

Email from former Mayor Kevin Sullivan to Lago Vista Watchdog editor Jack Britton, Oct. 5, 2026, 9:25 a.m., subject "Corrections and Additional Info." His attached list of corrections follows on the next pages, as he sent it. Email addresses, his phone number, and his signature block (logos and photo) removed by Lago Vista Watchdog. The research files he attached are posted separately.

Jack,

I've attached a list of corrections that I think reflect my statements from yesterday and where appropriate, I've included the research that backed my assertions.

I get that stories are limited and it is difficult to include everything. The full context from the recording will better reflect what I said. Do you mind putting something up front in the article to encourage readers to listen to the recording for a fuller picture of my comments?

Regards,
Kevin

Corrections/Information for Jack

- 1.) Your calculations on the Roadway Impact fee match my memory of what we passed. In the Fee Schedule, I just looked at the fee per Service Area. I did not check the number of Service Units as part of the calculation. The \$7,592 and \$1,713 figures per single family residence matches my memory of what we passed. So, the difference between the funds generated from higher density versus lower density is even more dramatic.
- 2.) In your definition of the FLUM would you mind using this full definition from the recommended CMP **The Future Land Use Plan is not a zoning map and does not grant development rights or entitlements. It does not *predetermine* specific land uses, densities, or development outcomes.**
- 3.) The Shoreline Ranch PDD caps the development at 568 units, not homes. We do have the rights to some multifamily.
- 4.) Don't know if you want to reflect the full extent of my time on council, if you do, I was on from June of 2016 to November 2018 and then November of 2020 to November of 2023 as a council member and mayor from November of 2023 to November of 2025.
- 5.) Review Chapter 14, Section 13.30(c)(3) for evidence that it takes 75% of the council to approve a zoning change.
- 6.) On the use of Impact fees, here is some additional information. The widening of Lohman should qualify as it expands capacity and would support the traffic associated with the new development. The controlling law is **Texas Local Government Code Chapter 395**. For Lago Vista specifically, its 2021 roadway and water/wastewater impact-fee ordinances expressly adopt Chapter 395 and incorporate the City's Impact Fee Study and Capital Improvements Plans. [Lago Vista, Texas](#)
The basic rule is this: an impact fee can be used only for **capital improvements or capacity expansions necessitated by and attributable to new development**, and only for the purposes identified in the adopted **Capital Improvements Plan (CIP)**. Eligible costs include construction, engineering/surveying, certain land-acquisition costs, and limited financing/CIP-preparation costs.
- 7.) I've attached a file with the prompt I gave ChatGPT and its response about Kevin Shephard and his teachings. It is pretty clear what the results are of his research. Much clearer than you indicate in the story.
- 8.) I've provided you with my research on the 140 Texas cities assertion and my APA research.

9.) When you describe the 2023 council action to deny the FLUM update request, you mention that I said there are two issues with the discussion. You are not very clear in your description of the two points I made. They are outlined in the slides I sent and cover the fact the council conflated the issue of a PDD Amendment with what was before us which was a FLUM request and council members insisting that a developer live with entitlements and never take advantage of the defined PDD process the city has. That second one wasn't covered in your story that I could see and really reflects the city's lack of transparency with developers. If you are not going to allow developers to take advantage of the PDD amendment process, remove it so investors will know what they are buying and the limitations they will experience.

10.) On the Turnback PID assessments, I've attached my research that corroborates my memory from the DAIS. The PID bonds were estimated to be \$40,000,000 for the infrastructure. Divide that by 349 units in the development and the average assessment would be \$114,613.