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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document has been prepared by the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) to provide guidance and direction to PPOA's Board of Directors as it considers decisions that will impact the future quality of life and preservation of property values for existing and new property owners in Pecan Plantation.

In the 2015 Long Range Planning report, financial analyses and alternative methods for funding the construction and operation of a new fitness and options for increasing golf capacity were presented. These were the amenities that appeared to be the most desired by PPOA members from a survey conducted in 2012. A major initiative undertaken by the LRPC this past year has been to select an independent management research firm to design, administer, and compile results for a new updated survey in an effort to validate the willingness of members to financially support the amenities analyzed in last year’s report.

The results of the survey indicated modest support for funding the construction and operation of a new fitness center in Pecan Plantation. However, there was not current member support indicated by the survey for the purchase of the Nutcracker Golf Club or construction of a new golf course as the two options proposed for increasing golf capacity. Based on the survey results, a Fitness Center Sub-Committee under the stewardship of the Sports and Recreation Committee has been re-activated to develop an informational campaign on the merits and benefits of having a fitness center in Pecan Plantation. The goal of the informational effort is to enable the PPOA membership to vote for or against approval of the fitness center at the annual membership meeting in March 2017.

Requests provided by other committees for new or updated amenities are outlined in this report. Amenities for the use and enjoyment of the entire PPOA membership is a founding principle of Pecan Plantation and is a major contributor to maintaining the quality of life and attractive property values that we enjoy as members of this community.

Also presented in this document is the numerical breakdown showing current demographic diversity within Pecan Plantation together with the projected growth of membership to 3,260 by year 2025. At the time of preparing this report, there were 2,988 PPOA members.

As the PPOA membership continues to grow at the forecasted rate, current amenities and infrastructure will begin to be strained to accommodate the additional demand placed on them by the larger number of member users. The impact of population growth on our buildings and infrastructure is discussed in the report. Also discussed is the inevitable problem of traffic density caused by a larger population residing in Pecan Plantation and the potential need for a third entrance.
The success of a long range plan is dependent on known and reliable sources of funding to be able to achieve its goals. The sources of funding required for PPOA’s long-term capital repair and replacement projects or other critical needs are described herein.

Recommendations discussed in this Long Range Planning report indicate suggested action for pursuing the future needs and vision of Pecan Plantation. As PPOA continues to grow, goals will be modified, financial forecasts will change, and initiatives adjusted or cancelled. All are part of the long range planning process.

This report is available for viewing by all members on the PPOA website.
2. INTRODUCTION

As members of PPOA, we understand the benefit of having an active, healthy, and vibrant community in Pecan Plantation with amenities, assets, and services that preserve our property values and sustain the quality and vitality of life that we all enjoy by living here. If one word could describe Pecan Plantation, it would be “Diversity” with the wide range of amenities, attributes, and attractions it has to offer to the wide demographic spectrum of our membership. The majority of members appear to be well satisfied with living in Pecan Plantation and have appreciation for the diversity of amenities and interests and want to see our community continue to grow and prosper for themselves as well as for future members.

The purpose of this 2016 Long Range Plan is to serve as an updated guide for the Board of Directors to use in managing the future of Pecan Plantation. Many of the items discussed in the plan establish direction, purpose, and urgency, as well as recommendations on how to proceed. In developing this plan, the Long Range Planning Committee believes that a plan for the future is a living document and should not be based on decisions made tomorrow but how well we prepare for tomorrow with decisions made today. It is recommended that this Long Range Plan that is presented to the Board of Directors for their use and consideration will be referred to frequently and updated on an annual basis. In succeeding years, some projects referred to in the plan will be completed and will therefore no longer be applicable for a long-range plan with replacement by new initiatives as they are identified.

Any success in developing this plan as a useful bellwether for the future of Pecan Plantation can be attributed in large measure to the input provided by membership. A major source of membership input was through the survey conducted by an independent consultant in the fall of 2015 to determine the prioritized preferences and willingness to financially support the proposed new amenities evaluated in last year’s Long Range Plan. The new amenities evaluated were for increased golf capacity and the construction of a Fitness Center. The 2015 membership survey and results are presented in greater detail within this report.

Recommended new or replacement future amenities requiring capital costs that are identified by the standing committees is another source of membership input provided to the Long Range Plan. In addition, the committees were polled this year to provide suggestions for more minor improvements to our existing facilities and amenities that may not require capital expenditures for funding.
One of the inevitabilities resulting from Pecan Plantation being an attractive and economical place to live is the rapid growth of our community in recent years that is forecasted to continue at a robust rate in the future. On the plus side, population growth will generate increased revenues through new membership fees and monthly assessments going into reserve accounts that will ensure financial stability and flexibility for funding new or replacement capital projects. The downside to an increase in the number of residents in Pecan Plantation appreciably above the present number in the future is that our current amenities and infrastructure will be strained to serve the needs of an enlarged membership.

A challenge for this long range plan and the plans of Boards in years to follow is to identify future needs and initiatives in an effort to anticipate and prepare for the expected growth and change in Pecan Plantation. With credit to well-known management consultant Peter Drucker, “The relevant question is not what shall we do tomorrow, but rather what shall we do today to get ready for tomorrow”.
3. BRIEF HISTORY OF PECAN PLANTATION

From its inception in 1970, Pecan Plantation has grown to approximately 3,200 residential lots with a population of over 6,700. Its original amenities, which included the clubhouse and grounds, golf course, tennis courts, skeet range, landing strip, stables, a portion of the marina facility, entrance facilities, and recreation areas, afforded residents a wonderful lifestyle in a peaceful country setting and created an attractive lure and quality of life for prospective members.

In 1972 the developer formed the Pecan Plantation Owners Association (PPOA) and the Pecan Plantation Country Club (PPCC). In 1978 there was a sufficient number of members in the association to warrant the conveyance of common property by the developer to PPOA, which was done under the turnover agreement executed on August 1, 1978. Upon execution of the transfer, the Pecan Plantation Owners Association, Inc. assumed ownership of all land and facilities described in the turnover agreement. Land owned by the Leonard Bend Farms for the pecan farming operations was retained under the ownership of LENMO, Inc.

Pecan Plantation has continued to grow and flourish over the intervening years as a result of the active participation of residents via its elected PPOA Board of Directors and associated committees consisting of volunteers from the community. The culture of volunteerism and service within Pecan Plantation has been a contributing factor to the sense of community and quality of life enjoyed by our membership.

Over the years, the existing amenities have been expanded and new amenities have been added as a result of agreements with the developers. In exchange for the right to expand the maximum number of build-able lots from 3,000 as defined in the original turnover agreement to 4,500 in the LENMO Agreement and its subsequent amendments, the developers agreed to provide additional land and construct the following amenities: a.) an outdoor sports complex consisting of a soccer filed, softball diamond, and an all-weather walking trail; b.) lap swimming pool; c.) community building/gym what is now known as the Pecan Activity Center (PAC); d.) playgrounds; e.) an equestrian trail; and f.) a horse pasture. An archery range, a riverfront walking path, two additional tennis courts, a dog park, and a campground pavilion have been added in recent years, as has a second airstrip as part of the Landings subdivision.

In 1991, the developer donated the land for an additional 18-hole golf course, which was built by some of the PPOA residents in a private, joint venture with the developer, resulting in Nutcracker Golf Club. Membership in that club is open to all PPOA residents for a monthly fee separate from, and in addition to, their PPOA membership dues. The second amendment to the LENMO Agreement offered PPOA the option to purchase the course, but the option period expired before an offer acceptable to the developer was completed.
The amendment also provided an option for the developer to donate 200 acres of land to PPOA if it expressed its desire to construct a third golf course, with the location to be determined by the developer. In response to interest in pursuing the option expressed by the BOD in 2014, the developer conditioned the location of the donated land on the purchase of Nutcracker Golf Club. The BOD considered this condition not to be in the best interests of the membership and did not file a formal notice of intention to exercise the option, which expires in November 2016. In response to Long Range Planning surveys in 2012 and 2015, PPOA members indicated their desire to acquire additional golf capacity and tee times, but they did not support the expenditure of necessary funds to construct and operate the new course.

The 2012 Long Range Planning (LRP) survey also identified membership interest in the construction of a new fitness center in Pecan Plantation. The existing fitness center at the Nutcracker Golf Club does not provide the variety of fitness equipment and programs to suit all members’ needs. The recent 2015 Long Range Planning survey solicited membership willingness and preferences for funding the construction and operation of a new fitness center as an adjunct to the PAC. Although the 2015 survey did not indicate overwhelming membership support for a preferred method of funding at this time, it did indicate sufficient interest to justify further exploration of alternative funding mechanisms for providing a suitable fitness center in Pecan Plantation.

In 2015, the developer began to develop Orchard XII to provide a total of additional 109 home sites in two phases. The roads and infrastructure are nearly complete and new home construction is expected to begin there in late Spring 2016. As homes in Orchard XII become occupied, the total PPOA membership will exceed 3,000. Upon reaching 3,000 members, initiation fees paid by new PPOA members will be placed in a separate reserve fund to be used for new amenities. As the Pecan Plantation continues to grow in population and demographic diversity, this new amenity fund will provide the means to maintain the uniquely tailored lifestyle that sets it apart from the majority of comparably sized communities.
4. ORGANIZATION OF PPOA

The Pecan Plantation Owners Association is a Texas non-profit corporation established to “...perform all of the functions and duties assigned to, delegated to, granted to and required of it by the terms and provisions of ...Declarations of Restrictions and such further rights and powers as may be appropriate under the Articles of Incorporation and applicable law...” The affairs of the corporation are managed by a Board of Directors consisting of nine members elected by the membership for terms of three years duration. At the annual meeting of the members, three new Board members are elected to replace three retiring members. This assures continuity of governance and smooth representation for issues that span election cycles.

The day to day management of PPOA is carried out by the General Manager, who reports to the Board President. Together, the Board and General Manager staff all the departments involved in conducting PPOA’s affairs, in compliance with Corporate Policy Statements that specify how the association is to be managed. The Board and General Manager are assisted by committees established to make detailed reports and recommendations pertaining to management and maintenance of Association amenities, capital expenditures, infrastructure maintenance, and changes in governing documents.

The committees vary in size in accordance with the specific committee resolution approved as part of the PPOA governing documents. Each committee has at least one management representative and one Board representative as non-voting members in addition to voting members who are volunteers from the community. Service on committees provides members an opportunity to gain familiarity with issues of concern and to provide advice to the Board in making complex and challenging decisions in the overall best interests of the entire association membership. The volunteer services provided to the community by committee members also represent cost savings that PPOA might otherwise incur. Current committees are listed as follows:

- Airport Committee
- Audit Committee
- Finance Committee
- Golf Committee
- Horse Owners Committee
- Infrastructure Committee
- Long Range Planning Committee
- Marina Committee
- Sports and Recreation Committee
- Architectural Control Committee
- Communications Committee
- Entertainment/Decorating Committee
- Grounds Committee
- House/Food and Beverage Committee
- LENMO Committee/Marina Committee
- Membership Orientation Committee
- Safety and Security Committee
- Wildlife Committee
5. PREVIOUS LONG RANGE PLANNING INITIATIVES

Since its inception, Pecan Plantation has been a work in progress. The developer provided the core amenities to attract initial buyers and then proceeded to build as the community’s desirability and buyer demand increased. What was initially a pecan tree plantation gradually has undergone transformation to a gated golf course community. Along the way, long range planning with collaboration by the membership and the developer has been the primary tool used for identifying development needs and wants within Pecan Plantation.

Through the long range planning process, the need for increased golf capacity and additional tee times were identified and resulted in creation of the Nutcracker Golf Club and the later addition of its adjoining fitness center. It also resulted in construction of the Village shopping market, medical clinic, pharmacy, gas station, tenant spaces, and carwash, as well as the PAC and its associated lap pool, soccer field, playground, dog park, campground pavilion, and archery range. In 2012 the Long Range Planning Committee developed an in-house survey to identify any and all amenities of interest to members and determine their attendant level of interest in them. As a result, increased golf capacity, a Fitness Center, and additional walking trails were emerged as the three most desirable amenities to members.

In 2014 and 2015, the Long Range Planning Committee worked with the Sports & Recreation, Golf, and Finance Committees to create detailed proposals for a PPOA Fitness Center and increased golf capacity that served as the basis for the 2015 Member Survey. The survey results served to accurately gauge members’ interests in and willingness to pay for those additional amenities. The response rate of the survey exceeded expectations and has allowed the committee to recommend specific actions to the BOD. The results of the survey are discussed in greater detail in Section 6 of this report. The interactions of the Long Range Planning Committee with other committees, management, and the BOD insured that all aspects of the survey issues and member responses were accurately and thoroughly considered. The processes followed serve as a template for future LRP Committee actions that will result in maximum benefit to members and efficient use of PPOA funds.
6. 2015 MEMBERSHIP SURVEY

A survey conducted in 2012 with PPOA members indicated that a fitness center and increased
golf capacity were the two amenities most desired by membership. In response to the results
of that survey, the Sports and Recreation and Golf Committees formed ad hoc sub-committees
to investigate and further study the feasibility, logistics, and costs of providing a fitness cen-
ter and increased golf capacity.

The findings and recommendations proposed by each of the aforementioned sub-committees
were presented to the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) in 2014 for further review and
evaluation. Accordingly, the LRPC undertook the development of detailed financial analysis
for both capital expenditures and operational costs needed for providing a fitness center and
increased golf capacity as described in the following paragraphs. The analysis was included in
the annual Long Range Planning Report that was presented to the Board of Directors on May 1,
2015.

Fitness Center

The 16,000 square-foot facility proposed by the Sports and Recreation Fitness Center Sub-
Committee would be located at the Pecan Activity Center (PAC). It would include cardio- and
strength training capabilities, group exercise programs, an elevated indoor walking track,
ample storage space for equipment, and meeting rooms for general use.

The detailed financial analysis performed by the LRPC for constructing and operating the fit-
ness center resulted in two alternative means of funding the construction and two alternative
methods for ongoing operations and maintenance.

Based on the estimated construction cost, assumed construction industry escalation factors,
and economic inflation rates, and anticipating starting the project in 2017, the total capital
cost, including exercise equipment, would be $1,812,000. The financial analysis assumes cap-
ital funding for the project would be with a 10-year bank loan at a 5% interest rate with zero
percent down with amortization by monthly payments. Repayment options of the loan would
be by one of the following options:

Option 1: Utilize current excess capital asset reserve account funds with no special
member assessment required, or

Option 2: A special monthly assessment of $5.95 per member for a 10-year period with no
reserve account funds used.

The analysis indicated that with a start of operation in 2017, the approximate monthly cost to
operate and maintain the fitness center would be $12,000 and projected to increase yearly at
a 2.0% inflation rate. Two alternate revenue options were analyzed to finance the operations and maintenance are as follows:

**Option 1:** Monthly membership user fees based on the approximate corresponding required number of members in 2017 as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Fee</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$20</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option 2:** A $4.00 monthly assessment increase for all PPOA members.

**Increased Golf Capacity**

Two separate means of increasing golf capacity at Pecan Plantation were evaluated by the Long Range Planning Committee last year. One was for the PPOA purchase of the private Nutcracker Golf Club and the other was building a new 18-hole golf course. Estimated costs for financing the purchase of Nutcracker or construction of a new course and their respective annual operations are summarized in the following paragraphs.

Purchase of Nutcracker and related equipment was estimated in the analysis to be $2,275,000. A 10-year bank note would be used to fund the capital purchase and could be amortized by either of the following two options:

- **Option 1:** Utilize current excess capital reserve account funds, plus a 10-year special assessment of $2.75 per month for all members, or
- **Option 2:** A 10-year special assessment of $9.55 per month for all members if no reserve account funds are used.

The annual costs for operating and maintaining the Nutcracker Golf Club were estimated in the analysis to be $457,000 that would require an additional monthly assessment increase of $11.80 per member for either purchase option described above.

Construction of a new third golf course in Pecan Plantation was the other means of increasing golf capacity for our members. The cost for construction of a new course and its required equipment is estimated to be approximately $5,000,000. In the analysis performed last year
by LRPC, financing the construction of a third golf course could be achieved with a 10-year bank loan with repayment by a 10-year special monthly assessment of $18.20 per member. In addition, an additional assessment of $11.40 per month by each member would be needed for operating and maintaining the new course. This alternative is based on PPOA exercising the option outlined in the current LENMO agreement by November 2016 to accept 200 acres of land for the course from the developer at no cost under certain restrictive conditions.

As a temporary solution for providing increased golf capacity, an agreement was made with the Squaw Creek Golf Club, a golf complex with two (2) 18-hole courses in Glen Rose, Texas, that enables PPOA members to play at that complex at a reduced rate. This arrangement was coordinated by the Golf Committee and has proven to be successful and well received by members.

**Member Survey**

One of the recommendations made by the 2015 Long Range Planning Committee was for the Board of Directors to authorize the engagement of a professional independent consultant to design, implement, and administer a survey of PPOA members to determine their prioritized preferences and willingness to financially support the new amenities evaluated in last year’s report. The intended purpose of using an outside firm to conduct the survey was to provide neutrality and to avoid any perception of bias by PPOA management and/or the Board of Directors.

After receiving the authorization to proceed from the Board and with assistance by the General Manager, a solicitation was sent to three management consultants for proposals to conduct the survey of members. All three consultants responded and after review, the committee voted to select ClubInsights from East Lansing, Michigan as the preferred consultant to conduct the membership survey.

Accordingly, ClubInsights developed the digital online survey shown in Exhibit 1 with review and input by committee representatives. Upon completion, the survey was sent by the consultant to every primary membership number via e-mail for electronic return. For those members without e-mail addresses on record, paper copies of the survey were made available at the General Manager’s office with pre-addressed envelopes for postal return. The survey was open for response and return for a 4-week period with weekly reminders sent out by the consultant.

**2015 Survey Results**

There were 1,296 responses to the survey received by the consultant, representing 43% of the PPOA membership. This response rate was considered outstanding by the consultant and ex-
ceedingly well above average when compared to market research standards. The final survey report is attached as Appendix A, together with narrative comments provided by members in Appendix B.

The results of the survey indicated that there is not presently sufficient support for pursuing the purchase of the Nutcracker Golf Club or construction of a new course in Pecan Plantation. Tabulated results for these two alternative options for increasing golf capacity, together with reasons, are shown in Exhibits 2, 3, 4, and 5.

For the Fitness Center, the tabulated results of the survey results indicate modest support for the construction of this amenity, as reflected in Exhibit 6. Reasons for the responses given by members for their range of support for the Fitness Center are shown in Exhibit 7. As indicated by the results, the more favored option for funding the construction is with the use of current capital reserve funds in lieu of a 10-year special assessment, although both options have less than 50 percent support by the members responding to the survey. For revenues needed to operate and maintain a fitness center, 45% of the survey respondents show support for a monthly assessment increase of $4.00 per PPOA member, whereas 34% showed being supportive of user fee memberships at $40 per month with commitments by 300 members.

Based on the interest shown by some members in having a Fitness Center in Pecan Plantation, the Sports and Recreation (S&R) Committee was requested to undertake leadership of a promotional initiative to inform PPOA membership on costs and benefits of this amenity. Pursuant to this request, the S&R Committee re-activated the Fitness Center Sub-Committee for this purpose. A marketing campaign will be developed with promotional information and town hall meetings to gain a measure of continuing support prior to a possible vote at the 2017 membership meeting.
7. DEMOGRAPHICS WITHIN PECAN PLANTATION

Prior long range planning reports provided U.S. Census data for comparison of Pecan Plantation demographics. Between 2000 and 2010, the median age increased by 5.5 years to 59.9. During the same 10 year period the population increased from 3,544 to 5,294, or 49%.

Current PPOA database records indicate a population of 6,748 residents, or an increase of 27.5% since 2010. The retirement age category (65+) increased by 4.8%, however the largest increase is in the 20-44 year category at 6.4%.

The information continues to confirm that although most PPOA members are of retirement age, Pecan Plantation remains a very diverse community. It is therefore important to retain, and if possible, improve the broad mix of amenities which make Pecan Plantation an attractive place to live for all age groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 19 yrs</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 44 yrs</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 64 yrs</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ yrs</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>2,926</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,544</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,294</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. PROJECTED MEMBERSHIP GROWTH

As of January 31, 2016, Pecan had 2,984 members and 2,534 of them own or rent homes inside the gates. The data illustrated below indicates that many members who were lot owners have now constructed residences in Pecan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Members</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Homes within gates</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 31, 2012</td>
<td>2,905</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 31, 2014</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>2,443</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 31, 2016</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although total dues-paying memberships in this 3 year period increased only 2.7%, the number of residences increased by 157, or 6.6%. This rate of population growth has increased the demand on existing amenities, but does not significantly increase the funds from monthly dues to operate them.

The developer has the right under the 2001 LENMO II agreement to develop and sell sufficient lots to reach a total of 4500 members. Build out of Pecan could ultimately approach a population of 9,000 - 10,000 people. The current Orchard 12 development will add 109 residences over the next few years.

For planning purposes, the LRPC has adopted the same expected rate of growth used in the financial projections for the Capital Asset Reserve Study and the Road and Drainage Study:
9. AMENITIES REQUESTED BY OTHER COMMITTEES

Pecan Plantation was founded on the principle of shared amenities that are provided for use and enjoyment by the entire membership. With the diversity of interests that exists in Pecan, there is no one single amenity that is unanimously used by all members on a regular basis. Although an individual member may not use a certain amenity, that amenity still has a direct impact on the property value and quality of life of that member as well as that of other members. The amenities in Pecan Plantation are also major factors in attracting new property owners, thereby contributing to the continuing growth of our community.

As a volunteer-driven organization, the PPOA standing committees made up of member volunteers that represent various interests are major influences in determining the development, use, and renewal of new and existing amenities within Pecan Plantation. Each year the standing committees submit to the Long Range Planning Committee their list of desired new or improved amenities within their sphere of interest and responsibility. The updated committee list for 2016 is shown in Exhibit 8 and is categorized by requests for current amenities requiring on-going improvement and maintenance or new amenities in the 0- to 5-year time frame or in the next 5- to 10-year time horizon. Most of the new or replacement amenities shown in the exhibit indicate estimated funding required for construction and operations.

In addition to the new or replacement amenities identified by the committees that would require major capital funding expenditures, individual members of various committees and other residents were polled about amenities and improvements that would benefit the entire community with only modest funding and/or volunteer labor. Recommendations from this polling are listed in Exhibit 9.
10. PROPOSED HEALTH AND WELLNESS CENTER

As described in Section 6 of this report, the 2015 membership survey indicated modest support for the construction of a fitness center in Pecan Plantation. Based on this apparent interest, the Fitness Center Sub-Committee under the direction of the Sports and Recreation Committee was re-activated for planning a promotional campaign for extolling the benefits and estimated costs of constructing and operating a fitness facility as an adjunct to the Pecan Activity Center (PAC). The primary goal of the sub-committee is to plan a series of informational initiatives culminating in a membership vote at the March 2017 annual PPOA meeting. Among the communication initiatives being planned are articles in the Columns monthly magazine, power point presentations, town hall meetings, trifold mailings, e-mail blasts, PPOA website notifications, Pecan TV channel presentations, and graphic displays at the clubhouse.

To make this proposed amenity appealing to the broad spectrum of ages and interests in our community, it is the consensus of the sub-committee that the scope of services offered at the facility needs to be broader than that of a basic fitness center as originally envisioned. Many PPOA members want on-site exercise equipment to use in their personally designed fitness programs. Others would likely use such a facility if they had assistance with tailoring a program to accommodate physical limitations due to medical conditions and age. Still others would benefit from dietary and lifestyle counseling and health assessment services to improve their overall well-being. With these factors in mind, the fitness center concept is being re-imagined as a Health and Wellness Center that would include all of the expanded functions and services that would appeal to the diverse population of Pecan Plantation. Also, the subcommittee will later explore opportunities to align with local medical facilities and assess any additional benefits and associated costs required for further expanding the facility’s appeal to the community.

The demographic information presented in Section 7 continues to confirm that although most Pecan members are of retirement age, we remain a very diverse community. It is therefore important to retain, and if possible, improve the broad mix of amenities that make Pecan Plantation an attractive place to live for all age groups, enhance property values of all members, and further entice our community to prospective home buyers.
11. LONG RANGE FACILITY MANAGEMENT

As the population of Pecan Planation continues to grow at the forecasted rate, current amenities and infrastructure will begin to be strained to accommodate the additional demand placed on them. According to the current amendment of the LENMO agreement, the future build-out of Pecan Plantation will allow up to 4,500 members, representing an estimated population between 10,000 and 12,000 residents. This section discusses aspects of long range planning considerations for buildings and facilities in Pecan Plantation. New or upgraded facilities needed in the future should not be based on plans made tomorrow when they’re needed but about how we prepare for tomorrow’s needs with plans made today.

Clubhouse

The most visible and used building amenity in Pecan Plantation is the clubhouse, which was originally constructed by the developer in 1973 and included in the turnover of properties to PPOA in 1978. This building serves as the social, dining, entertainment, recreational, and administrative center piece of PPOA. The building has three levels enclosing approximately 48,000 square-feet of interior floor space, plus an additional 8,800 square feet of overhead covered exterior space for porches and balconies.

The building structure consists of a well-engineered and -constructed rigid concrete frame composed of concrete columns, long-spanning concrete beams, and precast concrete double-tee floor and roof panels. The structural frame is not reliant on bearing walls for vertical or lateral support, thereby providing great flexibility for current and future space planning modifications. The structural frame of the building appears to be very sound without evidence of any damage or deterioration indicating a long-range useful life in the future.

Some PPOA members have suggested the current clubhouse is stylistically and functionally outdated and should be replaced with a more modern building. The estimated cost to demolish and replace the existing clubhouse on the same site with a building of approximately the same square-foot area and functions would be in the rough order of magnitude range of $9,000,000, exclusive of required professional architectural and engineering design fees, based on available parametric construction cost data. The demolition and new construction period would be approximately 9 to 12 months, during which all current administrative functions would have to be temporarily re-located elsewhere. During a downtime period for construction, the Food and Beverage service and operation of the Inn at the clubhouse would be suspended during the construction phase representing a significant inconvenience to our membership and loss of revenue to our financial operations.
Major currently occupied spaces in the building are the following:

1. **Basement**: Golf pro shop, 19th Hole bar and food service, teen room and adjoining grill area, A/V studio and office spaces, restrooms, and unassigned areas used for general storage.

2. **Ground Level**: Entrance lobby with open circular grand staircase, reception front desk, ballroom, dining room, bar and casual dining, kitchen, card and meeting rooms, staff offices, and restrooms.

3. **Second Level**: Administrative offices (housed in 6 previous guest rooms), 17 current Inn guest rooms, library, conference room.

General facility management initiatives for the clubhouse and other buildings within Pecan Plantation focus on operational efficiency, preventative and corrective maintenance, and replacement and renovation needed for updating and improving. Facility management is in fact asset management.

There have been numerable modifications and renovations to the clubhouse over its 43-year life in managing this valuable asset. Changes have been made to the building either out of operational necessity or to provide greater enjoyment, comfort, or convenience to the PPOA membership. In any case, the changes contribute to the preservation of members’ property values and quality of life.

Among the most recent updates have been the following:

- Renovation and expansion of the Brazos Room
- Complete overhaul and equipment replacement for the main kitchen.
- Replacement of exterior soffits, balcony railings, and exterior column covers
- Replacement of HVAC control system
- Installation of new elevator controls
- Updating of furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FF&E) in all 17 Inn guest rooms
- Replacement of flat membrane and sloping tile roofs (due to hail damage)
- Replacement of roof-top mechanical equipment (due to hail damage)
- Replacement of communications file servers and towers
- Re-surfacing of clubhouse pool deck
Among the budgeted projects scheduled for FY2016 in the clubhouse are:

- Renovation of exterior concrete stairs leading to Golf Pro Shop
- Patio outside of Golf Pro Shop
- A/C equipment upgrading for Pro Shop and 19th Hole
- Replacement of outdated telephone system

An area of the clubhouse warranting study and planning for more efficient space utilization and a more appealing appearance is the east end of the basement. This area of the building includes the Teen Room, adjoining snack bar, A/V equipment room and studio, restrooms, and storage area.

As part of the professional services provided by the design firm for the Brazos Room renovation, a master plan was prepared for a future renovation of the Terrace Dining Room and the Ballroom. In this master plan, the enclosed interior floor area for each of these two rooms would be enlarged by a total of 1,632 square feet by projecting the current non-load-bearing glass walls out to the colonnade of exterior columns. These columns support the second floor balconies above on the south and west ends of the building. A similar projection and enlargement of floor area was done during the Brazos Room renovation. Because these two rooms are the principal spaces used for PPOA social, entertainment and meeting functions, enlargement could be beneficial for accommodating the attendance and use by more members. The cost for enlarging these rooms by moving the exterior outward would be relatively minor when compared to other means of building expansion.

Opportunities for otherwise expanding the building are very limited because of the topography surrounding the building. However, another possibility for enlarging the building floor area might be achievable with a one-story addition along the south side of Terrace Room and the Ballroom at the ground level floor line. This addition would entail the building being extended approximately 30 feet from the existing exterior wall for a length up to 140 feet resulting in an increase of 4,200 square feet of floor area for the building. The feasibility of this addition would need to be confirmed with a thorough geotechnical exploration and detailed structural analysis by a professional engineer. If feasible, this concept for building expansion would require extensive earthwork and construction of a lengthy and vertically high retaining wall. Also, consideration of proper drainage would be needed to avoid hydrostatic pressure resulting in erosion and sliding soil. The cost for this approach to expanding the building would likely be significant and therefore merit a cost-benefit analysis before proceeding beyond the evaluation phase.
Another concept that has been informally discussed as a long range project would be to construct a stand-alone golf pro shop near the 9th hole green with a snack bar and administrative spaces. This concept would enable improved visibility, observation and control of the golf course operations by the golf staff. The snack bar could provide lighter fare snacks and beverages at the turn from the front nine holes than what is now offered at the 19th Hole. By vacating the present space occupied by the pro shop and 19th Hole, 5,600 square feet would become available for more much-needed meeting and card rooms.

With administrative space provided on the second level of a new pro shop building, the present administrative staff could be re-located to this new building. By moving the PPOA/PPCC administrative operations from the second floor of the clubhouse, the six guests room now housing the administrative stall could be returned to the Pecan Plantation hotel inn, thereby increasing revenue production for that asset.

**Pecan Activity Center (PAC)**

The PAC is a very popular and well utilized facility by PPOA members of all ages for recreational and health activities, arts and crafts programs, and meeting functions. This 12,240 square-foot facility was constructed and turned over to PPOA by the developer in 2006 as part of the Second Addendum to the LENMO agreement. The provisions of this addendum were that in exchange for an amendment to the PPOA By-Laws to allow membership to increase to 4,500 members and permitting the development of 1,500 additional residential lots, the developer would provide several new amenities including the PAC. Pending approval by the PPOA membership, the proposed Fitness Center (as discussed in Section 10) would be integrated as a long range planned addition and modification to the PAC.

**Marina**

Another revenue-producing facility in Pecan Plantation is the Marina. The Marina is a major asset to our shared amenity community and the present building is in need of upgrading and improvement. The Marina Committee has recommended that the long range plan identify a new building for construction in the 5 to 10 year time frame. The new building would replace the existing facility that contains a retail store and grill. It is envisioned that the new building would contain a kitchen, a semi-enclosed eating area, and restrooms. Licensing for the sale of alcoholic beverages would be pursued to expand the appeal and marketability for the facility and to also provide a more lucrative revenue stream to PPOA, particularly in the spring, summer, and autumn seasons.. The enhancement to this amenity could offer an attractive and pleasant dining alternative to our members and guests with access by road or the lake.
**Tennis Building**

The tennis complex consisting of four courts was one of the first amenities constructed at Pecan Plantation and was among the properties turned over to the Pecan Plantation Owners Association by the developer in 1978. The tennis facility was enlarged in 1996 by PPOA with construction of Court No. 5 and Court No. 6 in 2010 with a partial funding contribution by the Pecan Plantation Tennis Association (PPTA). The outdoor gazebo structure was erected in 1998.

The existing tennis building was built in 1991 with an office, merchandise area, and restrooms. Also, a separate adjoining enclosed space was constructed as part of the building for parking and storage of the PPOA EMS ambulance. The storage for the ambulance remained in the tennis building until 1998 when the fire department building was constructed, which provided a more logistical and centralized area for the ambulance. The vacated ambulance area in the tennis building was converted to storage and a more efficient tennis operations shop.

A long range planning modification for the tennis building has been requested by the Sports and Recreation Committee to be coordinated with the future construction of an additional tennis court.

**Security Building**

This building serves as the headquarters for security patrols and gate control. Also housed in the building is the Architectural Control and Compliance office and archived record document storage. The building has had cosmetic changes made over the years, including replacement of the windows in 2014 to provide greater weather tightness and energy efficiency. Although dated, the building continues to be serviceable for its intended purpose. However, with ever-continuing population growth, a new and larger building will likely be needed in the future to better serve the needs of PPOA.
12. LONG RANGE INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGEMENT

The 56-miles of roads and the storm-water drainage systems in Pecan Plantation are valuable assets significantly contributing to the property values and quality of life enjoyed by PPOA members. Much of this infrastructure was built in accordance with minimum standards of construction more than 40 years ago and has, over the past several years, begun to require major repairs and even complete replacement in some cases. The Infrastructure Committee has developed plans and timetables for prioritizing associated projects to insure integrity and preservation of these essential assets, as described below.

**Roads**

The minimum standards to which Pecan Plantation’s roads were constructed consisted of a thin road base and a seal chip topping. With this type construction, the useful life of a road before repairs and re-surfacing becomes necessary is limited, particularly with roads having moderate to heavy traffic density. The goal is to replace these older type roads with re-built roads having an adequate base to prevent major displacement, sinkholes, and cracking. Priority will be given to the major arterial and collector roads, including Ravenswood, Plantation Drive, Monticello, Wedgefield, Bellechase, and at the Front Entrance. Other roads will be re-surfaced or reconstructed on an as-needed basis.

The population growth that Pecan Plantation has experienced over its four decades of existence has resulted in continued and ever-increasing strain on its roadway infrastructure. Roads have long been and continue to be the most used and valuable asset of our community. As such, and in light of the forecasted ever-increasing growth of residents, a challenge exists to ensure that the mobility needs and convenience of PPOA members continue to be met over the long-term.

As a future long range planning initiative, a study of traffic densities and patterns and the adequacy of the current network of roads to be able to handle the impact of population growth will be needed together with creative concepts and financial analyses for phased implementation of new roadway construction. In addition to the normal auto and truck traffic, our roads also accommodate golf carts, bicycles, joggers, walkers, skate boarders, kids on tricycles, and baby strollers. In developing ideas and planning for how to address the need for improvements to existing roads and construction of new roads, factors such as safety, durability, drainage, potential impacts on the environment, community quality of life, and the adaptability of each alternative to possible changes in land use will need to be considered.
Drainage

During recent years, drainage has become a major issue in our community. An ad hoc committee consisting of PPOA members with engineering and construction experience made a presentation and appeal to the Hood County Development Commission for updated and more stringent county standards for new development and construction throughout the county, with drainage as a first priority. The purpose for requesting more rigorous standards would be to ensure that development is consistent for all properties within Pecan Plantation and would result in projects that are harmonious with existing and future development.

Hood County has taken no action on this request at the time of preparing this report. New development and construction with updated standards that would require compliance with sound engineering practices and generally accepted construction practices could contribute to preservation of our community infrastructure and afford protection from adverse drainage problems to both new and neighboring home owners.

The Infrastructure Committee will continue to monitor and update major drainage areas with an emphasis on protecting our assets and preserving the property values of members.
13. THIRD ENTRANCE CONCEPTS

Before reaching the allowable build out of Pecan Plantation up to 4,500 members, a major concern that will need to be addressed by the current and future Long Range Planning Committees is increasing traffic density on our roadway infrastructure. As the population grows, the traffic density will correspondingly increase. In traffic engineering, traffic density is measured as the number of vehicles per mile or any other given distance. With increasing densities on roads with constant speed limits, the flow of traffic will inversely decrease, ultimately resulting in traffic congestion and resident frustration. Means to mitigate traffic will become an ever growing need.

With the shifting demographic tending to include more younger members still working, traffic congestion will likely be exacerbated during normal morning and late afternoon commute times. Traffic bottlenecks have begun to occasionally occur at the existing two gates in Pecan Plantation. Congestion appears to be most acute at the front gate during morning and afternoon commute times for those members traveling to and from the Metroplex and elsewhere for their jobs.

The Chisholm Trail Tollway that opened in 2013 can provide Pecan commuters or other frequent motorists an opportunity to get to their destination in the Metroplex faster, safer, and easier. The tollway is a controlled access toll road that connects US Highway 67 in Cleburne with the central business district in Fort Worth at I-30 with intermediate exit/entry points in between. The tollway has also stimulated the planning for a future $100 million retail and entertainment center in the city of Cleburne that would be a major attraction for Pecan residents. Another major development along the tollway is the announced plan by Tarleton State University to build another campus in south Fort Worth along the tollway that would offer additional educational opportunities for Pecan residents. At the present time, however, getting to the nearest tollway interchange and commercial attractions in Cleburne from the front gate of Pecan Plantation is not expedient because of the distance and inadequate intervening rural roadways.

Traffic density and not having the convenience of easier access to the Chisholm Trail Tollway might in the future emerge as a negative aspect of living in Pecan Plantation. With an ever-escalating need to address the traffic management issue, it appears prudent and timely to begin evaluating the feasibility and costs for a future third entrance/exit gate in Pecan Plantation as means of dispersing traffic flows, and thereby relieving much of the anticipated vehicular congestion in our community. Dispersal of traffic can also have a positive impact on the maintenance cycle of our infrastructure assets.
Another gate with easier access to the Cleburne area would provide greater convenience to Pecan residents traveling to Cleburne and Tarrant County beyond, thereby contributing to their quality of life. Also, a third gate with easy access to Cleburne could reverse the benefit by generating real estate interest in Pecan Plantation among people currently living in Johnson and Tarrant Counties.

In addition to population growth and member convenience, another factor to be considered in evaluating a future third entrance/exit gate in Pecan Plantation is to provide a means of evacuation in the event of an emergency contingency. The Comanche Peak Nuclear Plant has in place protective measurement zones that have been developed for evacuating much of the population by vehicular means in Hood and Somerville counties should a serious problem occur at the plant which is likely to affect the safety, health, and general welfare of the public.

Pecan Plantation is part of the Comanche Peak area-wide evacuation plan directing traffic to Cleburne in the unlikely event of a disaster at the nuclear plant. At the present time, the most direct route to Cleburne is through the Pecan Plantation front gate turning right onto Fall Creek Highway to Massey Road and then to FM (Farm to Market) Highway 4 for a total travel distance of approximately 18 miles to US 67 leading to Cleburne. FM Highway 4 is a two-lane curving rural road that cannot efficiently accommodate high-density traffic.

With federally mandated safety requirements and regulatory controls in the nuclear power industry, evidence over six decades of generation of nuclear energy power for commercial use has shown that the probability of an accident occurring in a nuclear power plant that would require area-wide evacuation is low and continues to decline. However, if in the unlikely event that emergency evacuation of Pecan Plantation ever became necessary due to a man-made or natural disaster, terrorist threat, viral outbreak, or whatever reason, funneling all evacuation traffic through the front gate could lead to massive congestion, gridlock, and chaos.

A PPOA member and concerned citizen, made presentations to the Breakfast Club in 2014 and to the Long Range Planning Committee in 2015 showing two alternative concepts for a third entrance/egress point in Pecan Plantation. The concepts that were presented concentrated principally on providing a third gate as a means for Pecan Plantation to be able to efficiently respond, if necessary, to the Comanche Peak notification for an area-wide emergency evacuation. However, the concepts for the alternative entrances appear to have merit for further analysis and evaluation in mitigating future unsustainable traffic density in Pecan Plantation resulting from population growth. Also, the suggested locations of a third gate would significantly improve the accessibility to Cleburne for either entering the Chisholm Trail Tollway for members traveling to the Metroplex or to the new $100 million retail and entertainment center being planned by the City of Cleburne near the entrance to the tollway.
The concepts presented in the member conceptual study were for a third entrance gate at alternative sites located at Sandy Beach and at Plantation Beach. Aspects of each concept for a third gate in Pecan Plantation are briefly described in the following paragraphs.

**Sandy Beach - Hood County**

Sandy Beach is located at the southern-most point of Pecan Plantation along the Brazos River at approximately the mid-point of Bellechase Road. This location is near the most current densely populated critical mass area of Pecan Plantation. The geographical center of population in Pecan appears to be at the intersection of Wedgefield Road and Orchard Drive. An entry/exit gate at Sandy Beach would include the following:

- Construction of a new approach road along the eastern side of the Sandy Beach area from Bellechase to a new gatehouse.
- Construction of a bridge approximately 700-feet long 30-feet wide spanning across the Brazos River from Sandy Beach to a connecting road on the opposite (south) side of the river in Hood County. For comparison, the current bridge leading to the front gate is 581 feet long.
- Paving of an existing caliche road presently serving the Chesapeake Gas Processing Plant for a distance of approximately 1 mile in accordance with Hood County and Texas Department of Transportation (TXDOT) requirements for base material, depth and compaction requirements and standards for lane widths, shoulders, drainage, and easements would be necessary. This paved road would connect to CR 2174 at a point that would be approximately 8 miles from US 67 in Somerville County. The intersection of CR 1120 and US 67 is 14 miles from Cleburne and the tollway as shown on the map in Exhibit 10.
- Construction of bridge abutments at a horizontal distance and vertical elevation to be above the high water level of the banks on both sides of the river. The topography of the land near the banks of the river appears to be conducive to the construction of abutments above the high water level of the river without massive amounts of earthwork being required.

**Plantation Beach - Johnson County**

A second conceptual option warranting more in-depth evaluation is for a third gate at Plantation Beach. This location is approximately at the mid-point from each end of Ravenswood Road. Plantation Beach is in the Johnson County area of Pecan Plantation.
According to plat maps, there are a total of 139 building lots that are completely within the jurisdiction of Johnson County. Another 8 lots are split between Johnson and Hood Counties. Central appraisal district tax listings for both Hood and Johnson Counties are not clear on most of the lots that are split by the county line as to whether the respective county is claiming the entire lot or only claiming the portion of the lot which lies within that particular county for taxing purposes.

Some Johnson County government agencies, departments, and schools have difficulty in efficiently serving their tax payers living in Pecan Plantation because of the distance and travel time currently needed between the homes and the county offices. In particular, the Johnson County Sheriff’s Office (JCSO) cannot now expediently respond to short-notice emergency needs at the homes in Pecan within their jurisdiction. Representatives of the JCSO have indicated being in favor of an entrance to the Johnson County area of Pecan to facilitate improved service to their citizens.

A new entrance gate at Plantation Beach would require the following:

- Construction of a new connecting road from Ravenswood Road and entrance gate at Plantation Beach.

- Construction of a bridge approximately 750-feet long 30-foot wide bridge, including end abutments, spanning across the Brazos River from Plantation Beach to opposing side of river.

- Acquiring and paving approximately 4.2 miles of private road from Brazos River to FM 2331 near the intersection with FM 4. This intersection is 9.8 miles from the entrance of the Chisholm Trail Tollway. Paving of the roads would be required to comply with TXDOT and Johnson County standards for road construction. The route to the tollway entrance and nearby commercial areas in Cleburne from a new entrance gate Plantation Beach is shown on Exhibit 11.

- Considerable earthwork, including importing fill material, will be necessary to build up the finished grade for construction of bridge abutment above the high water level on the Pecan side of the river. Topography on opposite side of river appears to be steep enough for construction of abutment to be above the high water line without large quantities of fill needed.

Johnson County land owners across the Brazos River from Plantation Beach have in the past voiced opposition to a project requiring the paving of private road and increased traffic in proximity of their property that would occur with this concept. Creative negotiating strategies will be needed to overcome the objection of the land owners prior to acquisition of the
private roads and rights of way necessary for this third entrance concept. Discussions with Johnson County and the Texas Department of Transportation will also be needed to assess the validity of this concept.

Relative pros and cons for each concept for a third entrance are presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sandy Beach - Hood County</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Proximity to highest density of Pecan population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shorter length of paved roads needed across the river</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Favorable topography for bridge construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total travel distance of 23 miles from proposed gate to Cleburne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hood County opposition due to diverting commerce traffic away from local merchants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mixing traffic with heavy trucks near gas plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plantation Beach - Johnson County</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Travel distance of 14 miles to tollway and new commercial area in Cleburne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interest by JCSO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generate Pecan Plantation real estate interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Travel distance of 4.6 miles from population center in Pecan to proposed gate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opposition by land owners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More costly of two concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Successful execution of a complex mega-project like a third entrance will require a fundamental change from how projects are typically planned, designed, procured, constructed, and financed. A critical factor in developing a third entrance will be the significantly large capital expenditure and the financial impact on PPOA members. A project of this magnitude will require a complex cost model and finance plan with funding provided from multiple sources. Securing the funding necessary for the development of a third entrance project involving public funding or private grants will require a realistic capital cost budget and a credible execution and public involvement plan. Among potential financial partners for a third-entrance project are:

• Pecan Plantation Owners Association

• Pecan Plantation developer

• Hood or Johnson Counties

• Comanche Peak Nuclear Plant
To assess the technical, financial, and legal merits and overall viability of the two concepts described herein, or any other concept, it is recommended that a sub-committee reporting to the Infrastructure Committee be convened for this purpose. The subcommittee should include members with prior experience and knowledge in infrastructure planning and design, local and state regulatory standards, financial funding and analysis, and land evaluation and acquisition. The subcommittee should be tasked with preparing a feasibility study for a third entrance with consideration of the following:

- Conceptual engineering
- Traffic impact analysis
- Hydrologic factors
- Geo-technical information
- Preliminary cost estimates
- Environmental impact
- Land appraisal and acquisition factors
- Regulatory requirements
- Governmental issues
- Impact on county roads
- Safety and security
- Financial options
- Funding sources
- Eminent domain issues
- Tax implications
- Rights of way approvals
- Discussions with representatives from Hood, Johnson, and Somerville Counties
• Discussions with Texas Department of Transportation

• Impact on Pecan Plantation residents

In the interim period before a new gate would be constructed, it is recommended that the Safety and Security Committee coordinate with the Hood County Office of Emergency Management in developing an emergency evacuation plan based on the current roadway system within Pecan Plantation. Having vehicular traffic travel in one way direction on the main roads might be considered as part of an emergency evacuation plan.

An additional future consequence of population growth in Pecan Plantation will be the ever-increasing traffic density and attendant safety concerns on Fall Creek Highway (TX-167) outside the front gate of Pecan Plantation leading to the community of Acton. This situation will be exacerbated by other Hood County housing developments being planned that will also feed onto this road. A presentation was given to the Long Range Planning Committee by a concerned Pecan resident who described studies being evaluated to increase the width of Fall Creek Highway and which also would by pass the commercial area at the 3-road intersection in Acton.

Another conceptual highway development that would impact Pecan Plantation is the proposed South Loop 567, which would provide a new roadway connecting Mambrino Highway at Tommy’s corner and extending over the Brazos River to the west of De Cordova Bend Estates. This new road would connect to U.S. Highway 377 near the north-side crossing of TX-167. In the event that South Loop is constructed in the future, easy access to U.S. Highway 377 would be available for Pecan Plantation residents by exiting the back gate.

To monitor progress on these proposed highway projects impacting Pecan Plantation, it is recommended that PPOA have representatives attend, record, and report on any public hearings at which these proposals are discussed.
14. 15-YEAR VISION

As an adjunct to the Long Range Planning Committee, an ad hoc sub-committee was formed for the purpose of exploring the potential role of PPOA in control of development and commercial operations in Pecan Plantation if at such time in the future the current developer decides to divest his equity in the property. It is envisioned that if transfer of property ownership were to be contemplated, it would most likely occur in approximately 15 years.

A significant portion of undeveloped property inside Pecan Plantation’s gates is still owned by the developer and its future disposition is uncertain at this time. The developer has the right, but no obligation, to use any or all of that land to construct homes and the required infrastructure, up to the limit of 1,500 additional lots subject to the limitations detailed in the Second Addendum to the LENMO Agreement of 2001. Among the developer’s options is sale of the remaining land to an outside buyer, an event that could impact the future of the community in a number of ways.

It would appear to be in the best interests of PPOA to work with the developer to plan an orderly and detailed transition for ownership of the developer’s remaining land and create or amend appropriate agreements to carry out that plan. This might include providing necessary funds and an advance approval by PPOA membership to assure the developer of membership’s intentions and ability to achieve agreed-upon goals. The Long Range Planning and LENMO Committees would be the logical vehicles through which such efforts would be pursued. The efforts of the 15-year vision sub-committee will be communicated to PPOA membership at such time tangible progress is made.
15. FUNDING LONG RANGE PLANS

To be successful, a long range plan for an organization requires known and reliable sources of funding to achieve its goals. This section describes the sources of funding dedicated for capital repair and replacement projects and other critical needs envisioned by PPOA over an extended time horizon.

The Pecan plantation Owners Association is funded primarily through a Monthly Road Assessment of $19.00 per member and a Monthly Lot Assessment of $98.75 per member. The Monthly Lot Assessment is divided by allocating $90.75 to the daily Operating Fund of PPOA and $8.00 is dedicated to the Capital Asset Reserves.

Monthly Road Assessment

The Monthly Road Assessment is deposited into the Road and Drainage Reserve Fund, which is a dedicated reserve to be used for maintaining the front entry bridge, the roads, road shoulders, bar ditch cleaning, overall site drainage, and the airstrip. The monthly $19.00 Road Assessment is derived from the following two sources: 1.) $9.00 monthly Permanent Road Assessment per lot, and 2.) $10.00 special assessment for Roads and Drainage due to expire in 2024.

In 2011 the Infrastructure Committee completed a detailed 20-year plan for maintaining PPOA's roadways and drainage systems. The detailed plan included an estimated cost to maintain and/or replace the roads, drainage, air strip, and bridge. The plan was turned over to the Finance Committee, which prepared a financial analysis and 20-year financial projection.

The Infrastructure Committee and the Roads and Grounds Supervisor annually review and update their projection for budget proposes.

The funding and cost assumptions are based in part on:

1. An average of 26 new members per year
2. An inflation factor of 2.5% per year added to each project.
3. No new roadways or related drainage systems.

The results of these financial projections that are shown in Exhibit 12 indicate that the current funding is adequate to maintain the roads and drainage thru 2024.

Monthly Lot Assessment
The Monthly Lot Assessment is divided into the Operating Fund and the Capital Asset Reserve Fund for the following purposes:

1. The Operating Fund is used to pay salaries and benefits of the employees and all other costs related to the ongoing operating and maintenance of PPOA. The operational funding is zero based budgeted annually by management and reviewed and approved by the Finance Committee and the Board of Directors. In the event the monthly assessment of $90.75 per member does not cover the monthly operating expenses, management must seek other means to either reduce the expenses or increase the monthly assessment. The Operating Fund is management’s responsibility and not considered part of the long range planning process.

2. The Capital Asset Reserves Fund is a dedicated fund used to replace worn and obsolete plant, property and equipment. Funding is received from the $8.00 per month Lot Assessment and the initiation fees from new and existing home sales.

In 2011 a detailed physical inventory of all the capital assets of PPOA was completed and entered in a new inventory database. Included in the data for each asset was the acquisition date, purchase price, expected useful life, current condition and estimated replacement cost. With this information a financial analysis was prepared and a 20-year financial plan was developed to determine future funding requirements for capital assets.

As new assets or amenities are acquired, they are added to the inventory list and included in the 20-year projections for future funding requirements. Annually the department managers review and update their respective lists of assets for budget consideration.

Funding and cost assumption for the 20-year plan is based on:

1. A 1.5% CPI increase in the initiation fee of new members annually. For 2016 the initiation fee is $3,168.

2. No increase in the $8.00 Monthly Lot Assessment.

3. A 1.025% per year inflation factory for each listed asset.

4. There are no new capital assets included in the projections.

Exhibit 13 reflects 10 years of the 20-year financial projections. Based on these projections, the current Capital Asset Reserve Fund is adequate for the repair and replacement of our current assets.
16. RECOMMENDATIONS

From the present will come the future. Although we cannot manage or control the future realities of Pecan Plantation, we can plan for our current vision of it by focusing on predictable long-range needs and issues. The purpose of this Long Range Planning Committee Report is to communicate to the Board of Directors the challenges and opportunities facing Pecan Plantation in the future with the following recommendations.

1. Recommend that the Board of Directors and the LENMO Committee negotiate with the developer to extend the option beyond the current expiration date of November 2016 as set forth in the LENMO agreement for the developer to donate 200 acres of land in the vicinity east of Monticello Road for the future construction of a third golf course in Pecan Plantation.

2. Although there was a decisive lack of member support at this time for a third golf course indicated in the results of 2015 membership survey, it is recommended that the possibility for a future third golf course remain on the long range radar screen because of the forecasted growth of Pecan Plantation.

3. To assess the technical, financial, and legal merits and overall viability of concepts for a third entrance as described in Section13, it is recommended that a sub-committee reporting to the Infrastructure Committee be convened for this purpose.

4. Continue sub-committee exploration of opportunities for PPOA to have equity ownership and control of the entire operational entity within the confines of Pecan Plantation if in the future the current developer elects to divest its interests.

5. Support the Sports and Recreation Fitness Center Sub-Committee as needed in preparing for a membership vote for the development of a new health and wellness amenity at the PAC.

6. Like most communities in North Texas, Pecan Plantation is subject to natural disasters such as severe thunderstorms, tornadoes, flooding, and wild fires. In addition, with its proximity to Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant, a remote possibility exists for an industrial disaster that could impact Pecan Plantation. It is recommended that the PPOA Security Committee coordinate with the Hood County Office of Emergency Management to ensure and promulgate awareness to residents of a Disaster Preparedness Plan for Pecan Plantation with emergency evacuation procedures to be executed in the event of a disaster striking the community and communicate the plan to all residents.
7. To monitor progress on proposed highway projects and other public sector proposals having a direct impact on Pecan Plantation, it is recommended that the Board of Directors appoint a public sector liaison to attend, record, and report on any public hearings at which these proposed projects are discussed.

8. Establish an ad-hoc committee under stewardship of the House/Food and Beverage Committee to develop an updated in-house conceptual master plan of the clubhouse, that would include evaluation of current space utilization, building equipment issues, future functional requirements, and building expansion feasibility, to better anticipate the surge of membership growth.

9. Recommend that the Marina Committee develop conceptual ideas for a future new building requested in 5 to 10-year time frame, together with estimated construction and annual operating costs.
17. LIST OF EXHIBITS
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Exhibit 9. Amenities Requested by Individual Members
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Exhibit 12. Road and Drainage Reserve Fund
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Pecan Plantation Property Owners:

The Pecan Plantation Long Range Planning Committee and the Board of Directors are seeking input from PPOA members about future amenities in our community. A previous member survey conducted in 2012 revealed that the most highly desired amenities at that time were a Fitness Center and additional golf capacity. Based on the results of that previous survey, the Long Range Planning Committee evaluated alternative financial scenarios necessary for providing those amenities that appeared to be most wanted by members. The purpose of this current survey is to re-validate the desires of the PPOA membership in regard to favored amenities and the best long term approach for providing them.

Results of this present survey will be used to provide direction for the Long Range Planning Committee and the PPOA Board of Directors. With survey feedback provided by our membership, the Long Range Planning Committee will recommend the course of action to be taken by the Board. Therefore, it is important for PPOA members to participate and respond to this survey.

As an incentive for responding to this survey, a random selection of 10 membership numbers will be made by the outside consultant from the returned responses to receive a $25 discount coupon for a meal at the Pecan Plantation clubhouse. So hurry, and get your survey returned.

For tracking purposes, only one response per membership number will be permitted.

Q1 How long have you been a member of Pecan Plantation?

- First year member
- 2-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-20 years
- 21-30 years
- More than 30 years

Q2 Which of the following amenities do you or members of your family use? Select all that apply.

- Golf
- Tennis
- Marina
- Air Park
- Equestrian
- Campground / RV
- Archery / Air Gun
- Pool(s)
- Health and Wellness programs at the PAC
- Gymnasium at the PAC
- Pickleball
- Walking Trail at the PAC
- Walking Trail at the Campgrounds
- Cards and other games at PPOA Facilities

Q3 Do you or members of your family currently belong to any of the following? Select all that apply.

- Nutcracker Golf Club
- Nutcracker Fitness
- Gym / Fitness facility other than Nutcracker

2015 ON-LINE MEMBERSHIP SURVEY
INCREASED GOLF CAPACITY

Additional golf capacity is possible through two initiatives as follows.

1. PPOA can purchase the Nutcracker Golf Club from the developer.

2. Build an additional new golf course if PPOA exercises the option option in the LENMO agreement to accept 200 acres of land donated by the developer on or before November 2016.

PPOA is likely to receive the most favorable location for the donated 200 acres of land if PPOA agrees to purchase the Nutcracker Golf Club. Cost for purchasing, construction and operation for each option are shown below for your consideration. Please remember that current PPOA by-laws do not allow for the charging of member green fees to offset operating costs.

Q4 NUTCRACKER GOLF CLUB

The cost to purchase the Nutcracker Golf Club and related equipment is estimated to be $2,275,000. A 10-year bank note would be necessary to finance the capital purchase and could be amortized (repaid) by either of two alternative options:

1. Utilize current excess capital asset reserve account funds, plus a 10-year special assessment of $2.75 / member / month, or

2. A 10-year special assessment of $9.55 / member / month if no reserve account funds are used

The annual costs for operating and maintaining the Nutcracker Golf Club are estimated to be $457,000 that will require an additional estimated assessment of $11.80 / member / month for either purchase Option 1 or 2 above.

Please rate your level of support of the options above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all Supportive</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing the Nutcracker Golf Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use current excess capital asset reserve account funds plus a 10-year special assessment of $2.75/member/month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 10-year special assessment of $9.55/member/month with no reserve funds being used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating assessment increase of $11.80/member/month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 What is the reason(s) for your responses to the questions above? Select all that apply.

- Too expensive to purchase
- Too expensive to operate
- I am opposed to an increased assessment for this amenity
- I have no interest in this amenity
- I will use this amenity if it becomes available
- I strongly want this amenity in Pecan Plantation
- I believe this amenity will increase my property value
- Other. Please explain:

Q6 ADDITIONAL GOLF COURSE

The construction cost of an additional golf course and related capital equipment is estimated to be $5,000,000, which would require a bank loan to finance. Current reserve funds are not sufficient to support the bank note, therefore a 10-year special assessment of $18.20 / member / month would be required for repayment of the bank loan.

Annual operating and maintenance costs for a new 18-hole golf course are estimated at $450,000 that will require an additional estimated assessment of $11.40 / member / month.

Please rate your level of support for the various options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all Supportive</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructing an additional golf course</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 10-year special assessment of $18.20/member/month</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating assessment increase of $11.40/member/month</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7 What is the reason(s) for your responses to the questions above? Select all that apply.

- Too expensive to build
- Too expensive to operate
- I am opposed to an increased assessment for this amenity
- I have no interest in this amenity
- I will use this amenity if it becomes available
- I strongly want this amenity in Pecan Plantation
- I believe this amenity will increase my property value
- Other. Please explain:


Q8 Please share any comments you have about the potential golf options:

Q9 NEW FITNESS CENTER

A 16,000 square-foot fitness center facility constructed at the Pecan Activity Center would include cardio and strength training, group exercise, meeting rooms and an indoor track.

Construction costs are estimated at $1,812,000 with two alternative repayment options:

1. Utilize current excess capital asset reserve account funds

   OR

2. A 10-year special assessment of $5.95 / member / month

In addition annual operating costs are estimated at $150,000 with two alternative revenue options:

1. Sale of separate memberships to a minimum of 325 families at $40 / family / month

   OR

2. Operating assessment increase of $4 / member / month

Please rate your level of support for the various options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all Supportive</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Very Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of a new Fitness Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of current excess capital asset reserve account funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 10-year special assessment of $5.95/member/month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of separate memberships at $40/month for operating revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment increase of $4/member/month for operating revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 What is the reason(s) for your responses to the questions above? Select all that apply.

☐ Too expensive to build
☐ Too expensive to operate
☐ I am opposed to an increased assessment for this amenity
☐ I have no interest in this amenity

☐ I will use this amenity if it becomes available
☐ I strongly want this amenity in Pecan Plantation
☐ I believe this amenity will increase my property value
☐ Other. Please explain:

Q11 Please share any comments you have about the potential construction of a new Fitness Center:

The following demographic questions will be used for classification purposes.

Q12 Please indicate the number in each category for your member household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>More than 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Males</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Females</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Under 18</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q13 What is your current status? (PRIMARY MEMBER)

☐ Single, never married
☐ Married without children
☐ Married with children
☐ Divorced

☐ Separated
☐ Widowed
☐ Living w/ partner
☐ Prefer not to answer

Q14 Are you? (PRIMARY MEMBER)

☐ Retired

☐ Non-Retired

Q15 For tracking purposes, please enter your member number to ensure only one response per membership. To maintain confidentiality, this information will not be included with data reported back to the Club.
Exhibit 2

PPOA MEMBER SURVEY TABULATED RESULTS FOR PURCHASE OF NUTCRACKER

Number of Responses For Each Level of Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF. FILE</th>
<th>SURVEY OPTIONS</th>
<th>1-Not at all supportive</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10 - Very supportive</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Purchase of Nutcracker Golf Club</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Use Capital Asset Reserve Fund plus 10-year special assessment</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of $2.75/member/month</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>10-year special assessment of $9.55/member/month with no reserve funds used</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>871</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Operating assessment increase of $11.80/member/month</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Exhibit 3**

**REASONS FOR RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTIONS ON PURCHASE, FINANCING, USE, AND OPERATION OF NUTCRACKER GOLF CLUB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF. FILE</th>
<th>REASONS FOR SURVEY RESPONSES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF REASONS</th>
<th>% OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>RANK ORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>I will use this amenity if it becomes available</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>I have no interest in this amenity</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>I believe this amenity will increase my property value</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>I am opposed to an increased assessment for this amenity</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>I strongly want this amenity in Pecan Plantation</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Too expensive to purchase</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Too expensive to operate</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes:**
1. Responders were permitted to select multiple reasons for each question. Hence, total number of reasons in table above is greater than total number of responders.
2. Percentages shown based on 1,296 total responses.
# Exhibit 4

**PPOA MEMBER SURVEY TABULATED RESULTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW THIRD GOLF COURSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF. FILE</th>
<th>SURVEY OPTIONS</th>
<th>1-Not at all supportive</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10 - Very supportive</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Construction of new third golf course</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ</td>
<td>10-year special assessment of $18.20/member/month for repayment of construction note</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Operating assessment increase of $11.40/member/month</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 5

REASONS FOR RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTIONS ON CONSTRUCTION, FINANCING, AND OPERATION OF NEW THIRD GOLF COURSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF. FILE</th>
<th>REASONS FOR SURVEY RESPONSES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF REASONS</th>
<th>% OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>RANK ORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Too expensive to build</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>I am opposed to an increased assessment for this amenity</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>I have no interest in this amenity</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Too expensive to operate</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>I will use this amenity if it becomes available</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>I strongly want this amenity in Pecan Plantation</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>I believe this amenity will increase my property value</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:
1. Responders were permitted to select multiple reasons for each question. Hence, total number of reasons in table above is greater than total number of responders.

2. Percentages shown based on 1,296 total responses.
### Exhibit 6

**PPOA MEMBER SURVEY TABULATED RESULTS FOR FITNESS CENTER**

**Number of Responses For Each Level of Rating Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF. FILE</th>
<th>SURVEY OPTIONS</th>
<th>1 - Not at all supportive</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10 - Very supportive</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Construction of new Fitness Center</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW</td>
<td>Use of current capital asset reserve funds for construction</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AX</td>
<td>10 year special assessment of $5.95/member/mo. for construction</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY</td>
<td>Sale of separate memberships at $40/month/family for operations</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Assessment increase of $4.00/month/member for operations</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 7

**REASONS FOR RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTIONS ON CONSTRUCTION, FINANCING, USE, AND OPERATION OF NEW FITNESS CENTER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF. FILE</th>
<th>REASONS FOR SURVEY RESPONSES</th>
<th>NUMBER OF REASONS</th>
<th>% OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>RANK ORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>I will use this amenity if it becomes available</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>I believe this amenity will increase my property value</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>I am opposed to an increased assessment for this amenity</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF</td>
<td>I strongly want this amenity in Pecan Plantation</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>I have no interest in this amenity</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Too expensive to build</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Too expensive to operate</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes:**

1. Responders were permitted to select multiple reasons for each question. Hence, total number of reasons in table above is greater than total number of responders.

2. Percentages shown based on 1,296 total responses.
## COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMENITIES

Focus on this table should be on preserving and enhancing standing committee’s existing amenities to maintain on an acceptable basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMENITY DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>REPAIRS/UPKEEP REQUIRED/COST</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front gate entrance: Repair chain link fence/remove dead vines</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Anthony requirement referred to Lenm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal plantings at Guard Shacks</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>3 X annually(spring/summer/fall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of flower beds at gates*</td>
<td>Personnel cost Grounds Crew</td>
<td>As required/wkly-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulch</td>
<td>$500/year</td>
<td>As required/wkly-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed killer or manual weeding</td>
<td>Personnel cost Grounds Crew</td>
<td>As required/wkly-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer</td>
<td>$100/year</td>
<td>As required/wkly-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire ant killer</td>
<td>$200/year</td>
<td>As required/wkly-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Guard Houses*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power wash</td>
<td>Personnel cost Grounds Crew</td>
<td>Semi-annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint</td>
<td>Personnel cost Grounds Crew</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas surrounding guard houses*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowing</td>
<td>Personnel cost Grounds Crew</td>
<td>Bi-weekly in season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed-eating</td>
<td>Personnel cost Grounds Crew</td>
<td>Bi-weekly in season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lots upkeep</td>
<td>Personnel cost Grounds Crew</td>
<td>Bi-weekly in season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting barrier poles</td>
<td>Personnel cost Grounds Crew</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-hose reels</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>One time investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Circle annual plantings, upkeep and supplies</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARINA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Store</td>
<td>Repair roof $1500, Paint $100</td>
<td>Paint Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grill Area</td>
<td>In-house maintenance repairs</td>
<td>As Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,B, and C Docks</td>
<td>Clean and repair lifts</td>
<td>Weekly or as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Storage</td>
<td>Keep clean</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Storage</td>
<td>Repairs door lifts</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 8

| Gas Operation Pumps and Consoles | Replace nozzles $100 ea. Paint tanks $1 | Annually |
| RV Dump Station | No maintenance required |

**SPORT AND RECREATION**

| Paint PAC Interior | $4,000 | Every 5 years |
| Campgrounds & Beaches - Campground Pavilion | $34,000 | $500 | Annual |
| Campground Pavilion - 4th Wall - DONATED | $8,000 |
| Clubhouse Trail | $500 | 250 |
| River Trail | $1,500 | 500 |
| DOG PARK - 1-1/2 acres | $15,000 |
| Dog Park - Benches - Donated | $0 |
| Dog Park - Water Fountains - Donated | $0 |
| STABLES - Hay Barn | $12,000 |
| POOLS - ADA Lift - Clubhouse | $4,000 |

**GOLF**

- Erosion Control as follows:
  - #17 Retention Wall | Replace $63,000 | One time
  - #11 Retention Wall | Replace $47,000 |
  - #5 Repair East wall | Repair/replace $7,500 |
  - #8 Retention wall | Replace $53,000 |
  - #11 Pond Improvement two Options
    - A. Fill in, drainage & Grass $37,000
    - B. Add retain’g wall & spillway $65,000

**SAFETY AND SECURITY**

- Gate access procedures enhanced through
  - Technological improvements $60,000 (2017) | Annual (monthly)
  - The improvement of cell service within Pecan. In progress | Behind commercial area 2015
  - With the eventual “build out” of the remainder of our area,
approximately 60% of PPOA will have no cell service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIRPORT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canvas canopy at Plane View Park</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>Every 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS Approach</td>
<td>Recertification</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsocks</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>Every 2 or 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segmented Circle</td>
<td>Painted</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runway lights &amp; Hardware</td>
<td>Replace</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 8
NEW AMENITIES - 0 to 5 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUNDS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTIONS</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>ESTIMATED ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAC: enlarge exit/entrance to parking lot</td>
<td>For long-bed delivery trucks</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazebo</td>
<td>Structural mods and remodeling public use/rental</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Entrance</td>
<td>Landscape Architectural Design</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARINA</th>
<th>DESCRIPTIONS</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>ESTIMATED ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grill</td>
<td>Enclose eating area</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Dock</td>
<td>Put a cover over west end of dock</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Dock Gas Pump</td>
<td>Safety bumpers</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docks C &amp; B</td>
<td>Add new walkway</td>
<td>$4,860</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Storage Area C South Side</td>
<td>Correct Drainage &amp; Resurface boat</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docks A and B</td>
<td>Replace wood walkways</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPORTS AND RECREATION</th>
<th>DESCRIPTIONS</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>ESTIMATED ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Fitness Center Sub-Committee Recommendation</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Maintenance Building</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Overflow parking lot (Grounds)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Sand Volleyball Court</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Outdoor Basketball</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Disc Golf Tee Boxes - 9 Tee boxes</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Pavilion Shelter</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Sidewalks - on-going</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Outdoor Pickleball Courts</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIKE/WALK TRAIL (3 Phases)</td>
<td>Clubhouse - Rugged</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Trail - Mulch</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plantation Trail - Concrete 8-10 wide - See options</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPGROUNDS &amp; BEACHES</td>
<td>Campground Pavilion - Picnic Tables</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replace Campground Fire Pits</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exhibit 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARCHERY RANGE</strong></td>
<td>Septic System - Building Tie-in</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone Booster</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TENNIS</strong></td>
<td>Court #7</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancement/Renovation to Tennis Building</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOG PARK</strong></td>
<td>Ground Improvement - 3 phases - Tree removal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed/Sod</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance Drainage - Decomposed Granite</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNITY GARDENS</strong></td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 - Plots</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase II add 30 - plots</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POOLS</strong></td>
<td>Shade structures - PAC Pool</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>#10 POND</strong></td>
<td>Floating fishing dock</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOLF</strong></td>
<td>Short game practice area</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACC</strong></td>
<td>File Storage Building</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate controlled, Fire &amp; Storm Resistant</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIRPORT</strong></td>
<td>LPV GPS approach</td>
<td>STI Contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrigation System</td>
<td>Repair &amp; Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAFETY/SECURITY</strong></td>
<td>Widen road entrance (check with developer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dash Cameras or body cameras for officers</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATV</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NEW AMENITIES - 5 to 10 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW AMENITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTIONS</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
<th>ESTIMATED ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade Front Entrance</td>
<td>Using Architectural Plans</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance back circle with plans developed by Garden Club</td>
<td>Sprinkler system ground cover etc</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARINA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>Kitchen, Semi-enclosed eating area, restrooms.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased Land</td>
<td>Purchase the presently leased Land</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock A &amp; B</td>
<td>Replace existing docks with new Aluminum Structures</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPORTS AND RECREATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC - Area - Bocce Ball</td>
<td>Outdoor Bocce Ball Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball - Outdoor</td>
<td>Outdoor Pickleball Courts</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEACHES - Picnic Pavilions</td>
<td>Sandy Beach Picnic Pavilion</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Pavilions</td>
<td>Plantation Beach Picnic Pavilion</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Pavilions</td>
<td>Falls Beach Picnic Pavilion</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHERY RANGE - Cover Picnic Area</td>
<td>Cover Picnic Area</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAZOS RIVER - Small Boat/Canoe Launch</td>
<td>Small Boat/Canoe Launch</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AIRPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Pump Area</td>
<td>Remove &amp; resurface</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOLF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Golf Course</td>
<td>Add 18 hole Course (Nut Cracker)$2 MM</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or Build new golf course</td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## AMENITIES REQUESTED FROM POLL OF INDIVIDUALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Amenities Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>Airport Deer Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Airport Maintenance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPS Instrument Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Airport Disaster Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrigation system repair and improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fuel pump area congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Airport rotating beacon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture Control</td>
<td>File storage building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By-Laws</td>
<td>Floating dock at the marina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New buildings at the marina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walking trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>New sound system in the club house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>Practice area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remodel golf shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remodel teen room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remodel 19th hole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Third exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>Small boat ramp on river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skeet range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canoes and float tubes for river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bowling alley (10 pin ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remodel teen room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indoor hand gun range (tube)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety/Security</td>
<td>Hand held communication devices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCEPT OF THIRD ENTRANCE AT PLANTATION BEACH
Exhibit 12

ROAD AND DRAINAGE RESERVE FUND

Year | Balance
--- | ---
2016 | 717,927
2017 | 526,918
2018 | 244,864
2019 | 206,854
2020 | 620,164
2021 | 587,880
2022 | 999,551
2023 | 1,021,830
2024 | 562,786
2025 | -536,882
Exhibit 13

CAPITAL ASSET RESERVE FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reserve for New Amenities</th>
<th>Reserve for Current Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>15,840</td>
<td>1,502,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>128,621</td>
<td>907,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>114,231</td>
<td>1,127,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>99,381</td>
<td>1,564,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>100,872</td>
<td>1,514,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>102,385</td>
<td>816,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>103,921</td>
<td>889,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>70,320</td>
<td>1,205,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>71,375</td>
<td>1,618,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>72,445</td>
<td>2,136,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Consultant Report for 2015 PPOA Membership Survey

Appendix 2. Member Comments to 2015 PPOA Membership Survey
The cost to purchase the Nutcracker Golf Club and related equipment is estimated to be $2,275,000. A 10-year bank note would be necessary to finance the capital purchase and could be amortized (repaid) by either of two alternative options:

1. Utilize current excess capital asset reserve account funds, plus a 10-year special assessment of $2.75 / member / month, or

2. A 10-year special assessment of $9.55 / member / month if no reserve account funds are used

The annual costs for operating and maintaining the Nutcracker Golf Club are estimated to be $457,000 that will require an additional estimated assessment of $11.80 / member / month for either purchase Option 1 or 2 above.
The majority of PPOA members would not support the purchase of Nutcracker Golf Club.
The membership is divided with a third saying they would utilize the Nutcracker Golf Club if available and another third who have no interest.

What is the reason(s) for your responses to the questions above? Total Membership

- I will use this amenity if it becomes available: 34%
- I have no interest in this amenity: 32%
- I believe this amenity will increase my property value: 32%
- I am opposed to an increased assessment for this amenity: 31%
- I strongly want this amenity in Pecan Plantation: 24%
- Too expensive to purchase: 23%
- Too expensive to operate: 23%
- Other, please explain: 16%
Additional Golf Course

The construction cost of an additional golf course and related capital equipment is estimated to be $5,000,000, which would require a bank loan to finance. Current reserve funds are not sufficient to support the bank note, therefore a 10-year special assessment of $18.20 / member / month would be required for repayment of the bank loan.

Annual operating and maintenance costs for a new 18-hole golf course are estimated at $450,000 that will require an additional estimated assessment of $11.40 / member / month.
The construction of an additional golf course received even less support than the purchase of Nutcracker Golf Club with 71% of members not supportive.
The cost of building, operations and increased assessment are driving the lack of support for the building of an additional golf course.

- Too expensive to build - 44%
- Opposed to increased assessment - 40%
- No Interest - 37%
- Too expensive to operate - 32%
A 16,000 square-foot fitness center facility constructed at the Pecan Activity Center would include cardio and strength training, group exercise, meeting rooms and an indoor track.

Construction costs are estimated at $1,812,000 with two alternative repayment options:

1. Utilize current excess capital asset reserve account funds
2. A 10-year special assessment of $5.95 / member / month

In addition annual operating costs are estimated at $150,000 with two alternative revenue options:

1. Sale of separate memberships to a minimum of 325 families at $40 / family / month
2. Operating assessment increase of $4 / member / month
Construction of a new fitness center garnered the most backing with 47% of the membership saying they are supportive and 14% who are neutral.
Use of current excess capital asset reserve funds was the preferred repayment option.
A $4 per month assessment was the preferred revenue option to cover annual operating costs.
Nearly half of the membership say they will utilize the fitness facility if it is made available.
Members who are married with children are more supportive of the fitness facility, while those who are widowed are less supportive.
Of the members who are unsupportive, 78% are retired.
Members who currently utilize “healthy” lifestyle amenities are more likely to support the building of the fitness center.
41% of members who support the fitness facility, belong to a gym other than Nutcracker.
Demographics
Length of membership

How long have you been a member of Pecan Plantation?

- First year member: 10%
- 2 - 5 years: 22%
- 6 - 10 years: 22%
- 11 - 20 years: 35%
- 21 - 30 years: 8%
- More than 30 years: 2%
### Current Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married with children</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married without children</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living w/ partner</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retired Status

Are you? (PRIMARY MEMBER)

- Retired: 68%
- Non-Retired: 32%
Number of members in the household

Number in Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in Household</th>
<th>Adult Males</th>
<th>Adult Females</th>
<th>Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Amenity Usage

Which of the following amenities do you or members of your family use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Usage Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool(s)</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Trail at the PAC</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium at the PAC</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Trail at the Campgrounds</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Wellness programs at the PAC</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cards and other games at PPOA Facilities</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campground / RV</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery / Air Gun</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Park</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Memberships

Do you or members of your family currently belong to any of the following?

- Nutcracker Golf Club: 49%
- Nutcracker Fitness: 45%
- Gym / Fitness facility other than Nutcracker: 30%
Appendix
Nutcracker repayment options

Option #1

Use current excess capital asset reserve account funds plus a 10-year special assessment of $2.75 per member/month

Option #2

A 10-year special assessment of $9.55 per member/month with no reserve funds being used
Nutcracker Operating Assessment

Operating assessment increase of $11.80 per member/month
Additional golf course assessments

Repayment

A 10-year special assessment of $18.20 per member/month

Operating

Operating assessment increase of $11.40 per member/month
### Additional Golf Course: Reasons for answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too expensive to build</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am opposed to an increased assessment for this amenity</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no interest in this amenity</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too expensive to operate</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will use this amenity if it becomes available</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe this amenity will increase my property value</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly want this amenity in Pecan Plantation</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Please explain:</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New fitness center - second choice options

Repayment

Operating

A 10-year special assessment of $5.95 per member/month

- Not at all supportive: 20%
- Not supportive: 6%
- Neutral: 10%
- Supportive: 21%
- Very Supportive: 43%

Sale of separate memberships at $40/month for operating revenue

- Not at all supportive: 6%
- Not supportive: 7%
- Neutral: 9%
- Supportive: 11%
- Very Supportive: 23%
Member Comments

November 2015
1. **What is the reason(s) for your responses to the questions above?** Nutcracker Golf Club - Other

**Other. Please explain:**

- I already belong to Nutcracker and accept their current monthly assessment as a way to ensure I get decent tee times. I am concerned if PPOA takes it over my ability to get select tee times will lessen because of the increased number of golfers that come with PPOA ownership.
- **Build a new course**
  - I believe existing infrastructure can be improved and a good rainy-day fund established to prevent a future increase. I know we have a lot of folks who like golf but I see the courses empty a lot of time (maybe I am missing it).
  - Spend the money to correct drainage that was suggested a year ago by local engineer's. Many homes around here flooded. It would be nice to see the PPOA protect homeowners before buying another golf course. Especially since we did improvements to the existing golf course to the tune of 1.4m.
  - If purchased, the users of the facility should pay a cost to use it. Those of us who do not play golf should not have to support those who do.
  - **already a member at Nutt. I would like a third golf course. I would like the Nutt to stay separate so that Pecan Members will not overcrowd the Nutt course.**
  - Its why I joined to begin with.
  - **We have ongoing rpad and bridge projects to complete before we take on additional debt and/or expenses**
  - **Will not eliminate tee time availability to members. Both courses to busy now. We need another golf course.**
- **Build another 18 hole course**
  - We don't golf at all, but it makes more sense to buy the Nutcracker than take up additional space for yet another golf course in Pecan. Why not get some decent cell phone towers in here that will benefit all residents, not just golfers? Or make the PAC kitchen and diningroom available for family reunions and parties for a fee where we can actually use that nice kitchen rather than have it so restricted no one can use it? What about setting aside land for a community chapel where residents could hold memorial services or have prayer meetings? We are an aging community and all this emphasis on sports will become less useful shortly unless you have a big influx of young people in Pecan.
  - **PPOA needs to build 3rd golf course rather than purchasing Nutcracker. We NEED 3rd course for capacity and increase of golf amenities for pecan (current and future members). A private edition of this size needs 3 courses. We do NOT need to purchase nutcracker, Lenmo should continue to operate and Lenmo will need to become more aggressive in upkeep and having a DECENT Pro. Not a sub standard pro who doesn't care and is too lazy to do their job.**
  - I have been a member at Nut for 8 years....what about all the money I've put into membership?
- **Build another course. Leave Nutcracker as private club**
  - We are not golfers -
  - Would like PPOA to purchase Nutcracker, but believe that it would be better to get 500 members to pay $50.00 per month in order to use this facility.
  - I have no problem supporting a new amenity such as an additional golf course, as long as the people using the amenity are willing to pay Pecan's out-of-pocket cost. For instance, all members of the Nutcracker already pay significant fees to be a member and use the Nutcracker golf course. If the actual out-of-pocket cost for building a new golf course or acquiring and maintain the Nutcracker is passed on the people actually using it then I would consider supporting the amenity. The out-of-pocket cost to use the new amenity should much lower (than say the Nutcracker fees) since it would be open to all PPOA members.
Many of our residents are reaching ages where golf may no longer be an option, sadly. We should study this and revisit this in a few years. Also, consider getting some additional amenities from the Leonards. A good option would be the storage facilities by the stables. A real "cash cow" with virtually no operating expense!!

Why force everyone to participate in something? Should be voluntary. Otherwise it's dictating.

Nutcracker is in place and ready to go. No escalating construction costs.

the people who want to take advantage of this should be the ones who pay for it, just like they do now for The Nutcracker

You estimate of operating cost of Nutcracker is too low. There are very few synergies other than management.

Improving Pecan road, lighting, drainage security, providing natural gas to ALL of Pecan is considerably MORE important than a golf course for a few golfers. Their is an open invitation using Squaw Creek Club for all golf players to have unlimited rounds for one flat fee per month, it cost NOTHING to non playing members of Pecan Plantation. The Board and management of Pecan seem to be fixated on the desires of a few golfers rather the needs of the total community. Their are currently TWO golf courses for any one to chose to play. Now we want to add a THIRD, are you kidding me? Yet a community as large as Pecan still does not have the cheapest energy source available Natural Gas. Despite the fact we sit in one of nations largest gas fields in the country! I believe sharp foresight by Pecan Management when the gas driller wanted to testing inside Pecan could have reached an agreement so that for allowing a few trucks to do sound surveys of deep structure of rock, the driller would agree to provide natural gas to all of Pecan an amenity of value to ALL. A town in Missouri did what I just said and have a contract for 25 years of natural gas at approximately 2 dollars per thousand cubic feet. We simply have failed to consider the total community requirements while focused on the "amenities!! As Planning Community start thinking of Pecan as a community rather than a Country Club, a think of ways to serve ALL the members! Frankly, I doubt anyone on the Committee want to hear or even read what I just said. If you call me at 8172797082 and we can expand this discussion/

What would it cost to accept the 200 acres free & build a golf course?

We do not want PP to buy the Nutcracker.

Experience on upkeep of current golf course is under budgeted and the same will happen if Nutcracker is acquired. Management of Nutcracker would require an additional Pro or Director of Golf to oversee both Golf Courses.

Currently a member of nutcracker and this will harm our ability to obtain tee times. Strongly oppose PP purchasing Nutcracker

We want an additional golf course and support it's needed financing but not at the expense of losing Nut Cracker as a private membership! We strongly condemn Nut Cracker being purchased. We want it left alone

I support this additional amenity provided it is under the supervision of a golf professional separate from Pecan Golf Club.

Cost of maintaining two courses together will be less than maintaining two courses separately.

There is not a shortage of golf holes. There is a shortage of early tee times. The members don't take care of the courses they have. Ball marks on greens, divot left unfixed, drive carts on grass the entire hole. More courses would be just too much expense.

Why can't those who use or want the 2nd and or 3rd golf courses buy a membership as they do now?

Pecan Plantation does not need another golf course with a big club house and the expenses of the Nutcracker....In my opinion, it would be better to build another golf course, put a trailer house in as the club house and keep using the present club house as we are doing now.

I feel we need at least 2 golf courses for us to grow but am not sure if buying Nutcracker is the right way
to go and do not buy it to get a "better" 200" acres

Without having to be private member and PP ownership. No dues, except the 9.55 & $11.80 will make property in this neighborhood more desirable and increase value.

I assume that the increased assessment will cover operating expenses thoroughly AND that I will not be charged additional fees for use of the Nutcracker fitness gym. I won't likely golf more than I do today at the PPCC course (which is very little), but I the individual charges for using the Nutcracker fitness gym (only) is cost-prohibitive, even punitive, certainly not worth it. If we (PPOA) does not purchase Nutcracker (and get the fitness gym), then I think PPOA should invest in a fitness gym of its own. Perhaps an addition to the PAC.

I don't play golf at all

Seems like a no-brainer for all the Nutcracker members.

There should be by law amendment presented to membership which would allow modest green fees for those who play golf.

We do not play golf so not interested in this issue.

I don't want pecan golf involved with nutcracker, I like it the way it is.

Although, I think there are tee times available at Pecan course...just not preferred times. I believe limiting advance reservations to 2 times per week per member and any above that should be same day only. This would allow those who can't seem to get on during preferred times the chance to use the golf course equally. A small few are making it difficult for equal paying members.

Ease tee times for increasing golf players

Would be for this if the additional 12 dollars is added to my Pecan bill and the 200 dollars per month is dropped from my Nutcracker membership. If i still have to pay what i am paying now plus the additional assessment then I am against this.

There was a time when the developer offered Nutcracker for free. We declined on the grounds that it would cost too much to operate. I don't see anything that changed between then and now. Talk to Bob Cote for more details on that PPHOA history.

We of course, feel the drainage is priority in Pecan at this time. Once the drainage situation is fixed there would be no problem in supporting this purchase.

I do not want pecan messing up our tee times at nutcracker like the computer did at pecan. We have 400 votes at nutcracker that will vote down any attempt to buy us. We do not want you here, go away

Any money should be used for amenity upkeep of what we already possess. Our monthly dues have increased twenty dollars a month since we got here!!! We don't golf and if forced to pay even more would be extremely displeased.

The Wall Street Journal recently reported on the declining membership at golf clubs and subsequent increase in bankruptcies. Why would we want to sink money into a dying sport when we have nine courses already in the Granbury area, not counting Ft. Worth or other surrounding areas such as Stephenville and Glen Rose.

I am currently a landowner without a residence I would not mind paying for the amenities when I actually live in Pecan Plantation. I currently pay $180+ A month for a lot, and use no amenities.

It is very difficult to get a tee time now! It is going to get much worse real soon with all of the new construction going on. Joining a golf community and not being able to golf is very frustrating.

The cost of new golfing facilities should be shared by the users and the other members, with the users bearing the large majority of the cost. This would reflect the cost benefit ratio between the users and non-users. The no green fee bylaw can be changed. Free golf at new facilities effectively ended when the members voted for 1500 new members without the developer providing the total capital cost of the amenities for those additional members.

do not acquire enough new tee times
As more land is developed and the population of Pecan grows, more pressure is put on the current Pecan Golf Course with an increasing number of golfers. A second golf course just makes good sense. It is the most valuable asset in Pecan and is used by more members than any other activity. For a nominal fee, property values increase as well as the enjoyment for players who would have more flexibility in tee time availability, not to mention adding the variety of a second course. Members need to realize that growth precipitates the need to expand amenities as well as increasing dues to support them. Using the reserve account does not make good sense as an option. Pecan needs to always maintain a certain surplus of funds as a fiscal policy.

I would prefer the money be used for other activities within Pecan. There are already 2 golf courses available for use; I would like to see exercise equipment purchased for members to use at the PAC. Not every person knows how to play golf, but the elder members of the community need strength building equipment to increase their quality of life.

Opposed to purchasing Nutcracker based on the proposal another golf course would be built here in Pecan but members do not know where it will be built. Nutcracker gym is far too expensive. Would the cost come down (way down) if PPOA owned/operated?

Underestimate the cost as many improvements such as cart paths and irrigation improvements will be large.

I do not like Nutcracker golf course... it's too boring.

Currently Pecan plays about 40,000 per year. The additional golf course Nutcracker or New would make getting Tee times much more reasonable.

The Nutcracker Golf Club is available to all those who wish to play. The purchase of this course does not add to the amenities in Pecan!! The best that can be said about this purchase is it would reduce the cost of golf for a small SELECT group in Pecan. NO value to all others. It will NOT increase the property values in Pecan as it adds no increase in the number of holes available. The waste of 2.2M + or - on the existing course now comes home to roost.

I am already a member of Nutcracker Golf and have no desire to over-fill it as the Pecan course is and not be able to use it. In addition, I PAID AN ADDITIONAL FEE TO BELONG TO NUTCRAKER, is someone going to buy me out when they purchase the Nutcracker?

we already have a golf course. not opposed to a 2nd one but it should be funded the same as the 2nd airport. new shared expense amenities should be something we don't already have.

we do not golf so i really dont have opinion, but this is a golfing community so thats why I chose the least expensive price for my monthly assesment.

to help with golf capacity issues we face now, and in the future here at Pecan Plantation

Pecan desperately needs golf capacity but this option probably won't get us all the way there. I would prefer that we own Nutcracker but push to develope a top notch golf facility.

The by-laws were set up with one golf course in mind. Additional courses are fine, if completely funded by user fees

At the very least members that play golf should usage fee for play golf, say $10 per 9 holes to help off set the maintenance of our existing course. Members need to be told exactly how much it costs to maintain the course everyday.

Too many people on the Pecan course that get to play everyday and those of us who only get to come every few weeks can't get on this course. Need more golf options.

I believe that there are other items and areas that need to be added in Pecan to benefit the community. Such as walking and biking trails. A fitness center that is free for all members. Free classes.

By-laws could be changed to permit additional golf course member fees, i.e., purchasing the Nutcracker and maintaining it with additional costs to run it charged to those who are members of Nutcracker.

golf should be on a pay to play basis and should support itself on stand alone financial basis
Accessibility to Nutcracker might very well become as Pecan golf course, i.e., terribly crowded. The Golf Courses in Glen Rose have limited play. The best option for overflow play and tee times is the use of these two very desirable golf courses.

The Pecan course gets so much play and it would thin that out somewhat. Plus the option of two courses would be incredible. I am so in favor of this.

Will the Nutcracker still be a "private club" or open to all residents. Until that question is answered it seems to me the question is irrelevant to those of us who are currently members of Nutcracker

We would agree to Option 1 if there wasn't an additional assessment for usage. A compromise would be to have an assessment to purchase and then a change of by-laws to allow charging the actual users of the golf courses to pay green fees. We are adamantly opposed to paying for the green fees of members that can well afford to pay to play golf.

The main thing I like about Nutcracker is it doesn't have Bobby White or the Pecan MGA running it. This is a golfing community. The present is already overcrowded and this will get worse since a large number of new members will be moving in soon. One overcrowded course will discourage home sales and lead to less enjoyment by owners.

We already have a golf course. There are plenty of golf courses in the area people can go to. I will not support or pay for people who are cheap and want an additional free place to play. The solution to lack of available tee times on our current golf course is obvious. Charge people, even if just a little, to play on our course. People won't play every day if it costs them $10-15 a round.

I think we need an additional 18 golf course for Pecan. Maybe Pecan should consider building another 18 holes and leave the Nutcracker to operate independent. If Pecan had an additional 18 hole golf course, I would drop-out of the Nutcracker. The only reason that I am a member is that I can get a tee time when I want it. Its almost impossible at Pecan at this time. Also, if Pecan decides to build ........I bet the purchase price of the Nutcracker would come down.

change the current by-laws and have a user pay system

Build a new golf course and leave nutcracker alone

This is a dumb idea which continues to surface....Purchasing Nutcracker does absolutely nothing to increase golf course capacity since it already has a full membership. Additionally, those who already are Nutcracker members have a financial investment in that club plus monthly dues. Please explain how that could be handled in a fair and equitable manner. Explain how tees times would be handled for current Nutcracker members. Would there be preferential tee times or would current Nutcracker members have to get in line with everyone else for tee times? This whole scenario is fraught with problems while not increasing golf capacity...ridiculous idea! And an idea which we would fight hard with other members to keep from passing. Additionally, from a financial perspective it would be more feasible to buy the land for a new golf course from the developer and forget about buying Nutcracker...at least there would not be an ongoing annual maintenance cost of $500,000 after the purchase was made.

golf should be an option - pay if you use it , nothing if you don't. Make the pro and staff earn the players usage - should not be mandatory. Just like the restaurant - it does not break even when run as an amenity. Needs to be run as a business - which it should be..

Build on 200 acres per ageement

PPOA is likely to receive the most favorable location for the donated 200 acres of land if PPOA agrees to purchase the Nutcracker Golf Club. If we purchase Nutcracker will there still be another golf course built on the 200 acres?If not then what would Pecan do with the acreage? The above explanation makes it sound like there will be a new golf course built even if we purchase the Nutcracker course. Maybe we should look into using some of the current excess funds (say halve) and reduce the 9.95 amount per member. Is the increase per member number or household member?
Similar to the way other special interest groups pay to play, think marina and barn, I believe if more golf capacity is needed then member fees should be used to support that amenity.

I don't golf and don't want to pay for another golf course. Change the bylaws to require additional membership and dues for a new course or purchase of nutcracker. Build a fitness club.

I favor a new golf course. As a member of Nutcracker Golf Club I enjoy the ease of getting tee times and the uncongested course. A third golf course would spread play more evenly.

Amenities are great but PPOA fees are too high. I would prefer to see the primary financing for new amenities coming from those members who use them.

members who use this amenity should pay for it. Don't play golf anymore, why should I have to pay for others to play. Do we get our initiation fee back from Nutcracker

Would like whatever option would include gym access

If PPOA bought this, what would change other than everyone have to pay more?

Only a few people use golf facilities regularly. We would be making a very expensive investment primarily for the benefit of perhaps 200 somewhat bored members. The current facilities attract new members sufficiently.

Why would you need another Pro. Wouldn't this be the same as having a 36 hole course.

We would support the capital expenders only if the by laws were changed and all of the amenity operating and capital replacments were cover by user fees

I do not believe that a $20+ increase in assessments is acceptable to a majority of the residents and could be a hardship to some. We should explore a longer term note to lower the monthly assessment. We should also explore any possible economies of scale in combining the two operations.

Selfishly, I like that I can easily get tee times at Nutcracker now. I doubt this will be the case if everyone in Pecan has access

In our estimation, this is the least expensive method to acquire an additional golf course.

We have excellent golf facility already and would like to see improvements to them if that's the need, not more. Many at Pecan do not golf, costs above current costs should be assessed to golfers, not general population.

Nutcracker is nice as a private club. Acquisition by Pecan would make it too busy to get a tee time and we would be forced to pay for it.

Change the agreement to charge for golf to the people that use it. Let the developer build another course so he can sell lots.

I wish Nutcracker to remain private. Tee times a HUGE issue at Pecan.

I'm all for another golf course but I don't want my dues greatly affected by it

I feel like the Nutcracker is already available to those who want to pay to use it. In this plan everyone pays, not just golfers. Note: I am a golfer. Although it would be nice to be able to play Nutcracker for free, I don't feel its worth an increase in fees and/or draining reserves.

this would preclude having to build fitness center. nutcracker center could be expanded as needed. would be much cheaper than building a new one and would make purchase of nutcracker much more attractive.

If you want the facility, change the by-laws to a membership only status. Just as you are offering for the fitness facility. That way only the members using it will be paying assessment.

Those that want this should do the paying. Those not wanting or interested should not be charged any money to support someone else's interests. You want it, you pay for it otherwise leave everyone else alone.

We are not in favor of purchasing Nutcracker but very much in favor of additional new golf course being built!
I do not want an open ended $11.80 a month added to my monthly dues. I don't play golf, but I do think it will add value to the subdivision.

What will happen to the membership initiation fees already paid by members?

It is already difficult to get tee times at Nutcracker, and would become increasingly so.

I think we should buy it and then expand the fitness center rather than build a stand alone one. / I currently cannot get a tee time on weekends at pecan and as a result have to golf elsewhere.

We like the limited access on Nutcracker / We are also using and enjoying the deal with Squaw Valley

I would like us to build 3rd golf course. Buying Nutcracker would probably kill that for a long time. Since I am current member of Nutcracker, what will such members recoop for their membership?

We must continue to improve the amenities available to members, both in number and in quality, to sustain the high quality of life here at Pecan, as our membership continues to grow.

I prefer to keep this as a separate membership

I will strongly support either purchase option but using current excess capital assets would be my 1st choice. The interest rate appears high in today market, and having excess funds lying around spurs unwise spending requests.

There is no reason for the current members to pay for the increase in golf capacity. As intended by the LENMO II agreement, the new members should bear the cost and this can be done by simply increasing the initiation fee to the level required. Your numbers indicate we need some $525k to buy and operate Nutcracker. Thus we need to raise the fee by $1750 assuming we resell 300 houses per yr.. This still leaves us $1500 below de Cordova and we will have 2 courses and they one.

We do not used the golf courses and we don't want to pay more assessments for something we do not use

Utilize Squaw Valley for additional golf demand

Those who use the golf course should pay for it's operating costs

I realize that other members use the golf amenities that are conveniently located in Pecan. Unfortunately, I am not one of those members. I am not retired and have to work. I would like to see some money spent on other amenities since we just had all the greens re-done in the last 24 months. I would like to see a bike/hiking trail...somewhere my children and other children could use rather than trying to ride on the roads with some really unfriendly and speeding drivers. It is very dangerous and there apparently is no police presence in the evenings and at night when driver's seem to be speeding the most. I think we need to provide a place for the children before an accident happens.

Keep the 25$ at glen rose also

My husband plays golf on the rare occasion he has time, but not that often to justify the monthly cost.

NUTCRACKER ALREADY HAS A WORKOUT FACILITY FOR WHICH I PAY ALMOST $40 PER MONTH. WOULD THAT STILL BE CHARGED? IT WOULD BE OKAY WITH ME AND WOULD THOSE CHARGES OFFSET SOME OF THE NEW CHARGES?

Would reduce my cost to play the Nutcracker over $170 per month. Downside is loss of exclusivity and increased play on the Nutcracker. I plan to belong to the Nutcracker regardless of the option selected by the committee.

Can not seem to manage efficiently the current amenities.

As a current member of Nutcracker I don't want a lot of new players filling up the tee times at Nutcracker. Ease of use at Nutcracker is a big plus.

We can play golf whenever we want at the Cracker now, buying the course by ppoa would not benefit us as to playing whenever we want.

I want this to remain an independent dues paying club in order to limit excess membership.

There are other things that need to be done with the funds in Pecan before another golf course is
bought!!!!!!

Nutcracker should remain a private course.

Probably do not want to deplete the excess capital reserves, so perhaps a slightly higher monthly would leave some pad for unexpected needs.

There are a lot of questions not answered here. Like what is the impact on other reserve fund projects? While we don’t charge green fees, the trail fees took a big hit this year. How will that be impacted by adding Nutcracker? If we add Nutcracker, will we still go for the additional course next year to get the aforementioned land donation? I assume that will require another assessment much larger than this one. I think there should be a lot more transparency here.

PPOA should build a new course and not purchase Nutcracker.

I believe there are more pressing matters in Pecan, such as traffic and road safety issues.

Having three courses for use in Pecan would insure ample courses for future development and increase our property values like the option of using Squaw Valley.

The actual increase in capacity (premium tee times) will only be about 25-30 percent so not a good community investment.

People that feel the need for additional opportunities to play golf should plan their Tee Times in advance or join the Nutcracker Course at their expense and not burden the entire membership for their personal desires.

Cost should be offset by individuals that use it.

Golfers should bear at least some of the cost of the purchase and operating expenses, likely an additional trail fee for Nutcracker.

It will over load Nutcracker because everyone would be a member. I paid to join so I could get better tee times. This will eliminate that benefit. Will PPOA repay my $1500? We need the third course but not by buying Nutcracker.

I came to Pecan because of the equestrian center. There are already great golfing benefits. You could definitely strengthen your other areas instead of increasing the cost for members who may not even golf.

Not interested in an increase in dues plus a per use fee to golf at the Nutcracker.

I want the fitness center or a fitness center but am not interested in the golf course.

Honestly, how many golf courses do you really need in a land area of 4800 acres?

Will add richly to the attractiveness of living in Pecan. Demand will increase and property values will follow.

I always have concerns about using all reserves. Then when you have another emergency, you still face the need for an assessment. Having reserve funds to me is very important. We are new to PP but understand that playing golf at the Pecan Plantation CC is difficult if you desire an early morning or late day tee time during the summer or later morning or early afternoon in the cooler months. But I have been told that other tee times are readily available. If the high demand tee times are made available to all requests equally, which I have also been told is questionable, then golfers just need to bear with the demand. I do not think that funds and/or reserves should be spent on one interest when supposedly there are still time slots available. We do have the opportunity to join Nutcracker if we cannot live with the fact that we may not always get the exact tee time we would prefer.

supportive, only if Nutcracker is run on same basis as PPOA course -- meaning no separate private membership. If Nutcracker (after purchase) would remain "private", I would withdraw my support to purchase.

No increased golf capacity should be paid for an increased assessment for all members. Golfers should
We are satisfied with our present use of the golf facilities, as we are not avid golfers, so the additional amenity seems unnecessary to us personally.

I am not a golfer but do support the golf course as an amenity. However, from what I hear from the membership is that certain people always have access to the best T times leaving people who are moving in now no access to a decent T time. Afternoons are always open but apparently no one wants those because of the heat. It is not fair for people who have lived here for years to be able to play everyday at the good T times. There needs to be a system where members have to share in a schedule of some kind. We have grown too big to have certain members hog the good times "because they have always had them." I don't think we need another golf course. It is entirely too expensive to make those of us who do not play golf look at an enormous raise in HOA fees. If you want another golf course make it one that can be joined for a reasonable fee. From what I have gathered one can be had for about $25 a month from those who want to play it.

I am not a golfer but do support the golf course as an amenity. However, from what I hear from the membership is that certain people always have access to the best T times leaving people who are moving in now no access to a decent T time. Afternoons are always open but apparently no one wants those because of the heat. It is not fair for people who have lived here for years to be able to play everyday at the good T times. There needs to be a system where members have to share in a schedule of some kind. We have grown too big to have certain members hog the good times "because they have always had them." I don't think we need another golf course. It is entirely too expensive to make those of us who do not play golf look at an enormous raise in HOA fees. If you want another golf course make it one that can be joined for a reasonable fee. From what I have gathered one can be had for about $25 a month from those who want to play it.

I live alone and do not use the club much anymore. I only play bridge, and Newcomers Club. I have had a stroke so I stay home a lot. I have lost two husbands and a daughter sense I moved here. I can barely pay my bills now.

This should help balance the load of players to two clubs.

Though I have little time now, I look at the long term value of the purchase and it’s potential for positive impact on the community. The advantages of owning far exceed renting...

This would be a drastic and unjustified change to the Home Owner Association that all bought into. This would require all to pay for more free golf of the few golfers. Other Golf courses are open to golfers. They have to pay to play though and that is the "rub". They want others to pay for them. Not good justification. And consider the negative side by considering what would result if suddenly all of Pecan was made free. Who would be attracted to come. Consider how quickly the community would change and how quickly Pecan would go down. The same rational applies to those that would be attracted to Pecan for free golf.

The increase in the assessment is necessary, however a little high.

I do not feel that purchasing the Nutcracker Golf Course would alleviate the capacity issue since all prime tee times are already taken.

I am not a golfer but I would use a fitness center/gym at or near the PAC.

We seem to have a lot of ongoing repairs & replacements to maintain our current assets. Therefore, I am curious that there is excess capital asset reserve funds to draw from for this funding. I would need more information about rather the availability to play would be better by buying Nutcracker versus adding a third course. Nutcracker versus adding a third course.

With the amt. of people moving into Pecan, it will become impossible to get a tee time unless we have another golf course. Also, will use Nutcracker because it is closer to my home.

Nutcracker is a horrible design. Turned a bulldozer loose in a pecan orchard and called it a golf course.

i'm not sure about the constant increase of dues in the future. i, like others, have lived here many years and in the near future i would like to retire here. i'm sure if dues constantly increase, like in Washington, i might have to lose my dream of living here for the rest of my life.

/ i'm kinda indifferent

I thought I read somewhere that the actual cost for the Nutcracker purchase was 5 million

We are in favor of any of these. We both golf and it is difficult to get tee times at PPC.

We already have a golf course. We don't need any more golf courses. The golf course we have already costs too much to operate & there is a reduced demand for golfing across the United States.
| Let GOLFERS pay for it, we don't golf. Need bike lanes. There are people here that do other sports other than golf. Would be safer for children & walkers too. Why should we have to pay for amenity only golfers use; there is another group of residence here. NO MORE GOLF STUFF. Should be more family friendly. This is NOT a residence for just Seniors anymore! /
| We must have new golf facilities. The Pecan course is too crowded causing most of my rounds to be five hours long. This obviously indicates that golf is the foremost amenity and needs more facilities to support the thing that draws people to Pecan. |
| I prefer the Nutcracker Golf Club to remain optional. I play golf there 3-4 times each week. If PPOA should purchase it, overcrowding would occur. I like it the way it is! |
| How about a monthly fee for golfers who elect to play Nutcracker. Maybe $25.00 to $30.00 per month. Also a trail fee. |
| I have been a member since Nutcracker was first started. |
| All amenities are important as well as keeping up with projected growth within Pecan. |
| Would we have to operate 2 pro shops? It may be different if they were closer together and only would need 1 pro shop. |
| I know that some of my monthly dues goes to support the golf course (at least I think so). This helps my property value. However, I haven't seen anything that shows that there is an increased property value associated with increased golf capacity. No one in my family plays golf so our only interest in it is the affect it has on our property value. |
| Purchasing Nutcracker Golf Course from the developer does not benefit the entire Pecan Plantation community |
| This will save money for all golfers who are currently members of Nutcracker. There are many advantages to it being under the PPOA umbrella. |
2. What is the reason(s) for your responses to the questions above? Additional Golf Course - Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Golf Course - Other</td>
<td>Many of our members are approaching an age where they may not be able to play golf. This decision needs to be studied more and reconsidered in 3 or 4 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why force someone to participate?</td>
<td>An amenity benefiting only a few of Pecan Plantation members, other options are available at ZERO cost to Membership. If golfers want it, allow them to increase their own dues to pay for it. Then we will see how many are willing to pay for their pleasure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The undefined location for the new golf is disturbing.</td>
<td>I don't believe that the membership will approve another &quot;free&quot; golf course. Is there any consideration of a much reduced fee to buy the Nutcracker &amp;/ or build a 3rd course with a modest participation by PPOA? Interest rates are VERY LOW at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost of water access would be very expensive.</td>
<td>I think given the current median age of the golfers at Nutcracker and Pecan, there will be less demand on golf in the future and more on other types of amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are not golfers - do not plan to be</td>
<td>Anthony's will not provide a decent location for a golf course. Should be an executive course. perhaps only 9 hole. No ponds and no sand reduce operating cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need this 3rd course.</td>
<td>Developer should build the course free to get the extra money for lots. This is a good choice if the purchase of Nutcracker is not accomplished. Purchasing Nutcracker course is the best option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We could set up a rainy-day fund to prevent future increases in our assessments.</td>
<td>I might be for it if the course is added as part of the program we have now, it would probably be necessary to raise the cost of our monthly bill, but if the course is going to be separate, such as the Nutcracker is now, and we have to pay extra dues to play it, I will be against it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We don't use the golf courses</td>
<td>2 courses are enough if we maintain them well and more is a waste of water. Either build a new one or purchase Nutcracker. Nutcracker purchase is first choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need this course.</td>
<td>Reallocate the funds to new members, especially those whose homes will be located on the new course. Don't play golf at all!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again, too many existing infrastructure projects that could be worked and we could set up a rainy-day fund to prevent future increases in our assessments.</td>
<td>We do not play golf. pecan golf mgt. does not take care of the existing facility. I would rather purchase the Nutcracker course. If in the future we need a 3rd course, address it then. I do not think it is wise to borrow and/or use reserve funds to acquire 2 golf courses at the same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not cost effective. If additional golf is truly needed to make more fair for Pecan members, best option is to purchase Nutcracker from developer. This would also allow use of fitness facility. Other amenities besides golf need to be researched AND the marina areas and storage are a mess. Embarrassing to have</td>
<td>Not cost effective. If additional golf is truly needed to make more fair for Pecan members, best option is to purchase Nutcracker from developer. This would also allow use of fitness facility. Other amenities besides golf need to be researched AND the marina areas and storage are a mess. Embarrassing to have...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecan name on that.</td>
<td>If Nutcracker is bought I see no need for another course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Nutcracker is bought I see no need for another course.</td>
<td>Our funds need to be directed to the ongoing drainage problem in Pecan. Spring rains will be here soon and not real excited about anything that would flood my home for a possible third time in 14 years. This is completely outrageous to even consider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our funds need to be directed to the ongoing drainage problem in Pecan. Spring rains will be here soon and not real excited about anything that would flood my home for a possible third time in 14 years. This is completely outrageous to even consider.</td>
<td>If not an 18 hole course, an executive course would help alleviate the overcrowding of the current Pecan course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not an 18 hole course, an executive course would help alleviate the overcrowding of the current Pecan course.</td>
<td>Our fees have increased $20+ since we moved here. We do not golf. I do not want to be forced to pay for an amenity for others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our fees have increased $20+ since we moved here. We do not golf. I do not want to be forced to pay for an amenity for others.</td>
<td>Destroy more open space, cut more trees, kill more deer. Why do people move here, to play golf or is it because of the open areas, the trees and the deer. What are you thinking? On top of which, as previously discussed, we need another golf course like Custer needed more indians...The Wall Street Journal recently reported on the declining membership at golf clubs and subsequent increase in bankruptcies. Why would we want to sink money into a dying sport when we have nine courses already in the Granbury area, not counting Ft. Worth or other surrounding areas such as Stephenville and Glen Rose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destroy more open space, cut more trees, kill more deer. Why do people move here, to play golf or is it because of the open areas, the trees and the deer. What are you thinking? On top of which, as previously discussed, we need another golf course like Custer needed more indians...The Wall Street Journal recently reported on the declining membership at golf clubs and subsequent increase in bankruptcies. Why would we want to sink money into a dying sport when we have nine courses already in the Granbury area, not counting Ft. Worth or other surrounding areas such as Stephenville and Glen Rose.</td>
<td>Buying Nutcracker is a much better alternative!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying Nutcracker is a much better alternative!</td>
<td>See as previous comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See as previous comment.</td>
<td>must have more tee times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>must have more tee times</td>
<td>Pecan does not need 3 golf courses. New construction always costs more than what is budgeted, which would increase the proposed amounts estimated to be paid by each Pecan household per month whether they play golf or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecan does not need 3 golf courses. New construction always costs more than what is budgeted, which would increase the proposed amounts estimated to be paid by each Pecan household per month whether they play golf or not.</td>
<td>All lots built around any new golf course should have a portion of the purchase price applied to the construction bank loan to defray costs. The course should also have annual dues for those that use the course to defray operating costs. There are a number of way amenities can be added but most importantly members that use these new amenities should bear a greater share of the associated costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All lots built around any new golf course should have a portion of the purchase price applied to the construction bank loan to defray costs. The course should also have annual dues for those that use the course to defray operating costs. There are a number of way amenities can be added but most importantly members that use these new amenities should bear a greater share of the associated costs.</td>
<td>Oppose increase in assessment for an amenity this household does not use (current golf course, Nutcracker, or proposed new build). Also, the proposed site is unknown at this time (to members).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose increase in assessment for an amenity this household does not use (current golf course, Nutcracker, or proposed new build). Also, the proposed site is unknown at this time (to members).</td>
<td>Maintance is overstated dramatically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintance is overstated dramatically.</td>
<td>There is no need to carry a big debt for a no need amenity .. not now, not for a long time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no need to carry a big debt for a no need amenity .. not now, not for a long time.</td>
<td>While I will not be using this amenity, as I am now unable to play golf, I do think ADDING 18 holes in Pecan will increase my property values. The purchase of Nutcracker will not add new holes, while it will reduce the cost to a select few. I will add that I was a member of Nutcracker for many years, until I had to give up playing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While I will not be using this amenity, as I am now unable to play golf, I do think ADDING 18 holes in Pecan will increase my property values. The purchase of Nutcracker will not add new holes, while it will reduce the cost to a select few. I will add that I was a member of Nutcracker for many years, until I had to give up playing.</td>
<td>Again. We already have a golf course. In fact there are two. If the shared expense course is not acceptable, use the private one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again. We already have a golf course. In fact there are two. If the shared expense course is not acceptable, use the private one.</td>
<td>If done properly this could be a huge asset to Pecans HOA. The added HOA increase still leaves Pecan one of the best values in the nation and would help to set us up as such for years to come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If done properly this could be a huge asset to Pecans HOA. The added HOA increase still leaves Pecan one of the best values in the nation and would help to set us up as such for years to come.</td>
<td>This is something Anthonys should do so they could get more for lots around the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is something Anthonys should do so they could get more for lots around the course.</td>
<td>The infrastructure cannot handle another golf course. Let's go outside Pecan and build a Pecan Plantation Resort....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The infrastructure cannot handle another golf course. Let's go outside Pecan and build a Pecan Plantation Resort....</td>
<td>Purchasing Nutcracker would be my most desired choice. However, if that does not happen, I would like the additional course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing Nutcracker would be my most desired choice. However, if that does not happen, I would like the additional course.</td>
<td>Aren't two...that's one....TWO (2)... golf courses enough? This decaying, 1980's appearance community desperately needs many other improvements before even considering offering yet another expensive, unneeded golf course to the basket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aren't two...that's one....TWO (2)... golf courses enough? This decaying, 1980's appearance community desperately needs many other improvements before even considering offering yet another expensive, unneeded golf course to the basket.</td>
<td>No need for (3) 18 hole golf courses in PP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pecan need another 18 golf course.

change the current by laws and have a user pay system

Third golf course is needed but don't want another situation like road & bridge assessment which was supposed to expire when loan was paid but did not. Amount of monthly assessment was continued and rolled into operational expenses. Also want a detailed explanation of ongoing high maintenance expenses because there should be some synergy of expenses and equipment/personnel with multiple golf course maintenance.

Needs to be treated as a business,

I think the operating costs, if they include a golf pro, could be reduced. A pro is not needed as proven by Nutcracker. There just needs to be someone who can run tournaments and the front desk. Do not need a large clubhouse either, just somewhere people can sign in and possibly a small grill or somewhere to get something to drink.

see below

Purchasing Nutcracker is a more practical option.

See comment on prior question.

We would like to have biking paths.

If it is determined that additional golfing facilities are needed in addition to Nutcracker I would like us to build a 9 hole executive golf course.

The by-laws should be changed to allow PPOA to charge a user fee for any new amenities acquired after a set date. This would require the same number of votes as approving a special assessment fee would require. The proposal to build a new golf course would receive many more votes if the membership knew the golfers would be paying the cost through user fees.

Why do we need two Pros? These assessments never go away.

It makes very little sense to build a third golf course at a cost of $5M when a perfectly good existing underutilized golf course can be purchased for $2M. Over time the Nutcracker course can be enhanced if desired.

slow time line to benefit

It would be more equitable to charge the members who use the golf facilities a green fee and not require property owners who do not use the facility to subsidize the operation of the course

Golfers/users should pay more if want more facilities or upgrades beyond normal expected or reasonable, and should not be assessed by general population

If people want additional golf options beyond what is currently offered, they can join Nutcracker like those of us who are currently members.

I would vote this way ONLY IF the Nutcracker option is not passed.

See previous comments

This is too expensive to add on to my monthly dues.

not a sensible alternative to purchasing nutcracker

We do not need this many golf clubs in this community.

You want it, you pay for it; leave everyone not interested out of it.

Same reason on monthly $11.40 as prior comment section.

I don't think PPOA needs two additional courses. Purchase of the Nutcracker is our most cost effective way to add additional capacity. Eventually we may need the third course and at that time we can make decisions based on the costs associated with the third course.

It seems the cost of new projects is always 50% or more higher than projected. If management projects $5M for a new course, you can bet it will be at least $6.5 or more. Too many design flaws in the last golf course improvement that had to be slowly remedied. Deal with designer and builder SHOULD have contained clause for corrections in design at their cost, not ours. Bad negotiating skills on the part of our management.
management. It won’t get better any time soon.

I prefer buying the Nutcracker because it is close by; it is a good golf course and it has good amenities. I just don’t think building a new golf course would be acceptable by the membership and I think our increase in the number of golfers can wait during the developing and building time frame.

We need to strike a bargain with Anthoneys for a discounted price for Nutcracker. Having Anthoney withhold land he has promised, so we will pay a premium for Nut leaves me cold. We should investigate buying property across the river to build our new golf course and let him choke on Nutcracker. Once all lots are sold, we can buy it. We should then ask if members want it and for what price.

As our population grows, we must keep pace with this type of amenity.

I strongly believe that the Developer will build at least a 9 hole course, which will provide adequate golf facilities for a build out of 4500 lots on the assumptions of residents age and percentage who play golf.

The developer should, and I believe will, build the 3rd course as he needs golf course lots to make future development financially possible. And it was the intent of LENMOII.

We do not use the golf courses and do not want to pay more every month for something we do not use. Purchase Nutcracker first and assess the need for a third.

By the time a new golf course is built, I will probably not be playing enough to justify the cost.

For the same reasons I listed previously.

not needed if we purchase the Nutcracker. Experience says once a special assessment is approved, they do not expire when they are supposed to. The assessment remains even when the debt is paid.

I PREFER PURCHASING NUTCRACKER, BUT THIS IS AN ALTERNATIVE IF WE CANNOT PURCHASE NUTCRACKER. DOUBT THE MEMBERSHIP IN WHOLE WOULD BE WILLING TO PAY THESE ADDITIONAL DUES

Take the property and wait until we have Nutcracker paid off to start building.

Can’t seem to manage efficiently the current amenities.

Prefer to have Nutcracker as a second course.

I am supportive, but, even as a golfer myself, I thing this new course should be funded only by golf members.

I believe there are more pressing matters in Pecan, such as traffic and road safety issues.

If PPOA members want to play golf at another course they need to join Nutcracker individually or play other area courses. Pecan residences should not have to purchase or build another golf course.

like the option of using Squaw Valley golf facilities

Same as previous question.

The Nutcracker option is much more favorable in every way. It’s cheaper to buy and is a great course, especially for older or high handicap golfers.

Take too long to complete and would not be available for me to utilize for a long time.

If we buy the Nutcracker why would we need 3rd golf course?

Again, how many golf courses do you really need in a land area of 4800 acres?

Time to get it built and have mature greens are two negative factors for me.

supportive, only if additional course is “executive length”. This would draw super seniors, juniors, higher handicap golfers from PPOA and Nutcracker (thereby freeing up many tee times on championship length courses).

If the Nutcracker course is purchased, I don’t believe we need to build a 3rd course at this time.

User fees should be an important part of any plans for additional golf facilities.

I am not a golfer but do support the golf course as an amenity. However, from what I hear from the membership is that certain people always have access to the best T times leaving people who are moving in now no access to a decent T time. Afternoons are always open but apparently no one wants those because of the heat. It is not fair for people who have lived here for years to be able to play
everyday at the good T times. There needs to be a system where members have to share in a schedule of some kind. We have grown too big to have certain members hog the good times "because they have always had them." I don't think we need another golf course. It is entirely too expensive to make those of us who do not play golf look at an enormous raise in HOA fees. If you want another golf course make it one that can be joined for a reasonable fee. From what I have gathered one can be had for about $25 a month from those who want to play it.

I will not be able to use it.

It makes more sense to purchase an existing course!

Purchase of Nutcracker is much more efficient and should satisfy the golf needs of this community for the foreseeable future

As the number of retirees increase in the community and golfers from outside the community wish to play, there will be a need for extra capacity on the courses. In addition, were the course to be of professional quality and standing, there is always the potential for PGA consideration.

Buy the Nutcracker course and we will not need a new course.

Adding Golf Course(s) would be an unjustified change to the Home Owner Association that we all bought into. The benefit would flow to the Developer and the Golfers at the expense of all. This would force all, Gofers or not, to make available more Free golf for those who play. What is wrong with paying one’s own way? There are other courses available. And who would it attract to Pecan. I submit it would attract individuals who want someone else to pay their way. I further submit this would bring about undesirable changes to the community and lower property values. For illustration consider what would happen to Pecan if it was made free to all who come. Who would come? Who would leave? What is free?

We don’t need another golf course. One can go to the current course on any given afternoon and play. If morning times are an issue, stop allowing LGA/MGA to shut down the course multiple mornings a week (i.e. try better management).

Why build one, when you can buy one.

NO MORE GOLF COURSES THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

My husband and I would use the amenity if available but I think put on the shelf and come back to it after a few years after Nutcracker has been purchased and under PP operation. Nutcracker is ready to go and operational. Give people time to enjoy golf and amenities there then see if we still need a 3rd course. The first 2 assessments will be enough for people to handle for a while without adding $20 more on top of that. It will take a couple of years to get the course planned, built and then fully operational, but we will be paying the assessment. Just a thought!

We must have one of the golf course options on this survey. I would use them both if made available and be willing to pay the charges indicated on this survey on my monthly dues. The Nutcracker is a fine course and is ready......BUY IT. We can build another course later.

All amenities are important and to keep up with projected growth of Pecan.

I know that some of my monthly dues goes to support the golf course (at least I think so). This helps my property value. However, I haven't seen anything that shows that there is an increased property value associated with increased golf capacity. No one in my family plays golf so our only interest in it is the affect it has on our property value.
**3. Please share any comments you have about the potential golf options:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If members in general want more golf courses, it would seem to me that it would be self supporting to charge greens fees and/or levy a fee with the Mens/Womens Golf association to play the new course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we could use Nutcracker without paying for Pecan &amp; Nutcracker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I realize that Pecan was set up as a golfing retirement community but we have a lot of folks who do not golf and we have a lot of existing infrastructure that needs to be taken care of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My main interest in acquiring Nutcracker is to have access to the gym. Not a good idea. How about more dining options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of the Nutcracker makes more sense to me since it is an established course with its pro shop and work out facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you say increased property values and no waiting on the tee box! The members that play golf should be the ones to pay for this amenity through green fees. An amendment to the by-laws should be proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the utilization on Glen Rose Golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need another golf course in Pecan. Both courses are very busy at this time and good tee times are hard to get. As more homes are built we will most definitely need another course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the purchase of Nutcracker isn’t acceptable and in place of building a 18 course, could a 9 hole be added along with a &quot;Par 3&quot; nine hole course for a much lower costs? There also needs to be a teaching facility near the driving range. We need to save capital, if at all possible, for emergencies. For what is offered at Pecan, we should be paying $175.00 per month for HOA fees. We don’t pay city property taxes which would be around .40%. On a $300,000 home that means $1,200. By increasing by around $50 per month we are still half of what city property tax would cost. I could see that once you turn full social security benefit (age 66 currently) that your fees go down 10%. Anyone 72 or older has their HOA fees frozen. There needs to be an incentive for those with worries about income late in life to feel positive about this proposal. I concerned with taking over Nutcracker for centralized pro shop, i.e. starter. I thought I read in my HOA convents that after so many homes the HOA has to build additional golf course. I am extremely positive about this amenity needing to be upgraded and soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you think you have to have one, it makes more sense to buy the Nutcracker. No use in taking up more land and reinventing the wheel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 courses not enough for number of residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing an already existing Golf Course makes sense.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much, too quick. Buy Nutcracker, pay for it and then consider new course. 3rd course needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would propose a 9 hole course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the golfing community really wants another course, they should pay for it ala The Nutcracker course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either way is fine with me because we need additional tee-times and it is getting harder every year to get even close to the time you want or even get a time. If we purchased Nutcracker it would happen quicker but still have a problem fighting for tee-times with the present members of Nutcracker...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a new golf course is wanted let the golfers have a bake sale to raise money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We definitely need more access to be able to obtain tee times and not run by a computer as computers are operated by humans. Every member should be able to obtain a tee time not by who is who but as a pecan member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like having Nutcracker as private and easy to get tee time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We are not golfers - do not plan to be - have no wish to contribute financially to golfers and their amenities - they can pay for all that without my "community" membership. We do enjoy the club, but are not active golfers, tennis players, swimmers, etc. & see no reason that the club must support those activities financially.

Have a independent entity develope & build a new golf course & charge like Nutcracker. Also the price for Nutcracker is to low. I doubt the developer would accept it.

Again, if you could get 500 members for the Nutcracker course, it would take some play away from Pecan, seems like a win win.

Ridiculous

The purchase of the Nutcracker gives a second course at a cheaper addition so i would be interested in that.

Not all PPOA members play golf (based on my experience the members that regularly play golf are far outnumbered by the members that do not regularly play golf), so if the current structure is not changed to allow the PPOA to recover costs associated with our number 1 out-of-pocket expense, we are really providing a form of "golf welfare".

Golf play is diminishing steadily as the membership ages and the young do not play. Such high expense for a less used asset is not good business. The present interim agreement with Squaw Valley is fine for the foreseeable future.

We have enough places to golf!

If would probably add a small amount to property values. Maybe 3 to 8%

Put up night lights for the driving range

At present, it is next-to-impossible to get a Pecan tee time. We feel adding a new course or buying Nutcracker might give us the option to actually play Pecan once in awhile. We also feel this addition would enhance the marketability of our property.

I prefer PPOA purchase Nutcracker first.

I live on the Nutcracker Golf course now and see many and many hours of the day that there is no one using this facility.. Why buy or build something that is not needed???

I do not golf. I probably will not learn to golf. I have no interest. I do not want to be forced to pay for another golf course.

Tee times are already difficult to get now, relief is needed ASAP. To support the number of people moving into the community, as a golf course community & baby boomers retiring at record numbers, more availability is needed. I approve an additional monthly assessment, but not the current separate membership as is the case with Nutcracker.

Desperately need to bring both courses under same umbrella plus the variety it offers all players - 36 different holes already in place!

as stated before, if you want to play at the Nutcracker you join and pay for the Nutcracker, and no additional golf course is needed to be built and no more assessment increases

We are a large community and growing. We need to keep amenities growing with the increase in population.

The Golfers want those of us who do not play golf to support their hobby. I will never agree to an increase in dues to supplement the pleasure of others. Sounds like some idea the democrats would come up with to provide extra benefits to a few at the expense of all.

See comments on pervious two questions. 1: Use the Squaw Creek option, as it cost the average member nothing. 2: Lighting the course for night time play would improve utilization at much cheaper cost than new golf course. Night play would prove popular as its cooler than days in summer.

I was under the impression that water would cost more if we built another course. If this is true, how can the operating cost be about the same?
We need to use our imagination and share the wealth, creating attractions for the multitudes who do not wish to play golf and are perhaps among the quickly growing multitudes who wish to spend their time doing something healthy. Another thing: we built a PAC which we hope is attractive to kids, and then the kids have to skate-board Plantation Drive to get to it. There are perfectly good business reason for Messrs. Anthony wanting to divest Nutcracker; we could, for once, just say no.

There is better ways to spend money than building golf courses. PP needs to invest in necessities for growing community. Road improvement, existing building rebuilt to meet the needs of PP.

I believe the purchase of Nutcracker would relieve the inability to get a tee time that you want.

Leave Nut Cracker alone!

See above. This is not the time to negotiate since the Anthony will have many lots in the area he has stripped of trees. Look into another developer.

Nutcracker purchase solves many problems - tee times - maintenance costs - equipment costs etc

I do believe Pecan needs another golf course, but not the Nutcracker, the Main club house should still be used for anyother course, just a small building with some golf stuff, balls, tees, etc., and maybe a place to get a snack and/or drinks. Also, if it is treated as another club with extra dues and having to join it, I would be against it, an increase in dues that would cover both Pecan and the new course would be OK, if it isn't overdone, it would not need another golf pro, just people behind the counter to check us in.

this option does not give us the best bang for our dollars

Either build a new course or purchase the Nutcracker. Of the two options, I would prefer we purchase the Nutcracker.

Without my bothering to research, I'm sure the by-laws require PPOA dues to be distributed evenly from all members, or otherwise prohibits new members or those with home/lot locations near the new course(s) being assessed more than those with less desirable lots. That said, my suggestion to do so may be void. At half the price, purchasing Nutcracker seems like the more prudent option. Unless the proposed new course would be just short of a North Central Texas' version of Pebble Beach, why would we bother? Is the capacity of the PPCC so overutilized that we need another course?

I no longer golf, but even when I was still playing, I would probably have voted "no". There's already a $20 per month charge to run your cart. Of course, if you don't have a cart it doesn't affect you. Take the same approach on the additional course. If you don't play golf, no increase.

Why don't you charge ONLY members that will use the facilities, instead of trying to charge all of us (non-users)?

I can hardly afford my PPOA monthly expense now. My only income is Soc. security.

Already have plenty of golf courses for pecan

Let's see..... 250 per month to join nutcracker golf and health or 25 dollars. The biggest hurdle will be scheduling play when it's available for all. I play golf very little any more but can usually play anytime there isn't something scheduled because I will join others but the foursome players will have issues.

The purchase of Nutcracker Golf Club would solve our immediate needs.

We moved into this community for the other amenities as we do not play golf.

I think purchasing the Nutcracker Course would be beneficial.

Realize that Pecan is primarily a golf community but many golf 'widows' and other members have many other interests. As all pay, make as available to all as possible in the most cost effective ways.

I don't think us that do not have an interest in golf should have to help pay for any more golf courses.

Shared earlier. What are you planning to do for people that have already paid a membership due to Nutcracker? Are new members going to be required to pay the $1500

We hardly golf at all so we would not want to pay for It.
Favorable to another course but users pay operating costs

Not everyone golfs at pecan plantation. We don’t need “NEED” other amenities before we think about another golf course. While the amenity may be a draw for a few, it is not on my radar. Have not ever use the golf course. I drive by the golf course and frequently see it empty. We do not need another course!

I don’t play golf and if my dues continue to rise, especially for something I don’t use, I’ll be forced to move from Pecan.

Persons using this amenity should pay green fees.

We need another golf course.

I do not hear anyone complaining that the golf course is too crowded. We do not need to spend this kind of money on an additional course. The users should pay for the cost. Change the bi-laws to allow this. Put that up for a vote and see if that would pass.

We need to focus on other amenities beside golf. What about purchasing some of the orchard and keeping it as a green area for others to enjoy. It sad to see the developers take out all the trees on Plantation to increase the foot print of new development. Part of what is attractive about Pecan is the park like setting.

Have you considered an Executive course instead of a full size course. I believe this would be very popular with the elderly residents as well as many of the lady golfers, not to mention those golfers that just want to go out for a couple of hours. Just a thought.

Buy nutcracker contingent on Lenard’s gift PPOA 200 acres for future third golf course. Otherwise just do the new course.

do not play golf

I don’t believe having an additional golf course will add value to community or property values.

I don’t play golf, but I recognize that these amenities are a strong appeal to people who are looking for a pace to retiree.

Could be supportive if bylaws were changed to allow charging greens fees to pay for it

We want another golf course but I believe it will take so long to build. By the time we are finished building the price of material will increase that buying Nutcracker will be the best option. Also two or three years to build and another two or three years to mature.

We hope that if a second course is added, that our current pro will not be in charge of it.

A new golf course would only be for the benefit of a small percentage of our community yet all members would pay more.

For non-golfers to have to pay an additional $40 +/- per month in assessment fees for 10 years for 2 additional golf courses seems very, very unfair to us.

we don’t need two new courses one would be sufficient.

We do not golf and Fees have already increased 18% since we moved in. I would resent paying for an amenity a small percentage use when they already have a golf course and access to another.

Really one golf course as an amenity is sufficient; I feel others can pay, as now, for an additional course

It’s ridiculous to have so many golf courses in one gated community!

Ridiculous. Young people are no longer attracted to “Golf”. It takes too long to play, any exercise is minimal and it is expensive (both to play and to the environment).

I don’t think the current usage warrants another golf course.

The arrangement with Squaw Valley is a very good temporary fix! But it is just a temporary fix for a long term problem that is only going to get worse.

Nutcracker is already there for everyone to use and the pecan mantance is right there by nutcracker

Golf is the major Amenity and property value enhancer in pecan. It is already stretched to capacity and with continued home construction, will result in severe overcrowding. Additional facilities are sorely
needed.

I believe that the new golf facilities would increase my property value some, but not enough to offset the increased cost of construction and operation. Therefore, there is no benefit to me as a PPOA member in the PPOA bearing the full cost.

I would just use Squaw Valley which is more economical than any option what about acquiring part of the nutcracker course and building the remaining

We support either option for golf course expansion.

I have an interest in playing golf at Pecan, but do not feel that a 3rd golf course is a prudent use of membership funds. Other forms of activity should be increased rather than adding another golf course. As stated before, exercise equipment is needed at the PAC so that Pecan residents do not have to pay for membership elsewhere (YMCA, Nutcracker, etc.).

Not any golfer

There is more to life on the plantation than golf !!

It’s too much burden for members to pay for all the expenses to build a new course or to purchase the Nutcracker. It will be a better option to individually volunteer(not mandatory) participate with Glen Rose or other nice course.

This is no longer exclusively a golf country club. We need more meeting rooms, redo the Terrace Room and Ballroom, the clubhouse needs reprinting, the front entrance needs to be redone, the back entrance needs to be spruced up, the marina needs work, we need a fishing pier extension at the marina, yard bowling, pickle ball courts, an exercise facility. The holders had the opportunity for access to two additional courses for only $25 per month and they turned it down because they did not want to pay the $25. They want the non-golfers to subsidize their hobby which will take away from the general needs of the entire community. If fees are increased they should think about subsidizing the salary of a more experienced chef.

The people that play golf have enough options.

Subsidizing golf outside of Pecan would be a great way to waste most of the members $$s. Again, for the select few. When the PPOA Board and the golfers voted to waste the $$s on the existing 18 holes, they may well have blocked additional holes in Pecan.

The current addition of the golf availability at Squaw Vaaley is an outstanding idea. Should this facility become available in the future, it would merit our interest in some undetermined manner.

I believe the Nutcracker purchase would be best option, it would be available for play as soon as deal is made and is lowest cost. Also, I would more strongly support the additional course option if we don't get Nutcracker Golf. This is mainly a golfing community and anything we do to improve golfing will help property values for all residents.

A third golf course would give us more options for playing.

see above

Needs to be maintained by someone other than the current course greens keeper and current pro to make it a more attractive addition. They are both to set in there ways. Need new blood.

Golf should not be free. There should be a user fee to support this activity

For the quality of life here in Pecan we are opposed to any changes that allow for seperation and or segeration of residents here (such as the new Nutcracker developoment). We have also been opposed to a seperate golf club here that is not under the control of Pecans HOA (existing Nutcracker).

The by-laws were written with one golf course in mind. Additional golf courses should be totally funded by user fees.

I only get to come every 2 weeks to our home in Pecan. Some people play EVERYDAY and there are no other options for us that are not there everyday. We pay the same fee's but get less choices.
A new golf course will take years to develop and be ready for use....with each year and unexpected set back the price tag goes up. Nutcracker is ready to absorb more play and would bring the Pecan family together.

If Nutcracker is NOT purchased, I would shift my interest to this project
As stated on the previous page.

If Nutcracker purchased, both courses should be closed for maintenance the same day to avoid an overload on the course that is open.

golf should exist on pay to play basis

The longer you wait on these options, the more expensive they will become. Do something now!
The infrastructure cannot handle another golf course. If the Nutcracker can be purchased without increase in fee then do it. Let's go find property outside Pecan and build a Pecan Plantation Resort and Theme Park.

The golfers that are currently using all the tee time will also hog the tee time on any additional course.
The best option is the agreement with the Squaw Valley Golf Courses in Glen Rose. These courses have limited play and are always in excellent condition. This is the best option to limit the financial burden of golf to those that desire to play. I am a golfer the prefers to pay and play Squaw Valley then incur a dues increase.

Would like an additional golf course, but cannot afford the increased assessment.
I am an avid golfer, so obviously having access to an additional course would be fantastic in my opinion. The cost would be very much worth for me.

I think we need to have another golf course. My preference would be to purchase nutcracker over building a new course.
Pecan and nutcracker are great courses. Being retired I can't keep paying another x dollars as no raises coming my way

I believe that the golf facilities should be supported by user fees.

no intrest at all

The ranges of both Pecan and Nutcracker should be part of the dues structure the same as Nutcracker is today. Also a range should be included at the new course an be utilized the same as th Nutcracker range.

WE HAVE ENOUGH GOLF COURSE AREA IN PECAN. THIS IS SUPPOSED TO BE A WONDERFUL RURAL HOMEOWNERS PLACE TO LIVE BUT IT IS BEGINNING TO BE TOO CONGESTED, TOO NOISEY & NOT AT ALL LIKE THE AREA SOME OF US CHOSE IN THE BEGINNING.

No additional options needed; the golfers have enough as it is.

It seems to me that if a new course is built in Pecan it doesn't necessarily have to be on "prime land" donated by the Anthonys. We shouldn't be held hostage to them. If land is available for purchase without having to purchase Nutcracker that's what should be done.

Three courses would jeopardise the financial health of all golf courses. Too few members to support the investment.
Pecan has two golf courses. I cannot afford increases in my dues for an amenity to which the residents already have available to them. Golfers can leave Pecan if they want to golf at other locations. I am also not sure how long the fees are applied to pay off notes, it seems forever.

As a dues paying member of Nutcracker you have not made it clear what would happen to my monthly dues or increased memberships impact on course access.

Change the by-law so that green fees are not free. Charge $10-20 and people won't abuse the amenity. There are plenty of places to play golf. the problem is people want to play for free and have all of PPOA members pay for it. That is wrong. There are more people who don't play golf than do.
Pecan needs an additional 18 hole course. In either case (purchase or build), I think it's going to very hard to increase the monthly dues. There are too many people that are not willing to pay for an amenity that they do not use. They don't play golf, eat at the club, use camp grounds, or anything else that we have at Pecan.

Part of the developers long range plan for several years. /

We have way too many people for one golf course. I don't regularly know 3 days in advance that I can play golf, so the golf course favors those who have nothing else to do. We need another one.

I am a current member of Nutcracker and for me Pecan buying Nutcracker and also building the new course would save me about $160/month if the increases are per member number and not per household member which is not clear in either of the proposals. Currently I pay $215/month to Nutcracker and it looks like both options together would only cost me about $51/month. What a bargain and I would have 3 courses to play on!!!!

Increasing golf capacity would appear to benefit a select group of members, ie: golfers. We believe that user fees should be charged to cover this expense.

We have two golf courses available - not all of pp residents play golf or use these facilities - I am one of them. I have no desire to play golf.

We have far more pressing concerns in this community than purchasing/constructing a new golf course. For example, traveling on Plantation between the front circle and Village has become a harrowing experience if you are in anything but a full size vehicle. We need a proper golf cart/bike path to run parallel to Plantation through this part of the orchard.

I think purchasing an existing golf course (Nutcracker) is the best way to go.

Build a fitness center we can workout in. Pay employees at the club more so we have better service. Let us walk for exercise on the golf trails. On prime rib nights make it a buffet and use tickets so we only get one serving of the steak. That way we might not have to wait two hours for dinner.

I would like to have the Nutcracker and an additional course for the amounts specified to purchase, to build another course and to maintain both. I believe we could then be the most attractive gated community around if we aren't already.

I live on the 2nd fairway of Pecan. I see very few golfers. I am of the opinion that the facilities we have are not used. I hear my friend's husbands say that Pecan is too hard to play and that they want a 9 hole course.

Nutcracker is a use friendly course and the cost is a lot less.

We will need three courses (due to usage) in the near future... Certainly by the time a new course could be built.

Nutcracker should be purchased before building a 3rd course. If Nutcracker lost membership to a second course it could lose substantial value and decrease property value. A third course would be nice. Probably the best option is reserves for 1 and a bank note for the other if the membership wants both.

Consider amending the bylaws to charge $5 per round

My #1 choice is to purchase Nutcracker. We need another golf course and as the population grows it will only get worse

I strongly support doing one of the two options (buy Nutcracker or build new course). We desperately need additional golf capacity and this need will continue to become more acute in the future if we do not take action now. A new course would provide the greatest increase in overall golfing capacity for PPOA and would be my first choice. However, purchasing Nutcracker would certainly help and could provide more immediate relief. Either way, I strongly support doing one or the other. I believe that the increase in monthly assessments for either option is more than offset by the increase in amenity availability and future property value.
Currently, most people do not move to Pecan Plantation because of golf. Golf is not an attractive sport to most young people. They are more interested in health and wellness - activities that keep the brain and body sharp.

I like the idea of purchasing Nutcracker and perhaps adding a 9 hole par 3 golf course.

I would support building a new golf course if I knew where it was going to be built. I see no benefit in buying Nutcracker for the PPOA. How does buying it change anything as far as increasing golf capacity for PPOA members?

Additional capacity is desperately needed.

The current facility attracts members. However, more golf would do very little to attract more. The primary problem is that the current users all want to play in the morning or are simply bored at playing the same course over and over. You need to count the actual users who play multiple rounds.

Purchasing Nutcracker will not provide enough additional capacity for golf access to support the needs of the golfing community. Adding a third golf course would greatly increase the access to golf by the golfing community and provide the developer with hundreds of additional lots along the fairways which can be higher value lots. / If we purchase Nutcracker and build a third course the combined assessment would still not exceed the cost of current membership at Nutcracker and other courses outside the community such as Harbor Lakes. / The current agreement with Squaw Valley is a great interim solution to the capacity issue for many in the community. This was a great win and the BOD and Golf Management are to be commended for it.

Where are you getting the additional water to maintain a new course.

I would only support a capital expenditure if the by laws were changed so that all current period and replacements cost were supplied by user fees

The Pecan golf course is currently too busy. An additional course would allow us to potentially host more tournaments for non-member groups and bring in additional revenue. I don't know that the community can support three golf courses at this time and the level of participation at Nutcracker would fall.

Golf and program offerings cost substantial amounts, fully unfair to make Pecan Plantation residents pay for something as many don't use as do in our community. Those who want to use should be willing to pay the extra costs for anything above normal

We need three golf courses for size of current community and growth.

I don't play golf

Change agreement to charge a reasonable fee to golf and or let the developer build a course. Also look at agreement with Glen Rose (they are apparently hurting for players)

I feel like golfers now can pay to use Nutcracker if they want to, and if we build a 3rd 'free" course to play, it will hurt Nutcracker membership.

No more needed

You want, you pay for it. Not interested at all. Prefer you spend money on security.

I don't think it is practical to buy the Nutcracker and exercise our option to take the acreage which will require that we build a new course in the immediate future.

I believe this this the only way to alleviate the strain on PP course. Buying Nutcracker will not solve the overcrowding.

We are growing in population and especially in the number of new comers who are golfers. The Squaw Valley program is helpful to relieve the lack of tee times; however, we cannot depend upon this program as a permanent fix.

I do not play golf. However, support for these initiatives is necessary to sustain our lifestyle here. Even though I support an increase in monthly assessments, we are so far below the usual monthly fee that
such an increase is not out of line.

I don't think we need three golf anytime soon. NutCracker would more immediately available for use (no construction time) and lower long term costs. I also would NOT like to empty our capital reserves because that would limit other possible and unforeseen improvements.

My fear in all of this is that the estimated golf course operation budget is too low. The Nutcracker is currently collecting something around $75,000. per month in golf membership fees now. They maintain the boundary areas in a far superior manner than PPOA does. Do we know what they spend on M & O? / My other concern is "water". PPOA must do a deal to obtain it's own water and delivery system. We will be "killed" in the future if this aspect is overlooked.

I have heard from some board members that the developer is apposed to initiation fee increases and would not agree--has anyone heard of negotiation. He wants and needs this more than we do. With no more member golf capacity it will become difficult to sell plain lots with just trees for enough to pay for the cost to develop. And if he doesn't approve take him to court!! He took us to court over the road impact fee and we won. Have some guts.

Could have purchase Nutcracker a few years back for much less. Both the Golf Pro and the golf committee convinced the BOD that this option would not add significant golf availability.

Those who use golf amenities should pay for them. Those who do not use such amenities should not have to pay for them at all. We were willing to move to PP under the current fee structure, which we find reasonably acceptable. However, being confronted with proposals for additional amenities that we would not use, along with increased fees, is neither reasonable nor acceptable.

So charge green fees -

I support a new golf course not the purchase of Nutcracker. Those of us who have bought memberships to Nutcracker would be subsidizing the non members since no mention was made to recovering our membership costs. Secondly we better build a new course to keep up with golfing needs of Pecan. Today tee times are difficult to obtain at the Pecan course. Today, Nutcracker gives us an option to the crowed Pecan course. Opening the Nutcracker course to the entire Pecan community will negate that option and in addition confiscate the monies we have expended to be Nutcracker members.

I suggest a vote to change the by laws so that there would be a small green fee for golfers. If there is a second golf course with no green fee, it will become overcrowded as well and then what?

ADDITIONALLY, GOLFERS ALSO PAY FOR OTHER AMENITIES WE DO NOT USE, BUT I AM HAPPY TO DO THAT AS IT IS GOOD FOR OUR COMMUNITY. I WONDER IF NON GOLFERS WILL FEEL THAT WAY.

Take the property and wait until we have Nutcracker paid off to start building.

Too much of an increase in dues.

I do play golf occasionally. I believe that the funds need to be used for other amenities first before another golf course is bought or built.

We prefer to see Nutcracker kept as a private club, even though its purchase would be less of an expense versus building a new course. We have not seen data showing why a second course is needed (such as, there are consistently more requests for tee times than available slots for Pecan). If data supports a second PPOA course, then we would support the option.

I would be more likely to vote to purchase Nutcracker and vote to allow a fee specifically for golfers to pay for the course. But I would like to see some way, maybe set times, that the course could be used for walking, as well.

If PPOA members want to play golf at another course they need to join Nutcracker individually or play other area courses. Pecan members should not have to purchase or build another golf course.

Purchase of the Nutcracker course seems the most cost effective option

Forget buying Nutcracker or building another course at Pecan. Instead, use the facilities at Squaw
Valley. This would give golfers 2 more choices of 18 hole golf without the added costs.

If additional courses are needed, it should be private just like Nutcracker so that the people that use it, pay for it.

The timeline for a decision to buy is too soon for an adequate assessment of the usage vs age of the population. It may be viable in 5 years but now it is premature.

More golf capacity is badly needed

We need another course in Pecan.

Buy Nutcracker is the best option. It's cheaper and is ready to go.

I think the purchase and utilization of a second golf course that already exists with many of the members already playing the course is way more reasonable than building a new course and having 3 total courses in pecan.

Work out deal with Glen Rose courses to make access there easier and more conducive to Pecan folks to help with load. Much cheaper option

Purchasing Nutcracker is the most affordable but I am not sure all members should pay the full cost to buy and operate it. All members should pay part of the cost as it will likely increase property values.

Priorities. Fix drainage issues, which threaten homes & will decrease property values.

See previous note

.owners should not have cut down so numerous a month

None golfers should not have to pay for additional golf facilities

I just don't like dealing with Anthony - he always seems to outwit us and leave us holding some kind of rotten deal. We should use Squaw Valley as an alternate.

Establish a members ONLY "Golf Club" for those enthusiasts who find this an exciting, attractive addition and who are willing to pay for it. I do not golf and have no interest whatsoever in the game and certainly do not wish to pay for the habits of others.

I don't play golf

I am not interested in paying a per use charge for any additional amenities.

This additional amenity could be provided at the cost for the users in the form of their private membership to the course, not the entire community.

Prefer purchase of Nutcracker versus Building new golf course.

Even though I do not play golf, I think we need another course. It seems the least expensive option is to buy the Nutcracker Golf Course--but either way buy Nutcracker or build a new one Ithink our property vaules will be enhanced.

Either option should increase the resale value of my home by having more amenities available for half the potential buyers (if they play golf). I also think the monthly cost is cheap as compared to joining an outside club to play golf at. My concerns are keeping the cost as low as possible so those that do not use the golf courses do not see a large monthly increase for an amenity they do not use. This could create some to want to move and could have the reverse effect on resale if the potential buyer is not a golf player. One of the key reasons I moved here was a combination of the amenities and the low HOA fees associated with them. Thank you for your time.

If one of the two options is chosen I would prefer nutcracker due to cost

Would support acquiring the Nutcracker instead of this option

Water availability is an unknown for me. If we purchase Nutcracker, we should know going in more specific costs.

This has been a topic for the 18 years we have lived here! Stop talking about it and build it! It's so crowded on the Pecan course.
Buying Nutcracker and keeping it "private" would require strict accounting of all maintenance, etc in order to "prove" to PPOA players that the "private" course was not being further subsidized at PPOA players expense. If both courses same, can achieve economies of scale in expenses.

I think additional golf needs to be made available. However, if the Nutcracker course is purchased, I don't believe an additional 3rd course is needed this time.

Do not consider raising assessments on all members unless a significant amount of the cost is covered by actual user fees.

If we could at least have another 9 holes. Or a 9 hole 3 par course if it would be less expensive.

You go overboard on Golf courses here. I have been here since 2007 and I don't know 1 person that uses the Golf courses. I would pay for a membership to support an indoor pistol shooting range.

I would use the additional facilities but would prefer the lower cost option and it seems more logical to use facilities that already exist. I also believe this will increase property values.

We do not need another gold course. As for a fitness center have a business move it with one that people can join.

Think that Nutcracker would be the best solution. We moved here because of the golfing and security. New people moving here should be aware of all that Pecan has to offer and not fuss so much about what's going on and also the people who already live here knew about the golfing and dues.

Not interested in golf.

It makes more sense to purchase an existing course!

Believe that users should pay. The golfers should bear all costs.

Nutcracker is a more viable option.

We already have a bad capacity problem with the Pecan Plantation Golf Course and with the 200+ new homes going in our capacity problems will worsen greatly. This could negatively affect our property values.

I am a Nutcracker club member but there is no estimate of the monthly dues if the PPOA were to purchase the club. / The arrangement with Squaw Valley golf club for the PPOA members is a very reasonable alternative to buying the Nutcracker Golf Club & constructing another course by the PPOA

I will soon be 70 in a very few years. My usage in any or all the amenities are decreasing and for me this is an expense I prefer not to have.

I am too old and too out of shape to partipate. I am an arthritic.

Think a second PPOA membership course is needed, but not sure if two additional courses will be needed in the future.

Don't allow so many tournaments and just open it up to play. The MGA and LGA take up too much time at the course EVERY week. Let them have events every OTHER week.

I would support a phased approach to additional golf capacity by constructing 9 holes first, adding another 9 holes as needed.

My preferred position is to build a new course and NOT purchase Nutcracker.

Do not play

Pecan needs 18 more holes. The number of rounds played now are not sustainable with one course. What is now an asset will become a liability.

I could be convinced that we need a new facility if facts were presented to indicate that the option of purchasing Nutcracker would not resolve the tee-time demand issues of the golfing community. I just think the Nutcracker purchase option is more likely to get approved.

This would be great in the future bu not for several years nutcracker maybe, but future cost increases for a few could cause problems for the older members who have supported Pecan through many changes .
I and many others are not golfers and we should not have to pay for what we do not use.

This doesn't tell us whether the purchase of the NC will satisfy the capacity issue.

I am not a golfer.

Nutcracker purchase would be more cost effective.

We play golf mostly at Nutcracker as it is easier to get tee times. IF we purchase Nutcracker will this make it more difficult to get tee times at Nutcracker. We would prefer to have more greens available at Pecan to utilize getting tee times. We feel we pay Pecan fees but are VERY RARELY to obtain decent tee times at Pecan. We will go with whatever the board deems appropriate. We love living here!

This is burden that we do NOT need. When everybody moved here the amenities were here and that's why they moved here. They didn't move here so that there could be more amenities at a greater cost to their dues. Why do dues have to go up? If there are indeed more people coming here then their dues would cover the increased need for another golf course NOT THE EXISTING PEOPLE WHO ARE ALREADY here dues to go up? That doesn't make any sense to raise dues for more golf courses.

Waste of my money

Why do we need more than two courses? Why buy Nutcracker, you can already use it. Needs other things besides golf out here.

Perhaps find a way to only assess the people who actually use it.

Golf courses never generate enough revenue to remotely support themselves. Let an outside entity build it and charge members that want to play private fees. Why should a golf course be heavily subsidized by members who don't play?

My family uses Pecan golf course, both pools, walking paths, river (fish, hunt & kayak), marina, the fine roads in Pecan to ride my bike, PAC, parks, dining room, Brazos room & street dances. We are grateful for the quality of life Pecan offers. Having said all of this "WE MUST HAVE MORE GOLF COURSES". Thanks for listening. Jay Sherrill

Don't have the members who do not play golf pay for this. If you want to play golf let the golfers pay for it .. NO ME.

I think the golf options currently offered are quite adequate! Pecan Plantation is not only about golf!

Consider a par 3 course to reduce traffic @ Pecan course.

As PP continues to grow, more amenities will be needed. Golf being the main attraction for many residents, addressing the purchase of NC & building an additional course seem like the most immediate need that should be addressed. The additional costs are very reasonable and considering the special assessment is for only 10 years, seems doable. / Both courses are very busy & sometimes having a tee time for just a couple is impossible to get. We'd like to have more access to the courses and not always have to have "added" players because of over crowding. We are walkers swimmers & bikers, who also have fitness equipment at home, so that amenity has not value to us. / Thanks for looking to the future.

The recent & current renovations to the club house, pools & restarant have been great!

the information you presented is confusing, if we purchase the nutcracker, do we still get the 200 acars? and why is it so much more to build than buy, That to me does not make any sence

continue use of the glen rose golf facility with two beautiful operating courses

I have concerns of operating 2 separate golf courses and that they may be each ran independantly. I have seen other clubs that have 2 courses but they are ran by 1 pro shop.

If this increased golf capacity is to go through, please show those of us who do not use the golf facilities how this will increase the value of our property. (It would be a good idea to enforce the law that states children are not supposed to drive golf carts on Pecan. A little girl lost control of a golf course in front of my house, entered the rough ground of the unimproved lot next to mine, and threw her mother out of the cart. The little girl got it stopped in time to avoid hitting a car parked in a driveway two lots away.
The mother was skinned up, but insisted she was fine and they drove off. If the golf capacity is increased there are bound to be more golf carts being driven around. A strong emphasis needs to be placed on our "no-kids law".

Would rather purchase a seasoned golf course (Nutcracker) for much less money.
4. **What is the reason(s) for your responses to the questions above? New Fitness Center - Other**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other: Please explain:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Already use the Nutcracker facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While this alone may not be too expensive Pecan wants to buy or build everything and just increase the assessment. I doubt the PAC improvements would really pay for themselves in enjoyment for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy living facility w/in community Available to all levels of age and fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I already have two other fitness memberships. on at work is free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nutcracker fitness center meets my needs and it is underutilized. The cost is $48/mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutcracker has a fitness center that a person can use for very little money. Good equipment. Less expensive than your proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This amenity should be self supporting/sustaining without requiring every resident to pay for something they might not be able to use -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be willing to pay extra for and use this amenity if it was built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have interest in this amenity. I currently pay the YMCA $75 a month. Would rather spend that money closer to home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutcracker charges a separate monthly fee and entry fee for membership. If those wanting a Fitness center do as Nutcracker, charge a entry fee to build and monthly fee to maintain. Pecan has a large population of elderly who have zero interest in increasing dues that benefit a few at the expense of ALL. If someone wants a fitness center they can join Nutcracker, I did!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should ba a user fee supported activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am supportive of the facility only if users will pay the freight, which I would intend to do. I have no interest in parties who have no interest in using a fitness center paying for me to do so. I have no use for a system where some ride the wagon at the expense of others, and I have no interest in an add-on to the one here in Pecan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We belong to the NC Fitness center. We do not need another one for us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare with Nutcracker. Look at doing it first class adding heated cover to pool. That is what we should have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If nutcracker is purchased, a fitness center would be included which could be expanded to provide for increased usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More money for something I don't use!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are already options for exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they have a great facility at nutcracker, if they want to workout, let them join, why would I want to pay for something I will not use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If people wanted to use a gym they would already be using the gym at Nutcracker. This is a not a good idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fitness facility is beneficial to ALL members for health benefits. Much more equal use of member dollars for an area that all could utilize...not just golfers or tennis players. An amenity that most hotels, apt complexes and even offices have - why not yet in Pecan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who use it should be the ones who pay for it.. Not all PPOA members should be required to pay for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can become member of new YMCA for $15/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again, not everyone had the capability to be so active due to physical disability to do so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No strong feeling either way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Drainage repair is priority in Pecan. Not eye candy.

You can use nutcracker's where people pay if they want to work out. The rest of us fat people do not care about it

This is a facility that everyone can use, not just golfers. This would be for the good of all residents not just a few wealthy ones who want everyone else to pay for their fun and games.

They are building a brand new YMCA which will be available to anyone via membership. Why spend the money in Pecan for something that will be less than what the YMCA can offer.

Have been a member of several in Texas. The healthclub was the most underutilized amenity in each of those clubs.

Observation while attending the current exercise sessions and meetings does not demonstrate a need for more of what we already have. If offering different activity, i.e. indoor pool, we would be in favor. That would add value. Many people do to other facilitates in the community to access indoor pool.

Would not use it and those who choose to should pay for their own access to the facility we have on site.

Of course you need an exercise facility. No need trying to explain all the health benefits of exercise, particularly to the elderly. But you do not have to go out and spend a million dollars. Take the money you have and the facility you have and convert a room or two. See what the usage is. Rent the facility from the Nutcracker if you need more room. Go to two temporary buildings adjacent to the pool area if you need more or subsidize PP home owners who want to join Nutcracker as a social or exercise only member. There are just a ton of things to do before you go out and spend a million dollars. What do they do at De Cordova? Maybe we should have a joint membership with them?

The term current excess capital asset reserve funds is a misnomer. The capital current capital asset reserve is needed for replacement of existing facilities as they wear out. According to the reserve studies, there are no excess funds.

I am supportive of the improvement of the PAC with the inclusion of exercise equipment, I am NOT supportive of an additional fee for membership in order to use these facilities. Golfers do not pay an additional fee for playing on the Pecan golf course, so why should members be required to pay for use of the PAC exercise equipment. A fee for a possible trainer would be another topic.

We are in need of a GOOD fitness center in Pecan.

40$ per month is too high (that is the same as Nutcracker - non member fee currently).

The meeting rooms are necessary. I think the fitness center will increase home values overall. It would provide additional benefits to all members of the community rather than a select few. Especially the meeting rooms.

This is more like it. Something new. If we have excess capital, why would we borrow?

We feel it would be a positive asset to our community that should out weigh the additional hit to our HOA's

Why would members be charged to use this amenity? Again, golfers don't pay!

If Nutcracker is purchased by HOA, expanding the existing facility would certainly be less expensive and Individual memberships could be the avenue for the expansion and operation cost

Don't change the unique characteristic of Pecan Plantation. If you build a theme park then go outside Pecan and first work on infrastructure. Too many cars and golf carts. Accidents waiting to happen.

Current amenity is poorly operated. Pool doesn't open on time. Members stand and wait for someone to do their job.

Currently I would not be using. However in the past I would have really liked to have had such a facility. I would provide some low level support for those who could currently use such a facility. I would also support a skeet shotgun shooting range. A whole category of residents don't have an amenity to enjoy their leisure hours.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>there is already a fitness center here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DID NOT MEAN TO MARK &quot;I WILL USE THIS AMENITY&quot; ABOVE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It isn't fair to charge an additional assessment to members who do not use the gym; members who do use the gym should be monitored (entry key pass, etc.). Those members who use the gym, even once a month should pay the Assessment increase. Also, the yoga classes, etc., should be held there. Again, an opportunity to capture assessment fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let the users pay for the operating costs, just like the golf course should be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral on this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutcracker already has a fitness center which their members pay for...if Nutcracker is purchased, what happens to that fitness center?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This should be a private company, pay for use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User fees should finance any new amenity that it the entire community will not utilize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am already a member of a gym that is close to my office in Fort Worth. Why would I want to pay for membership in a second gym I will never use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would be a wonderful addition to Pecan’s amenities. Something that would benefit all members (if they chose to use it) and not just golfers as an additional golf course would do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we buy Nutcracker we could expand the existing health club at less cost than building a new one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would prefer to see some of the surplus used and lower monthly membership figures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again, the cost of the center should be recouped through user fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The $40 monthly membership fee provides the members who want a fitness facility and will use it to pay the cost of operation for the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood county is constructing a first class center in Acton. Absolutely NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project needs to be better defined as to what we really want and need. We need to evaluate the current usage at the PAC and determine if we can reconfigure or add on to that facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My property taxes increased hundreds of dollars annually for the Hood County YMCA (which I voted against). Maybe we should see how that works out before making a decision. It may change the support of a Pecan fitness center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently a member a the Nutcracker Health Club. There should have been an option/provision as a possible solution along with the purchase of the Golf Course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of my family members would love and use this amenity especially if it's only a few dollars extra a month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buy nutcracker along with their fitness center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would possibly use this facility, if available, but strongly opposed to an increased assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You want it, you pay for it. Leave those not wanting to use or interested out of it. Keep your hands out of our pockets for someone else's wishes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not believe it's needed plus one can join the fitness center at the Nutcracker.....There is plenty of fitness programs at and around the PAC Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The monthly fee should be for those who use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very happy to drive to Freedom Therapy because the staff is always there and always helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divide the cost by the number of users of this facility. Not even close to being a good deal when you factor in the actual cost when it comes to actual building. No estimates by management are even close to actual costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecan was build as a &quot;smorgasbord&quot; of amenities, we should try to keep it that way as much as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe this can be a pay as you go item--sell memberships as is now the nutcracker model. Thus no increase is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We already have the nutcracker fitness center we can pay for and between the PPCC and PAC there appears to be meeting rooms and group exercise places. I'm not sure there is a need big enough need</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to build more.
The fitness center at Nutcracker is never busy. Why not open it up/expand and then determine if there is a need for a new facility.

Already have a facility at Nutcracker

Those that want to exercise do so already (I have been) and have a place to do so (home, roads, trails). I see this as a big expense for something very few will actually use. This also interacts with the Nutcracker matter and their w/o facility.

I am in favor of this amenity, as long as the hours are available for all members...even the members that are still working. We have a fitness facility here that is nice but the hours are not conducive for members that are still working. 24 hours with a key card like other fitness facilities would be fantastic.

Sling special memberships would place the costs on the members who use the facility not the entire community.

why not use the pac for this

I ALREADY PAY $40 A MONTH TO NUTCRACKER WORKOUT CENTER AND FIND IT SUITABLE. IF WE BUY NUTCRACKER, IT COULD EASILY BE ADDED ON TO IF MORE MEMBERS WERE SERIOUS.

We're opposed to this amenity if we do not buy the Nutcracker Golf Club.

If Nutcracker is purchased, just expand the current facility there.

It would not get the use everybody thinks it would and would soon become a "white elephant".. it should be paid for with user fees..

We are in our 80s, would not use such a facility.

We have seen no data that shows current fitness options available in Pecan are not meeting members' needs or requirements.

There are currently fitness centers at Nutcracker and some capability at the PAC. Are they used now? Not enough information to make a decision. If the $4 a month assessment means no additional cost to use the facility then that might be attractive. As to an assessment or capital funds to build it, it depends on what happens with the purchase of Nutcracker. If Nutcracker is not purchased then perhaps a split of assessment/capital excess could be considered.

I'm not sure this amenity will get enough use to make building it worthwhile. Also, we have existing spaces such as the Teen Room at the Club that are in serious need of updating.

We already have "free" golf so I feel that fitness should be offered as a free amenity as well

Since not all members will use it, but it will support our property values, I think all members should pay to build it but only those that use it should pay for the operation of it.

PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE consider a Racquet ball court!

More useful to us than golf courses but fix the drainage first.

Again, too expensive to request all to support the hobbies of a few.

See below.

I have concerns of 2 increases to the HOA Fees at a close interval if the golf course is approved as well.

If there are any increases in membership dues, we prefer that the money go for a new golf course. This represents a diversity in amenities and is a better option than yet another golf course.

I am not in favor of using Reserve funds for this type of expansion. One question, is PP allowed to be in competition with the exercise facility at Nutcracker? I have observed the facility at Nutcracker which is available to all residents and seldom see a high usage of the facility. How many residents of PP use the local Y and Silver Slippers which is free to all members? I am new to PP but have noticed that PP has two pools and was amazed at how few people, from my observation use the second pool. I am sure this was a large expense for the resulting use. Maybe the solution is to actually have an advanced
membership drive with an upfront fee to cover the cost of the construction and then a monthly fee to cover the operating costs. If the initial sign up does not get adequate memberships to begin construction then all fees could be returned. Possibly a better option than building it and hoping they will come.

This amenity, like the golf amenities, should require some payment by users.

We need an indoor pool to be a part of the center. Many of us need water exercise because of joint issues and because it's the best exercise for mature adults.

Nutcracker has a fitness facility which can be utilized. Interested parties can join Freedom for $30 per month with great facilities.

We do not need the expense of a fitness center. Let one move into the business area by the grocery store. If people want to join it, they can join it. I believe there was a fitness center here at one time that went out of business because of non use. The new YMCA is a better option.

just not interested in building another fitness center.

I LIVE ON A LOW FIXED INCOME.

I would use the amenity more often were the hours more conducive to my work schedule, as I am not retired yet.

$40.00 per family can cover many people with much use. Individual fees are better.

$40.00 mo. is way to much YMCA $20.00 mo maybe. If I can pick and choose to pay $40.00/mo when I am here the OK, but if we travel 4 to 6 months a year and not here and not going to be here to use it then no, that is too much money if you are not using it every month.

Such is available and more will become available outside of Pecan. For example there is a new YMCA currently being built. There are exercises facilities currently available.

we should wait until a more friendly economical market ... at least until after next presidential election

No Steam room or Sauna

a nice amenity, but I will not use very much

what percent of the owners would this be used by. i expect a minority but all would have to pay. sounds like washington.

Purchase of Nutcracker would add that exercise facility to existing.

We use the current facility often and it is never full. I don't see the need for a new building

This might be OK if it was financed ONLY by the people who sign up and use it and NOT by the general membership.

I agree with a monthly cost of $40 for families that use the facility and not making families that don't use it not have to pay but on the other hand, it will be a part of Pecan Plantation and will help property values. It would also be good to open it up to non-Pecan Plantation members at a higher monthly price.

All amenities are important and to keep up with projected growth of Pecan.

If the membership wants the Nutcracker Golf can't we use that fitness facility. They need to determine what they're going to do with golf before adressing a fitness center.

If we choose the family memberships I believe the classe should be included.otherwise it's too expensive.

If Pecan purchases Nutcracker, there is no need to build an additional exercise facility.

There are comparable fitness centers in Granbury.
5. Please share any comments you have about the potential construction of a new Fitness Center:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It seems odd that we can charge fees for a fitness facility, but cannot charge greens fees for golf. Don’t use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much does Pecan really want to spend and how much will it increase the assessment? Those that wish to use this facility should pay a monthly fee to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my belief that members that use this amenity should be the ones to pay for it with dues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I haven't seen any ideas presented about what the facility should contain. I do think that it must have space for walkers. The track should be a minimum of a 1/10 of mile. It should contain space that could be a &quot;Spa&quot; area where memberships or pay as you go are provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed badly, I presently use the Nutcracker, but it is getting old and does not have all the things needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no problem with a fitness center but this sounds like an overkill and does not require meeting rooms and/indoor track...Downsize and still have a nice center and I think it would fly..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste of money. Pecan has PAC and Nutcracker fitness that is not expensive. Seniors get discount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This amenity should be self supporting/sustaining without requiring every resident to pay for something they might not be able to use - a new fitness center would not have enough support. Example Nutcracker fitness is under used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small percentage of populous would utilize it.....add space at PAC for 1/2 the costs and no assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is something that all PPOA residents could use and I would support it. Use the one already built at Nutcracker!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is what we need! We have plenty of golfing. A facility with an indoor track and weight training would promote health and wellness year round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we purchased Nutcracker, could we consider increasing the size of the present workout center there instead of building a center at the Pecan clubhouse site, due to the centrality of location?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The present fitness amenity at the Nut Cracker is not being fully utilized so what is the need for additional ???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have interest in this amenity. I currently pay the YMCA $75 a month. Would rather spend that money closer to home. I am still not in favor of forcing someone for something they have no interest or desire. again, if people want to join the Nutcracker, they can and then they can pay for it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I beyond time when Pecan stopped thinking of the desires of a few rather than the concern of the total population. Why, do we need to duplicate what is available already in Pecan? Wasteful of memberships value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a person is interested in weights and cardio, this is already available at Nutcracker for $35 to $40 a month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make it a part of the community not another membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent idea and an amenity that members have requested for over a decade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am opposed to using the excess capital reserve fund for either of these projects!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not feel we have a need for it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See above. We should have facility with heated lap pool connected to fitness. If not, Nutcracker suffices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>currently using nutcracker facility and if not available will buy my own equipment for home use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Centers are not needed. Waste of money. People can get all the exercise they need without going to a fitness center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I believe a fitness gym is a required/minimum staple item for any HOA of this caliber and would be a welcome addition to PPOA amenities, and increase the attractiveness of Pecan Plantation in general. That may, someday, ultimately lead to increased property values, but I think it’s a stretch to sell the concept as a property value booster.

This should be amortized over the life of the facility, then it would be paid for by current as well as future members.

Not enough members will support/use the additional Fitness Center

Notes as above. Good amenity for everyone living in Pecan. Please consider this first, before additional golf.

I am happy with Nutt Cracker’s facility

needs to be first class facility

We need this amenity.

It is unfair to propose selling memberships to cover operating costs when a similar proposal is not offered for the proposed golf courses. The unequal proposals proves a preference for golf at the outset. I support increasing dues for BOTH golf and fitness together, but NOT an increase in owner dues for golf and a monthly membership fee for fitness. If I subsidize a second golf course that I don’t use, I would appreciate the golfers subsidizing the fitness center, even if they don’t use it. Particularly when the subsidy for golf is twice that for the fitness center.

We have the one at Nutcracker that people can use.

This is a facility that everyone can use, not just golfers. This would be for the good of all residents not just a few wealth ones who want everyone else to pay for their fun and games.

live very close to fitness center. can walk to center

see above

If offering different activity, i.e. indoor pool, we would be in favor. That would add value. Many people do to other facilities in the community to access indoor pool.

There is no free lunch. If we want to maintain Pecan Plantation as an excellent place to live, we must pay what it costs to do so.

Only if it is not open to children. Our PAC pool was to be a lap pool but turned into a kiddie pool.

I would definitely use this amenity

There is a facility here already and if folks want to work out they should pay for it themselves.

If someone wants to use a fitness center there is already one available at the Nutcracker.

Talking with new and existing members, I repeatedly hear when are we going to get a fitness center. People are having to drive into Granbury or Fort Worth or both to get access to a fitness center and some have to do both. With 3,000 rooftops we should be able to have a fitness center.

If pecan wants to build it with funds available and let those that want it pay for personal memberships to help pay for it and pay for the upkeep let them go for it

There is a fitness center at the Nutcracker. I doubt there is strong interest in PPOA duplicating this facility. I believe there would be more value added to the member’s equity by totally renovating the Marina store, restrooms and food facilities.

I work out at home. I don’t need any such facility

I would live to have this amenity! It would be great for rehabilitation. I would be will to pay the increase of $4 a month, but I believe $40 is too much since I pay for amenities now that I do not use.

I believe it is in much need, and is about time that this is being considered. To make one pay to use the PAC equipment would give non-golf playing members another reason to hate the game of golf, or resent the monies being spent to buy/build another golf course.

As Pecan continues to grow, additional amenities will become necessary to draw families to the community. These amenities need to be funded in large part by those who use them.
Isn’t there a new YMCA under construction in Granbury? Is there a need to have a fitness facility in Pecan too? How can the costs for those who will use be kept low without assessing every member a fee? 40.00 a month is too much.

The new Y will offer these amenities and more for less money.

If we bought the Nutcracker would we then not have a useable fitness Center??? Why not pursue an agreement with the city:county about a PPOS pass at the new Y?

People who are nutcracker members already have that amenity usage.. people who are interested in that amenity, they have all kind of options. I personally have no use of that facility. We should not spend too much money for a small group of people.

What would the location be?

Like golf, there really should not be a special fee for the users. I would not use it but to charge one group fees to use amenities but not charge fees to use another (gold) creates a 2-tier, discriminatory caste system. It gives special preference to the golfers.

Let people that want a fitness center PAY for it, and the people that have no interest should not have to pay for it.

I had planned to join the Y when new facility is opened, but would much prefer to have a facility in Pecan, as long as it doesn't interfere with the Golfing proposals. The biggest "draw" we have here is Golf and that should come before any other amenity expenses. If supporting the Fitness Center means we can't do the Nutcracker golfing proposal then I will not support it.

Why are separate memberships so costly? Why not use one of the unused rooms at the PAC instead of building another costly building that will need to be maintained costing even more or remodel part of the PAC for the gym. Is the PAC center really used that much as it is now? You need to be competitive with the new gym that is being built in Acton if you want to ensure that members use our facilities instead of more affordable resources.  $40.00 a month is way....way....too much.

What percentage of the membership use the current Center? Less than 5%?. PPOA is not in the business of increasing amenities to benefit few of its membership.

With all the options for home fitness equipment I really feel this is an amenity that will benefit the fewest members.

Not everyone plays golf that lives in Pecan. This option would attract a larger number of residents.

If Nutcracker purchased couldn't their exercise facility be increased in size at a much reduced price?

Don't change the unique characteristics of Pecan Plantation. The resort type Infrastructure does not exist on this real estate. With the cars and golf carts negotiating on the roads.....People trying to go to work.....This is not a resort..... Who is pushing this stuff? What do the legal people say to all this?

We currently have a gymnasium and walking trails. An exercise facility with equipment can be built or added to the PAC at a much more cost effective option.

If we do not get the additional golf course then the excess capital money should go to the fitness center.

we have a Y in acton

I believe it would be a huge asset for our community, but not at $40.00 a month. If it is $10-15 per month, that seems more logical. I believe there would be a huge use of this facility by the members

This is not needed in Pecan. There are plenty of Fitness centers in town.

If you build it, it should be supported by user fees.

I think if we do this we need to add a golf cart/bike trail along Plantation road. Increased traffic on this road could be a major issue.

With the new Y going up in Acton, this plan may not be needed.

We will not use such a facility.

Will this include an indoor swimming pool?

If we have the money to build this, I think that we should use it for this purpose. A small assessment
increase to support it is okay. Individual memberships are a bad idea. We would not join as we travel a good deal and I do not wish to pay a membership fee when we are not here to use it.

Why would PPOA get into the fitness business? If it is a valid business then the private sector should work with the developer to build a building and start a fitness business.

To me, it looks like Pecan is trying to compete with the Nutcracker. Why not just join the fitness center at the Nutcracker.

An amenity which requires separate membership for utilization is an anomaly in PPOA and unacceptable. First, ALL members would be assessed to build the fitness center, whether through using the reserve or floating a 10 year bank loan but then only through the family membership would monthly dues not increase. In other words, all members would help build the facility and then utilization could be available only to those who purchase membership...that is discrimination. And a 16,000 square foot center with an indoor track demonstrates that the BOD and management continues to "have champagne taste on a beer budget"!

Would also be interested in recruiting a private company to build and maintain a center with interested parties paying membership fees.

If we do not use the excess capital asset reserve account for the golf then the money should be there for the fitness facility. We could actually build the fitness center where the new golf course will be built and then you could use part of the fitness center as the pro shop for the new course which would save money on the new course.

We should think hard before constructing amenities that require subsidization to succeed. Hood county will soon have a state of the art community YMCA less than 15 miles from Pecan. Gyms succeed by recruiting new members to purchase memberships and provide operating capital. That is good business acumen, not subsidization by PPOA

I am curious what happens if gym usage trails off after 3, 6, 9 or 12-months? Then what? Are we saddled with the expense of paying for and operating an amenity that is largely unused? If you want a gym, run it the same was as another for-profit business. Do not charge everyone for an amenity that only a small portion of the residents will use.

Bring it on. We ALSO need an indoor swimming pool. What a shame the current pool at the PAC wasn't built with more planning and forethought.

See above

I was a member of Nutcracker for several years and unless you went there very early in the morning, the rest of the day it was practically empty. I don't think it gets used enough to warrant a new one.

Have membership at Nutcracker, but do not use it

Additional golf course is needed more than the fitness center.

It is my belief that 20 years from now a larger percentage of Pecan residents would use a fitness center than would use a golf center.

Except for the running track if Nutcracker was purchased you could convert space at the Nutcracker facility into more fitness because you would not need the office space or the kitchen area.

This is not needed here. If someone wants to exercise, they can buy their own gym.

Our present one seems to be satisfactory.

NOT NEEDED A first class center is under construction in Acton

We are not opposed to the addition of a fitness center but believe there is probably not a great need for an indoor track and the size seems excessive for a fitness center.

Consider including a racquetball court(s)

Our dues are high enough as it is. Why do you always look for more ways to spend money and raise dues. Are you trying to squeeze the elderly and widows out?

No scenario was included as a choice if the Nutcracker Property was purchased and utilizing the existing
health club. To me, this was an oversight in the options provided.

I think this is more of a necessity over a new golf course. I think the win/win for everyone would be the purchase of the nutcracker and build a fitness center plus you're only paying an extra $15 a month at most.

paying 1.8 million for a new fitness center doesn't make sense when buying nutcracker would include a fitness center

Not interested and don't charge those not interested to support someone else's wishes.

Their will be no in house swimming pool

With YMCA coming, closer to home would be good, if we have competitive equipment etc.

I believe we need a Fitness center and not another golf course. Many pecan residents do not play golf, but would use a fitness center if additional dues are keep reasonable. I would think this would be an added benefit and enhancement to living at Pecan.

Purchasing the Nutcracker would make this a mute issue. I think we need this type of facility; however, I think we have too many negative owners who would cast a negative vote.

Our community is notable for its lack of such a facility. As our population grows, such an amenity is absolutely necessary to sustain our relevance as a choice for new members.

I think it would only be fair to put the fees in our normal monthly assessment rather than a special membership rate. I'm a golfer. I should be willing to pay to support this amenity when we have a lot of people already supporting the one I like to use.

If you build it they will come, but not at $40. per month.

I already belong to the YMCA

If we buy Nutcracker we in effect get one.

USE teh Nutcracker Fitness Center of the YMCA

See "other" comment above. Note, too, statistics re how many sign up for fitness centers/programs and then discontinue.

Again those who will use it should pay for it.

With the construction of the new Y in Acton, not sure this amenity is necessary anymore

Terrific idea, please make sure the hours are available for those of us still working. The other fitness facility opens at 7:30am...that doesn't work for most of us that have to be at work by 8:00am. I think if the fitness facility has updated and plenty of equipment most members would love to have this as an option.

Would have interest, if an indoor swim pool was part of the design.

Do it

There are too many questions I have in order to properly answer the question re fitness center and Nutcracker golf course. // We currently have fitness memberships at the Nutcracker and the YMCA. Would an indoor pool be planned for the new fitness center? Winter access to water is important. // For us golf is not a priority (as we do not golf) and we believe, as people age, water and weight exercises are extremely beneficial to the masses. // If an indoor pool and high quality fitness center is added, with no additional charges for classes, we would support the building of a fitness center and the purchase of the Nutcracker. // Additional items which would benefit Pecan and our property values include: // A more complete medical facility, such as the Scott & White Clinic at Sun City Georgetown (Texas), that would provide a broader range of treatment than the current clinic and would offer links to a major hospital, would be more beneficial than the current clinic that is linked only to the small Glen Rose Hospital. // Even though PP is not age restricted, there are many older members here. A
progressive care facility offering increasing levels of assistance as the member's needs change (such as Waterview in Granbury), would attract people who may someday need greater care.

I think it would be a wonderful amenity and I think that those wanting to use it should pay for it instead of an assessment increase for all. I also believe that the family memberships would help with overcrowding versus everyone being members.

If we buy the Nutcracker Golf Club then why not enlarge and improve that facility!

Not needed if Nutcracker facility is purchased.

Maybe a renovation of or a small addition to the PAC to enhance fitness options would be more cost effective.

As stated above, I'm not sure a fitness center will get enough use to make building it worthwhile. And we have existing spaces such as the Teen Room at the Club that are in serious need of updating. Let's maintain what we have before we add more things that need to be maintained.

too expensive

I think it's a great addition to our community. Golfers do already have access to 1 free and one private course but there isn't a "free" nice size Fitness Center.

It provides an excellent amenity for the population at a moderate increase in assessments. (2 beers or 2 lattes at Starbucks)

I am not certain that a fitness facility of this magnitude is required for our community. I believe that meeting rooms are already available in other areas of our community and an indoor track is excessive. We have 2 outdoor walking paths now that are under utilized and more people take to the streets for jogging and walking. I am not certain that an indoor track will induce them to come inside. A nice indoor cardio and strength training facility would be excellent that included some personal training and group training that extended to very early morning and later evenings. I am unable to participate in the current physical activity programs now because they are during the work day.

if the nutcracker is purchased there will already be a fitness center.

Way overdue!!!!!! Go for it!!!!

A little confused, is this facility INSTEAD of the Nutcracker Fitness Facility or IN ADDITION to the Nutcracker Fitness Facility, we are members of the Nutcracker Fitness Facility and are pleased with it, we just want to have AT LEAST one fitness facility in Pecan. If there are two, then we will decide based upon monthly membership fees

Should be fully paid for and maintained through a separate health club fee by those using the facilities.

If I want more golf I feel I must support other amenities.

Would be good for the members. This would be an additional attraction for future home buyers.

None users should not have to pay for new facility

I am not interested in paying a per use charge for any additional amenities.

I currently have a membership at the fitness center at Nutcracker which costs $44.00 (approx.) per month. Why duplicate? / $44.00 per month for a family membership. This is the most economical option for this very nice amenity. Why duplicate this?

Anyone that lives in Pecan Plantation can join the fitness center at the Nutcracker Golf Club, it seems a waste of dues to duplicate what is already available if you want to work out.....we definitely need more room on a golf course than in the fitness center.

I am prayerful that if this amenity is built, it will not be overseen by the Anthony's. They're great folks, but the evidence suggests they use the lowest bidder working to the lowest possible standard.

Not sure why we would need this if we acquire Nutcracker

What happens to the Nutcracker Fitness Center? Why would this facility be built at great expense when we already have the Nutcracker Fitness Center which is used very sparsely. We already have meeting
rooms, group exercise facilities at the PAC, as well as potential for cardio and strength training. The only thing we don’t have there is an official indoor track, and people do use the gym for that purpose.

It would be useful and those that use it should carry the cost burden.

Use the facilities that we already have.

It would be kinda like the Kiddie pool. Just for a select few. I pay all I want too for all these / amenities you have now, especially since I don’t use any of them.

This would be tremendously beneficial to our family, as we would use it regularly and it would increase the time we had together as a family. Many young families have two parents that work and going outside of Pecan for fitness needs is time consuming. A fitness center will also promote a needed health and wellness mindset in our community for all.

Although the indoor track would be great, could a fitness center without an indoor track be built and operated for a lower cost? Spending less on construction and operation would make this more attractive.

This is a needed facility in Pecan, I strongly support the addition of a fitness center, especially if it were included in the membership package. I believe this too will enhance property values.

Let a commercial one come in.

I don’t have any comments.

How about nutcracker facility? Part of golf purchase. Don’t want to go to a facility that has noisy kids using equipment in the family membership

$40.00 mo. is way to much YMCA $20.00 mo maybe. If I can pick and choose to pay $40.00/mo when I am here the OK, but if we travel 4 to 6 months a year and not here and not going to be here to use it then no, that is too much money if you are not using it every month.

with world conditions being what they are, it would be wise to allow the financial market to be more reliable

I would be in favor of a private company building a fitness center provided membership would be voluntary & at no cost to individual members to construct & maintain.

Hard to believe a fitness center for PPOA membership is not already in place.

I would want to know numbers that use the Nutcracker fitness center to determine if this is a need now.

Add a racquetball court!

see above statement

Everyone needs exercise options. Should just be added to dues

We need to take care of other things before we spend money on this kind of thing - for example there are drainage and clean up work needs that need to be done.

Better than another golf course

Exercise equipment good, but indoor track makes too much expense on building. Nice out door walking areas are better. Bike paths, etc.

This will be a benefit to the entire community, we already have a golf course, we do not have a good indoor fitness option

Need to utilize the fitness center we have now.

I am excited at the prospect of a new fitness center. I am a 400+ hr certified yoga instructor, certified group-x instructor, I am certified in Turbo Kick; Piyo; RIPPED; Mat flex pilates and currently working on Jillian Michaels Body Shred. I also am a certified Personal Trainer and working on my Golf Fitness Specialist certificate, so I would love to teach some classes and try to get more families involved and working out together.

It would be nice but let the people who use it pay for it.
We have our own equipment & like to exercise outside /
more meeting space is needed for growing existing groups as well as new ones
Yeah!!!! Long overdue!!!
Not sure what our feelings are on this question.

Resistance exercise is needed by all of us in the Pecan demographic. It's not easy to get this type of exercise at home.

I will only use this if classes are included! We had 24hr fitness membership for $45 and all classes were included! Needs to be all inclusive and this is the same comment I am hearing from LOTS of members that have YMCA membership!