

**Siesta Shores Home Owners Association
Annual Meeting**

September 29, 2007

Pedernales Property Owners Association Building
512 S. Pace Bend Rd, Spicewood

Board Members in attendance:

Jenny Worthington--President

Elaine Bagley—Treasurer

Roy Casanova-- Secretary

John Collins—Vice President

Elizabeth Blount—Secretary II Member at large

Claude Garrett—Secretary I Member at Large

Motion called to begin by Jenny Worthington.

Guest speaker is Mark Myer with Vizcaya developers, with more information on subdivision which is being build. The subdivision will rest on 1050 acres, will have a two story clubhouse which will be built on a peninsula and will include a marina with 100-120 slitts. Big Issues are Water quality and the Traffic

Dan Bishman (?)appraiser for Travis County property taxes. He has done over a1000 lots in the state of Texas, recognized in courts and attended Texas State University.

Dan: I have no bias for or against any argument, I do not know anyon, and I am working for food. I am not going to solve any major arguments; I have studied several descriptions of the arguments. I have been over to Siesta Shores for several years. There are several questions; the basic question is if this is going to be a good or bad influence for this subdivision. The question should be if this is going to be valuable to bring the total value of the property an enhancement to Siesta Shores. You may have

moved into Siesta Shores for a certain reason, yet, someone else might want to move out here for a more valuable reason.

If this subdivision is close to a specific lot which creates noise position or causes smell this might cause someone to bring into research or want someone to look into this property. The marina might add significant noise pollution to MY marina. Looks like it has been looked as of a hit to be hit.

John Collins states: They paid a lot of money to make this property sell (basically).

This subdivision should create value to Siesta Shores.

John Collins: wants to ask for the subdivision to add maybe a rock wall or a divider.

First of all, we cannot believe any of their promises. We need to create ourselves squeaky wheels about their promises. If their promises create a problem other than the marina.

Jenny: states that the marina might cause a problem.

Joining the two sections will mean, 120 lots added to more lots For section 2. I am talking to only section 1 or section two/ ////** All, both sections.

Lop sided vote from both sections.

John states that we should be equal to share with all of the members. The next buyer to come into the section 2 to buy property might look as if someone might?????

From your standpoint, as a section 1 owner; will it interrupt the value into the section 2 owner? I have never seen a situation where the value will be impacted in the negative.

As long as there is not an issue with the buyer, but will be happier with a smaller property owner association fees (that is his opinion). 110 members in section 1 owners, to add 144 for section 2 property owners.

The more people who share the cost are always better, and the cost will be lower.

The question I asked Dan to answer: is if the cost will be lowered for section 2 to be the same as section 1? With the history will depend on the property? Bias the situation.

Roy:

You are trying to say that if I own the certain property. If the new owner cannot take the responsibility of the park?

\$35 per year per lot. Section 2 \$60 PER year per lot. Section 2 property have bigger lots.

Roy: The dues should be kept the same as they are now.

Question is that property should be kept the same.

Jenny: states that at the prior meeting, we should pay according to the property value.

Dan: I have valued with many buyers and see the reaction to Making a big deal out of nothing. Can the parks handle the 144 or if the section 1 paying too much.

The niddy gritty, it is irrelevant to the questions being asked about the cost of properties of both sections? No logic that I have heard so far, about the subdivision devalue.

Thank you

John Collins: I have spoken with a couple of value appraisers, but he had to be at the game this evening. He states that section 1 is exclusive and the votes have been tallied how we can live. Until the vote tells how we can run our neighborhood.

John we are not saying that if we combine that we will be able to tell you how to build your houses, or run your roads.

If you join the community, we do not want to have anyone tell us how to run our homes. I have not had a lawyer look at this to have anyone tell us how to charge for things.

John, the question is if section 2 became partial owners of section 1 if they can use parks. If we have majority vote we can vote section 2 out of the park. Section 1 has exclusive use of parks and there will be

What it boils down, who has exclusive use of the parks and the property. (Scott Jones)

There are not too many cases, where he has valued the property. This information will be submitted to section 1 owners and anyone from section 2 will need to pay for the information.

If it was not for Roy, the park would look like

Brian Wilson:

Claude:

Jon: I pay more for the horse.

Claude: I have been paying more, since I have been paying since 1968.

John:

Elizabeth: If the use worth paying.

Dan: There is no use in paying for the use of a park or should.

Elizabeth:

Roy: How much are the controlling rights worth?

: If the answer we got tonight, section 1 value does not go down if section 2 joins.

John: I am not saying that.

:

Dan: John, introduced a wrinkle to what I have already answered, that there are no differences, only that the ownership of the park. There are different things that the next phase of buyers are going to be paying for the membership. Maybe for one particular buyer to watch both associations. Therefore section 1 loosing certain ownership.

John: I want section 1 to be kept exclusive, with 110% to use the park. Section 2 should argument/discussion of ownership of the park, which is only the value and only some people will loose the usage of the park.

Jenny:

John: states section 1 will be loose usage of the park.

Claude: states he looked at a lot of pictures of the Christmas parties and we should be getting together to be together. Not only to get together to bicker (?).

Elizabeth: Section 2 is going to pay for the lawyer to draw up the ballots.

John: Section 1 needs legal presentation on this matter.

Elizabeth: The lawyer is going to draw up the ballots not going to represent any section of the association.

Roy: I went around the neighborhood to see if anyone would be going to the meeting. And many of the residents advised me that they were not advised about the meeting.

Elizabeth: we are going to put out one more ballots

John: section 1 has to hire a lawyer, let's take a vote. This needs to be looked at in the legal senses?

Committees discussed:

Welcome Committee

Parks Committee

Issues Committee

Financial Committee

Committee list is with Joyce

Sail boats and trailers at the park, Rene did call me today. To please reconsider keeping the boats/trailers on the park. I would not like to talk over each other, please raise your hands. John: We will need to have insurance on the parked boats. Only residents on

section 1 will be sued if someone should sue the owner if a kid goes on the boat and falls.

Boat parking for the association was discussed; John states we need to see if the boats are covered with the existing insurance should be checked by the owner's coverage.

Claude: We should send out a ballot that during Jan – March if we can park the boats on trailers.

Claude; Motioned the vote to check, Jenny second the motion.

Elizabeth: Everyone wants to get decals for the association that will be kept out of the ballot.

Jenny: Who wants to be kept in the directory, hand them over to Joyce? Always feel free to ask me about questions about the website. The Rex rivers meeting, if you want to know about the results of the meeting, voted for Rex Rivers with Rene pushing for an evesment for the property. The only regulation is that Rex needs to build drainage for the property.

John: Right here it states that

Jenny: there are several stipulations for the use of the docks down there. We need to let everyone vote. And will be posted on the webpage.

John/Joyce/Jenny: Discussion about the Dockumaniums does not mean that they will own the docks but will have only use of the docks. The limit of docks available will need to be discussed to vote for or will there need to be more docks put in.

Roy: It depends on the amount of taste and the amount of the usage, for the plain. The restaurant and parking was a lot of money to move the restaurant and the business.

Jenny: He was not approved to have a business at that site.

Roy: Yes, he was approved for the business and was a shame to be placed in the situation to have the building removed or

John: We have put

Bob Moss: States that section 1 is voting for section 2, can we cross vote?

Waiting on the results for the vote, Scott Jones and Bob Moss are counting the votes:

Jenny: I have the tally for the board

President:

Jenny Worthington-53

Steve Strickland-11

Robert Bear-1

Vice President:

Steve Strickland-New Vice President

Treasurer:

Elaine-65 Vote
Ian –

Secretary:

Roy-63
Pat Garrett-

Claude Garrett

