

Below is information that the POA Board has put up at the entrance gates as well as on their web page. They continue to misrepresent the facts and single Dave Tucker out as the only person responsible for what we are trying to accomplish. The first sentence ignores that every person that signed the petition is responsible for the election and it's for the benefit of the entire Raintree community. It's troubling that they post this type of information without disclosing who wrote it and if it's board approved. We must assume the majority of the board believes this since they are the only ones with access to the gate signs and their website. We have to question why they continue to spread false information. The following are our comments to their posting and immediately below that is the actual posting copied directly from their website.

First the overall tone is negative. While some of the "Pros" information is correct, you can notice words like "presumably" and "might" are used to qualify their statements while the "Cons" are written as absolute fact. Regarding the "Cons", every single bullet point is false. First, 1-19 and the Forest will not be paying a membership if the measures pass. Second, there is no extra work for the POA to collect dues for the club. They will continue to collect assessments as they do now and then write one check per month to the club just as they do with their other vendors that provide goods and services for Raintree. It's hard to believe they still are spreading this lie considering the recent court hearing where this exact POA burden was proven false and even had the judge questioning their thinking. The third bullet point is completely false. The contract that is part of Ballot 2 clearly states the POA pays the club after assessment payment is made. Fourth, multiple lot owners will pay assessment on additional lots they own as currently required by the covenants and the POA will pay the club as per contract for each lot. Per the contract, the POA only has to pay the Club \$240 for two legally combined lots. Lot owners are paying assessments to the POA not club memberships. Fifth, this is pure speculation. This concern wasn't raised during the last couple assessment increase campaigns that the board presented. We would argue that our ballot items passing will increase the POA income as the increased level of amenities provided will create a demand for those lots that have already been abandoned and not currently paying any assessments. Sixth, again speculation on future increases. Also, the cost of living increase as allowed by the ballot item #1 provides additional revenue for the POA if there is a cost of living increase as specified by the Social Security Administration. There is no COLA cap for the POA assessment, just a 2% cap on

the contract payment made to the Club. Lastly, the contract can't be terminated unless both parties agree. The Club is unable to terminate the contract unless the POA agrees. It protects both parties and does benefit every single lot within Raintree.

POA Message:

MR. TUCKER IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SPECIAL ELECTION AND IT IS FOR HIS BENEFIT

636-789-4466

PROS & CONS

### PROS

- Raintree continues to have the Club and golf course available
- Property values are presumably bolstered by the status boost afforded by the Club.
- Property might be more marketable once the Country Club issue is settled.
- Unlimited golf and club amenities are available to all property owners at a modest cost. Current Country Club members in all sections will pay the same annual amount for the same amenities.
- Sections 20-25 are no longer forced to pay whatever annual membership fee the Club chooses.
- All of Raintree is subject to the same membership cost per lot which should eliminate existing internal strife.
- More people might want to live here if we become a community again. The large contractor property owners might also start building, resulting in more revenue for the POA.
- A media blitz in St. Louis newspapers and surrounding counties by the POA could increase Raintree values as has happened in other communities.

### CONS

- Sections 1-19 and the Forest will become required to pay a membership they did not sign a contract to accept although many, obviously, are already members.

- The POA is required to pay for and do all the collection for the Club's membership dues. The bookkeeping and accounting will require more work for the office staff, for which the POA will not be reimbursed.
- The POA could be deemed accountable to pay the Club for assessments not collected.
- Lot owners with multiple lots will be forced to pay multiple Club memberships.
- Lot owners might abandon their property due to increased assessments resulting in lost revenue for the POA.
- The increased cost will make it even more difficult for the POA to get the assessment increase so desperately needed to maintain our infrastructure, while the Club increases the amount that must be collected on their behalf by the implementation of an annual COLA up to 2%.
- The POA has no power to discontinue the contract unless the Club agrees. All contracts signed by the POA are usually short term and for services and not memberships. The majority of the services supported by the assessments benefit all POA members.