

Win/Win

In the Feb 15<sup>th</sup> edition of the Island Moon as well as in other public forums, Board Candidate and Incumbent Leslie Hess has made many public statements in opposition to the proposed ARCH bylaw amendments. These amendments and the reason behind them can be found at [www.PadreIslandARCH.com](http://www.PadreIslandARCH.com)

The opposition most frequently cited is the extreme additional mailing cost to the PIPOA if only the Members are allowed to modify our Bylaws. But this does not make sense to me. If it truly is such an expensive practice, then why is "Member Only" amending the overwhelming practice of Associations across the state of Texas and the country?

How do all these other Homeowner Associations handle this situation in a cost-effective manner? How do they avoid these "extreme mailing costs"?

I looked to see how other communities handle this situation. And found that they handle it by involving the Homeowners so that amending regularly occurs at their Annual Meetings so no additional mailings are needed.

For example:

My parents live in Sun City Grande just on the outskirts of Phoenix. Theirs is a community of just under 10,000 Homeowners (almost twice the size of us). Like us, they are a mixture of full-time and part-time residents. Like us, they have a set of Bylaws and Covenants. But unlike us, only their Homeowners are allowed to amend them.

They have a standing committee comprised of Homeowners called the "Consent Committee". This committee is tasked with keeping track of upcoming legislation as well as changing community standards. They solicit input from the Homeowners and formulate suggested changes to their Bylaws and Covenants through a series of open meetings during the spring and summer.

Any recommended changes are legally verified and written. All documents (before, after, redline and explanations) are posted on their website. Then, throughout the fall, they host several community forums to discuss why the changes are recommended. They allow the Homeowners to ask questions and then make adjustments if necessary.

Information is shared and consensus is reached. So, by the time the items show up on the ballot at their annual meeting, the items pass easily. And no additional mailing costs have been incurred.

Perhaps we could try an approach like this. We have a lot of people in our Community who want to be involved.

The Board will be able to delegate some of their current workload. The Community will be allowed the input they so desperately want. And only one mailing required.

Sounds like a Win/Win for everyone involved.

Kelly McFadden