

Dear PUD members,

In the coming ballot, we encourage you to vote **NO on both Vote 1 and Vote 2** regarding pool “removal and repurposing.”

Why am I receiving this email? - Pursuant to California Civic Codes [§5200](#), [§5205](#), [§5210](#), and [§4515](#), Savas Parastatidis, on behalf of a group of 25+ other homeowners, requested access to the PUD members’ email list solely to communicate directly with you about the upcoming vote. We want to ensure you have access to relevant information and counterarguments to the PUD Board’s proposal before casting your ballot. You can find a lot more information and analysis on the [“Save Our PUD Pools” webpage](#).

Here’s why many homeowners are concerned:

Permanent loss of shared amenities (and precedent)

Once pools are removed or repurposed, the change is effectively permanent—and it sets a precedent for continued reductions over time that can, over time, dramatically alter the unique character of the community we all bought into.

- **Vote 1 removes specific pools and transfers land without compensation.**
 - The proposal would permanently remove **Pools #27 and #29** (with the PUD paying \$200K for their decommission).
 - The #27/#29 land will then be transferred to the Country Club **as a gift, without compensation to the PUD/homeowners.**
 - There is no plan as to how the land will be used by the Country Club.
 - The proposal **will also repurpose Pool #33 (without a clear plan as to what will replace the pool area).**
- **Vote 2 is a “blank check”.**
 - The PUD Board is asking for authorization to repurpose **up to two additional pools** in 2027–2028, **without identifying which pools**—meaning one could be near your home or your favorite one.
 - There is **no plan about their new purpose.**
- **The “savings” are small per household per year—and come at the cost of lost amenities and land.** The reduction in maintenance cost is presented as a “cost saving” when in fact it represents the permanent loss of shared amenities. The PUD’s finances are healthy. There is no need to start cutting shared amenities.
- **Cutting shared amenities.** Once we start cutting shared amenities and start giving away PUD land without compensation, where do we stop? We all bought into the Indian Ridge community for its amenities, part of its character and attraction. What message do we give to prospective buyers if we start cutting amenities?

Lack of important data

The membership is asked to vote on a very important and impactful topic, given the permanent loss of shared amenities, without access to key data and analyses.

- **Valuation.** To date, homeowners have not been presented with any written, objective reporting on valuation/easement questions.
- **Usage.** We don't have access to usage data. We don't even know how the rotating schedule for pool heating has impacted usage. Homeowner testimonials point towards **reduced usage because of the rotating schedule**. The rotating schedule hasn't had a great impact on cost saving, as per the ad-hoc committees own admission during one of the presentations, but it has probably negatively affected usage. The point is that **no data has been presented**.
- **Value impact.** The PUD Board has not presented any analysis on the impact to the values of our houses from taking away 5 pools or on how it affects the Indian Ridge's desirability by potential home buyers.

Potential legal challenge to the process

See the attached letter to the PUD Board from PUD member Michael Ross. The PUD Board hasn't yet addressed in writing whether it believes it has the authority to take away shared amenities, as articulated by Mr. Ross. The ballot does not indicate whether the Board is seeking approval of the proposal by **the majority of those who vote vs the membership (301 "yes" votes)** or some other number.

You can read more about this topic on the ["Save Our PUD Pools" webpage](#).

A note on the **environmental impact/wastefulness** argument presented in the ballot.

We all care about the environment. We knowingly purchased homes in a community designed with **17 neighborhood pools** and **2 golf courses** as **desired luxury amenities**. These amenities existed at the time we all decided to purchase our houses and are part of the community's character. Singling out pools without addressing broader environmental tradeoffs raises questions about consistency and proportionality.

Please take action:

1. **Vote NO on Vote 1 and Vote 2** in the ballot.
2. **Go to the “[Save Our PUD Pools](#)” webpage** to find more information and analyses related to the above points.
3. **Fill out the “[Save Our PUD Pools](#)” online form** to join the community of members who oppose to the PUD Board’s proposal and stay informed.

Thank you for taking the time to review the information and participate in the vote.

Sincerely,

Savas Parastatidis on behalf of a group of 25+ concerned Indian Ridge PUD homeowners
[“Save Our PUD Pools”](#)