where is the same consideration for the members of the Meet and Greet video recording in that regard? Do you not think it could have been edited in the same way?

Erika McDonald in chat: It was a last-minute decision by the Board to cancel the meeting in-person and host it only via Zoom to apply a fair opportunity for all candidates. We shared the Meet and Greet recording to ensure Members were able to make an informed decision when voting.

Courtney asked why is Erika allowed to speak on my agenda item and take up my minutes?

Stacy Savage stated she is providing context and agenda items are not timed.

Jan Schwindt stated these were not for Board minutes. We wanted to be fair to everyone running for the Board. We can take it under advisement.

Courtney said that the Board did take it under advisement and it decided that the reason was for misrepresentation.

Ruth Bullock stated I had a previous engagement with the City Council and I didn’t want to miss out speaking to you all so I was sitting in my car in the cold on the phone so I could be part of this because it meant that much to me. Otherwise, I could have skipped the whole thing.

Deena Eden stated can we propose getting pre-approval from the candidates before we post them online next time?

Charles Brading stated he was happy people recorded it so people could see it.

Courtney continued stating that there was a discrepancy requiring candidates must be on camera and even though Ruth couldn’t be on camera, she was still allowed to participate. If I couldn’t join by video would I have been afforded that same consideration?

Charles Brading stated there are always extenuating circumstances and we need to be flexible, but it was best for the community. It was also asked of all the other candidates if it was OK that Ruth joined by phone and not by video chat. We all agreed that she deserved an opportunity to participate and that this decision would be best for the community to hear from all candidates.

Courtney stated she was happy that Ruth was there. I’m stating the rules were different.

Ruth Bullock stated nothing can be done from this, but you have brought forth issues we can address in the future. We need to be better prepared for the next election.

7. Discussion on 2022 election voting ballot totals.

Jo Egitto welcomed the new Board. I wanted to touch base to just go over the election result reporting was a debacle, but I want to move forward from it. The Election Judge didn’t report the results on the website.

Obviously, those results were negated and a recount was done by the Tribunal and those results are posted on the website, but I am having trouble understanding the pieces of it. Where were we off in numbers so it doesn't happen again?

I am assuming we paid the Election Judge \$500.00, regrettably, and hopefully that person is not retained for next year's election.

Jan Schwindt stated that the published information explained all of this in a TVNNN email blast with details on the 3 sets of numbers and where they came from.

Jo Egitto challenged Jan's statement saying she received the email and saw the discrepancies published by the POA, but where on the form does it indicate the number of voting ballots mailed back to the Association? What are these results? How was it so off with the Election Judge?

Jan Schwindt explained that the Election Judge came in and had all of the ballots and had not yet filled out the ballot reporting form but had it all handwritten out. She completed the ballot reporting form and put it in a sealed envelope. She accidentally took it home with her when she gathered her stuff off the table. She said she placed the sealed envelope on the speaker's podium in the meeting room. When she was asked to double check her belongings, it was revealed that the sealed envelope was still in her possession.

In the meeting, the Election Committee chair, Kris Cook, was in the audience and spoke to the Election Judge by phone and verbally received the vote tallies for each candidate over the phone. Kris transcribed the vote tallies as told to her by the Election Judge and then verified to the Membership audience that the vote tallies she gave to the Board was in her own hand writing and confirmed that she had received this information directly from the Election Judge. After the Annual Meeting, the Election Judge was instructed to deliver the original form to the office on the following Monday. Amanda informed me that the numbers given to Kris Cook over the phone did not match the numbers on the vote reporting form, therefore I went straight to the office immediately to speak with the Election Judge. I asked her about the numbers, and she could not explain to me why they were so different. As a Board, we immediately knew there needed to be a recount to figure out what the real numbers were. So, we notified the Election Committee and the Tribunal, with 3 people on each, and immediately called a meeting to do a recount. The actual ballots were handed over from the Election Judge and, in a closed meeting, the six of them recounted all the ballots. The final numbers from this recount were issued publicly through that TVNNN email.

Jo Egitto asked if there was any feedback from the Election Judge as to why they were so different?

Jan Schwindt stated she could not answer as to why they were different.

Jo Egitto asked if was she paid?

Jan Schwindt stated yes, we paid her immediately as is our practice upon delivery of the report. She was paid at the point when she sealed the envelope.

Jo Egitto requested that the POA doesn't pay an Election Judge until the final election report is submitted to the Membership.

Jan Schwindt stated there are a lot of revisions that we need to look at in that process and nobody could have predicted this situation.

Jo Egitto stated that this transaction wasn't complete until the election results were made public.

Jan Schwindt stated we will take this under advisement.

Kris Cook stated that this is why more people should be involved in counting and the Judge should be the final person to verify the counting.

Jan Schwindt stated we can't fix last year, but we can move forward.

7. Discussion on 2022 election.

Courtney Kellogg stated she wanted to speak about the things that went wrong with the 2022 election and asked if there were any arrangements for the Election Judge to be present at this meeting.

Jan Schwindt stated no.

Courtney stated that some of the Tribunal is here, and that Kris Cook is here and that all of these people have valuable information as to our election. When you say that no one could have seen this issue coming, I think plenty of people here could have. I think plenty of people were steam rolled in the rewrite process of the elections segment of the Bylaws, overseen by Erika McDonald last year. She was front and center of the problems from the last election, so it is an insult, in my opinion, to have her lead that Bylaws rewrite process in the first place. Also, Mr. Carter was front and center of the issues in the 2021 election and he was also part of election Bylaws rewrite Committee.

Jan Schwindt asked Courtney to state her question.

Courtney said we need to come together and talk freely about the concerns and discrepancies not using the same people who failed at the last election. Everyone thanked me for giving my advice, but didn't allow me on the election Bylaws rewrite Committee. I was blocked every step of the way in every possible manner. This election clearly could have been different had the people that messed up last year's election been allowed feedback from people like myself and Mr. Wilson who did see these discrepancies. Why aren't we using standard voting practices similar to Bastrop County's process?

Jan Schwindt stated we have a high percentage of owners that live out of state and out of the country. We are not a government entity, so you can either drop it off at the office in the lockbox or mail it in.

Courtney implied that those running the election and those with access to the ballot box could be one in the same.

Jan explained that all ballots went straight to the Election Judge, she was the only one who had a key to the lockbox, and the only time she was allowed take ballots out of the box was when she had someone with her from the Election Committee. They are never in possession from anyone on the POA/ACC, the staff, or the water district employees. Only the Election Judge is allowed possession of the ballots.

Charles Brading stated we need some improvements and stronger guidelines, but we need to move on.

Ruth Bullock stated I have been a part of the City/County election system and Tahitian Village doesn't have the money for something like this.

Stacy Savage stated that the Election Judge is licensed and bonded with the State of Texas and that she does not live in the Village. I want to clear any myths about any funny business going on about ballots themselves.

Everything was turned in when the recount was done.

Courtney asked if other people involved in the election had any other public comments. I want to be sure this can be addressed.

Tiffany Ferguson reminded attendees that the Election Committee and Election Judge signed non-disclosure agreements (NDAs).

Jan Schwindt stated the Election Judge does not need to come to this meeting and be interrogated as to how she did or did not administer the count.

Stacy Savage informed the Membership that the Election Judge took accountability for the miscount in an email to the Board. She was very apologetic to have caused any strife or any misrepresentation to anyone within our Membership who may now be questioning the integrity of our elections process.

Jan Schwindt stated that her email didn't explain how the numbers were off.

Stacy agreed and stated that the only other recourse we had was to involve the Tribunal to do an immediate recount, which was the action that was ultimately taken.

Jan asked Kris Cook if she would like to add anything on the discussion on the 2022 election.

Kris Cook in chat: I'm unsure of what else I could say about the situation. The numbers I wrote down were the numbers she gave me over the phone.

Jan asked Kris if she had any input on how to make the procedure better?

While waiting for Kris to type out her answer in the chat box, Stacy Savage reminded the Membership that

having your item on the POA agenda didn't necessarily mean you are guaranteed a solution tonight. There may be a need to do more research and speak with our lawyer. All we can do is either resolve things where we can or get a game plan in order to resolve issues later with a more informed vote.

Kris Cook in chat: There needs to be more people involved in the counting process and I don't understand why we had an Election Committee to just review candidate applications.

Jan asked if there was anyone else on the Zoom call that would like comment?

Kris Cook in chat: The general process in coordinating with the Judge felt like there were too many people involved.

Jan stated that's interesting because the last comment regarding the last election was that there weren't enough people involved.

7. Discussion on street signs.

Courtney Kellogg stated she reached out to the County's sign shop and they approved six street signs approximately 2 years ago. There are streets with no signs and would like the POA to coordinate this effort with the County for safety purposes.

Jan Schwindt replied, I contacted County Commissioner Mel Hamner. The Road District is responsible for the roads that have not yet been turned over to the County. As they go in and accept roads to the County, erecting street signs is part of the process. He requested that we make a spreadsheet to detail where signs need to be put up and to get this to him.

Greg Stigall stated you can email the water district (BCWCID #2) to get that street sign put up.

MaryJo Creamer agreed with Greg's statement, but added that the county also has other higher priorities and any requested street signs may not be put up immediately.

Courtney asked the POA to take on the responsibility of this process on behalf of the community.

Jan Schwindt stated we can help do that.

Courtney also asked for informational signs, such as "Do Not Enter" and Dead End" road signs, etc. Can we do that?

Jan said yes and that can be part of this spreadsheet.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Jessica Zamora asked for clarity on the candidate meet and greet zoom call and whether Ruth should have not been allowed to participate because she did not join by video chat and did not show her face on video as required of the other candidates. Does this mean that if a candidate cannot join by video chat or in person, they are not allowed to participate in the meet and greet or that they cannot be on the ballot at all? Do we want to be able to make exceptions for future meet and greet events?

Courtney stated she wants the words "must be on camera" to be reconsidered by the Board when candidates participate in meet and greet events.

Ruth Bullock stated we are not going to use that word moving forward.

Jessica Zamora asked is the problem that Ruth got elected without showing her face on camera at the meet and greet event or is the problem that the two people with the least votes people were not elected even though they appeared on camera at the meet and greet? Where is that problem?

Jan Schwindt stated you have one minute left and please clarify the question.

Jessica Zamora asked Courtney what the problem was? Is the problem that Ruth didn't have to show her face but got elected or is the problem that Courtney wasn't elected by 13 votes and Deena was able to be elected? What's the problem?

Courtney stated there was the use of the term "must" that was applied to all candidates, except for one.

Jessica clarified that if the word "must" was not used, does Courtney feel she would have been elected to the

POA?

Courtney replied that's not correct at all.

Jessica said OK, I just wanted clarity. For the record, ballots are private. We don't know if the people who are voting are local or not. Also, the only ballot lockbox key is with the Election Judge during that time period, but I believe Jan or Stacy cleared that up already.

Kris Cook in chat: Does the POA keep records of how many ballots are returned back to the Association regardless of whether they live locally or out of state/country?

Erika McDonald stated that the POA puts a return service request on the ballot mail out so any that did come back can have the address corrected. There were 2,420 local ballots mailed out, which includes 6 zip codes and 860 non-local zip codes.

Tiffany Ferguson stated when we get something returned, we update our system to mark the inaccuracy in order to correct them or we mark it as undeliverable until the member contacts us to correct the address.

Jo Egitto stated that having been on Road Committee for years, the street signs that do get put on, people take them off because they don't want potential buyers on those roads.

Courtney stated that in early January she was given a requirement as a newly appointed ACC member to sign the Association's Code of Conduct (COC) and a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA). I was told that my executive rights could be revoked if I didn't sign. I asked for a full meeting with both boards and our lawyer and was never afforded this meeting. It is a violation of our deed restrictions to sign these on Sections 6.02 and 7.04. Furthermore, the COC had no spot for a signature and the NDA was a generic form which had changed from the previous form last updated in July 2021. The documents were changed after I notified the Association of these issues and I was sent another round of documents to sign with updates made to them without discussion from the Board or Committee. My member rights were restricted. I have asked several times in several different ways. If you sign, you are putting yourself in personal financial liability. Who decided this?

Jan stated this is not answerable topic in public comment period. You have filed a formal complaint on this topic, and because of that, they won't be discussed in this meeting.

Therefore, that is the end of my comment and discussion.

Courtney asked who approved the COC?

Jan replied that is the same topic.

Courtney claimed the Board didn't answer her questions? When will this be discussed?

Jan stated that Courtney's three minutes were up, and I want everyone to know that Courtney has had the opportunity to correct those forms.

Randy Hudgins stated that every member has signed the documents. As far as I see, Courtney has no authority. If she wants on the Committee, she has to sign the paperwork.

Courtney replied that the deed restrictions state otherwise.

The POA entered an Executive Session at 9:10 p.m.

The POA reconvened in regular session at 9:55 p.m.



Mary Jo Creamer made a motion to accept the Association Manager's annual job performance review for 7/1/2020-6/30/2021 and the cost-of-living increase paid retroactively from July 1, 2021 to present. Charles Brading seconded the motion. A vote was taken, Mary Jo Creamer, Ruth Bullock, Charles Brading, and Deena Eden voted to approve, Stacy Savage voted to oppose. Motion passed.

Stacy Savage made a motion that explanatory and procedural emails to the Membership needing additional context for accuracy must be vetted by multiple Board members first and where final

approval of this messaging goes through the Secretary before distribution to the public. Charles Brading seconded the motion. A vote was taken, Deena Eden and Stacy Savage voted to approve and Mary Jo Creamer, Charles Brading, and Ruth Bullock voted to oppose. Motion did not pass.

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

Meeting was adjourned at 9:59 p.m.

	3-15-22
Stacy Savage - TVPOA Secretary	Date
	3/15/2022
Amanda Homesley - Association Manager	Date