

WORKSHOP REPORT
Grand Haven Development District

Meeting Date 10/28/08 Start 10:05 a.m. End 2:45 p.m.

ATTENDEES: Present

P. Chiodo	Barry Kloptosky/OM	Chris Buckley VC Mgr
D. Cross	T. Lawrence/OM	
S. Davidson	D. Berman/DM via phone	
S. Halley	C. Trautwein	

BUSINESS ITEMS:

1) Board Member Protocol

Presentation and hand out made by Pete Chiodo.

A) Lack of respect by the Board between board members, CDD contractors and residents.
Micromanagement - of Board Employees by Board Members.

Allow CDD Managers to do their jobs

We need to curtail personal agendas and streamline meetings.

.Eliminate individual Board member directives to CDD employees. (Set parameters for CDD employees) Establish performance objectives for the staff and mission direction is needed.
Workshops in the future- Define Supervisor's Role.

B) Doctrine of Civility- Tom Lawrence explained has been adopted by other Govt. entities.

Treat everyone with respect.

Give staff a chance to resolve an issue you are aware of.

10:55 a.m. Dave Berman signed off. No cost to CDD

2) Landscape and Irrigation Issues

Austin representatives answered questions.

Tom Lawrence- handout of costs for irrigation heads, boxes etc.

Discussion of head replacements and reclaimed water problems, air pressure surges and the aging CDD water system. Austin recommended putting money aside for future replacement.

3) Tennis Issues

Ken ~~Jackson~~ ^{Boerner} guest- PC Community Center Pro 

Spoke about the Chelsea Reservation they use.

Features: Requests for reservations can be made from telephone and internet.

Sends email confirms with date and time. Gives each member a number which tracks their use.

Penalties for no shows.

Cost- depends on the type of design you want.

Telephone connection fee and \$10/mo per court. (\$70 month to GH)

Steve Davidson presented data on current tennis situation as well as other systems. See handout
Recommended steps to block time. **Chris Buckley instructed to keep time and use records of**

courts and report in the future.

4) Air Handler and Compressor at VC

Barry Kloptosky presented report.

1. Replace entirely with a 13 seer \$3,097. Recommends-more efficient


2. Replace only handler which is broken \$1900 cost-does not recommend

5) Rizzetta & Co reponse to Chairman's email

Presented by Pete Chiodo-

A) **Prepayment of Bond**-Rizzetta should be responsible for filing paperwork for residents who prepaid the 1997B bonds.

B) **Investments**-A delay by Rizzetta & Co. (Pete Williams) which took 5 weeks to supply the needed paperwork to seal the deal with First Nat'l City-resulted in a loss to the CDD
{Rates for the \$1MM investment. 9/4th the rate was 3.89 on bonds, 10/15th dropped to 3.35}

3.89 initial 

Other Issues

Suggestion by D. Cross- **Open Item list** of Dist. Mgr. should be given prior to the meeting. Sam Halley wants a True-up from Austin on maintaining entrance and pruning vines. Tom Lawrence was told to bring to next meeting.

Dennis Cross wants a Qtrly true up on actual cost by Austin.

Tom Lawrence stated that Scott Clark is to comment on salaried employees and their responsibilities and roles and the restrictions on Board demands on salaried employees.


Barry Kloptosky commented on roof repair and sealed bids.-stated spec sheets need an architectural and structural engineer and complicates and makes the procedure more expensive.

Ergo does not recommend sealed bids and cannot do them by the next meeting. He wants to rescind the sealed bid request at the next meeting. Commented on the embarrassment caused him by the allowing of Rende to bid after the previous decision. He recommends in order to establish the credibility of the CDD and the Dist. Mgr that bids should never be re-looked at after the fact. It is unethical and embarrassing. Barry Kloptosky stated previous experience with this firm was negative. He would not recommend using them. **The Warranties are not necessarily enforceable.**


CDD Board recommended a rebid with the four listed firms.

Dennis Cross -twelve villages have not been transferred to the CDD. List to be given to Libby Webb the District Engineer.

Report Issued by Charles J. Trautwein Vice Chairman October 29, 2008



ASSISTANT SECRETARY



CHAIRMAN

Exhibit A

Tennis at Grand Haven

The GH tennis courts are a community amenity provided for the use of all residents. The tennis courts were constructed with public (bond) funds and are maintained thru non ad-valorem o+m assessments to lot owners or daily/yearly user fees to non-lot owners.

There are currently 1664 occupied homes x 2.5=4160 estimated potential resident users.
At full build-out of 1901 occupied homes x 2.5=4752 " (14% increase.)

Informal groups report an estimated 230 active regular players: $230/4160=5.5\%$ of community.
Estimated 60 block players/ 230 total players = 26% of total players.
Current schedule includes 8 slots/day x 7 courts x 7days/wk = 392 slots/wk.
12 slots/wk tentatively block scheduled up to 48 hrs. in advance: $12/392 = 3\%$ of weekly slots

I/we as (a) GHCCD Board Supervisor/s, keeping in mind that the tennis courts are a community amenity open to all, would like to accommodate the active player groups as equitably as possible in evaluating whether a change in Tennis Amenity Policy is necessary. Two key issues are involved in the analysis:

- A. An evaluation of the current scheduling system.
- B. Distribution of blocked time for special play.

Scheduling system

The current scheduling system involves paper and pencil (P&P), via in-person or call-in request commencing 2 days in advance for date, court, and time of play. The current "round-robin" players sign up in a separate book 1 week up to 48 hours in advance.

Other available systems include a card and online computer reservation (Chelsea) system. A survey of local area tennis facilities has produced the following information:

City of Palm Coast Tennis Ctr. 10 courts, D>C, Chelsea System in house "best system when every court, every time period, every day, every season is in constant use. Always keeps court assignments fair and impartial."

Florida Tennis Ctr. 24 courts, C>D, P&P (did not renew Chelsea System), "most courts not fully booked on daily basis, cost \$10/month/court not justified. P&P works."

The Trails Racquet Club 8 courts, D=C, P&P (no card system) "too much volume only in morning, generally assigned 2 days ahead, assigned earlier for off peak times, limit pro teaching times."

Ormond Tennis Ctr.

8 courts, C>D, P&P (request slips 4 days in advance with random draw)

Result: until $D > \text{total } C$, i.e. until demand for every court, every time slot, every day, every season, cannot be met, P&P utilized by most facilities.

Rx: AMG to keep accurate as possible weekly record of court use, including last names of all players in currently blocked times. AMG to (spot) check players signed-up 48 hrs. in advance actually use courts as scheduled.

Results of VC email survey do not demonstrate a desire on part of respondents to change scheduling system to card system. AMG staff report current system works fine.

**Recommendation: until such a time as $D > \text{total } C$, the current P&P system remains in effect
AMG begin to collect weekly court usage statistics as above.**

Distribution of blocked time for special play.

Some players have anecdotally complained that the current block scheduling of 4 courts 3 days/week, for "round Robin" play, has created a $D > C$ problem. Although the community has no accurate statistics on court use at this time, anecdotal reports indicate that the problem is more of a competition for specific time slots at specific times of the day during specific seasons. The following steps are recommended to address this problem:

Short term:

1. Accurate court usage statistics be kept by AMG
2. AMG relabel men's and women's round robin blocks as "Community Tennis."
3. Names of all Community Tennis players to be recorded up to 48 hours in advance.
4. Minimum of 6 players/court for each CT slot, i.e. 4 courts = 24 players
5. If 24 hours ahead, insufficient players signed-up, court/s released for general play

Long Term:

6. AMG to create a Tennis Advisory Group:
 - Amenities Director
 - 2 Community Tennis Players,
 - 2 Competitive (Intra/extramural league)
 - 2 Casual players, working + non
 - 2 Non-players.

The group to develop an equitable distribution of blocked time for special play, such as Community Tennis and Intramural League play (to be developed.) The Amenities Director should present the results to the GHCCD BOS for policy decisions. The GHCCD BOS should not micromanage the tennis amenity courts schedule unless it becomes apparent that the community is so divided and uncompromising that a totally impartial, computer generated, weighted lottery system or a rationing system becomes necessary. Then all will be unhappy equally.