

**MINUTES OF MEETING  
GRAND HAVEN  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

A Community Workshop of the Board of Supervisors of the Grand Haven Community Development District was held on **Thursday, October 6, 2011 at 10:00 a.m.**, at the **Grand Haven Village Center, Grand Haven Room, 2001 Waterside Parkway, Palm Coast, Florida 32137.**

**Present at the meeting were:**

Dr. Stephen Davidson	Chair
Peter Chiodo	Vice Chair
Marie Gaeta (via telephone)	Assistant Secretary
Tom Lawrence	Assistant Secretary
John Pollinger	Assistant Secretary

**Also present were:**

Craig Wrathell	District Manager
Matt Kozak	Wrathell, Hunt & Associates, LLC
Barry Kloptosky	Field Operations Manager
Howard McGaffney	Amenity Management Group (AMG)
Roy Deary	Amenity Management Group (AMG)
Nancy Fargnoli	Grand Haven Administrative Staff
Tary Tucker	Grand Haven Administrative Staff
Joe Renzo	Resident
Bob Hopkins	Resident
Bob Crouch	Resident
Al Lo Monaco	Resident
Frank Benham	Resident
Rob Carlton	Resident
Ron Merlo	Resident
Vincent Marmo	Resident
Tom Byrne	Resident

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Mr. Wrathell called the meeting to order at 10:12 a.m., and noted, for the record, that Supervisors Davidson, Chiodo, Lawrence and Pollinger were present, in person. Supervisor Gaeta was attending via telephone.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS****PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

- **Tree Issue - 11 Egret Drive**

***\*\*\*This item was an addition to the agenda.\*\*\****

Mr. Wrathell introduced Mr. Joe Renzo, a resident. He provided the Board with pictures of a District tree which overhangs onto Mr. Renzo's property. Mr. Renzo voiced concerns about the size and condition of the tree and possible damage from branches falling onto his home. Mr. Wrathell confirmed that he reviewed this matter with District Counsel; his opinion is that the District has no liability, as long as the tree is healthy and properly maintained. Mr. Wrathell reiterated Mr. Renzo's concern that damage could occur, even if a healthy branch hit a person or his property. Staff's perspective is that the District has the right to leave the tree in place; however, Mr. Wrathell felt the Board should use its discretion in making a policy decision, regarding this matter.

The Board agreed to include this item on the next agenda.

- **District Counsel Letters to Residents – Treatment of Staff**

***\*\*\*This item was an addition to the agenda.\*\*\****

Mr. Wrathell recalled that District Counsel was asked and has sent letters to two (2) residents for mistreating staff. He indicated rebuttals were received from both individuals; however, those issues will not be discussed today. Mr. Wrathell felt this matter has been addressed and further issues can be dealt with, as needed.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS****CONSULTANTS, GUEST REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS**

- **Field/Office Manager Office Staff**

- **Continued Discussion: Resident Registration: Issues, Process, Policies, Timelines**

Supervisor Davidson reviewed the reason for this continued discussion. He noted that, conceptually, the beneficial user rights clause establishes that there be one (1) set of user rights for each residential address or lot and further explained the estimated number of occupants, per residence, as it relates to the total number of users, within the community. Supervisor Davidson

indicated problems arise in the situation of a residence that currently has 15 occupants, which is approximately 4.3 times the anticipated occupancy rate. He questioned whether the District can legislate the number of occupants, noting there are stipulations allowing for special assessments to owners, when something is excessively beyond the norm. Supervisor Davidson requested research into whether the Board can pass a rule regarding exceeding a certain number of occupants resulting in the property owner receiving a special assessment for excessive use of the facilities.

As it relates to the beneficial user rights clause, Supervisor Davidson felt that issues also arise when both a tenant and the property owner are utilizing the facilities; creating a double demand. These instances of overuse potentially create wear and tear on the infrastructure, amenities and roads, along with increasing the repair and maintenance expenses, annual budget and assessments. He further felt these items result in a decrease in the quality of life of other owners.

Ms. Tucker reviewed the organizational process being utilized by the office staff and the status of each phase. She indicated that when Phases 1 through 3 are completed, a strategy must be developed to complete Phase 4, which is community-wide re-registration and verification. Ms. Tucker presented a draft of the requirements for new residents and suggested the information be emailed to new residents on a monthly or quarterly basis; new residents would be asked to make an appointment to register. She reviewed the draft gate access and amenity card requirements for current residents. In response to Supervisor Lawrence's question, Ms. Tucker confirmed she will accommodate walk-ins, if she has time. Mr. Kloptosky advised that new residents are being asked to make an appointment because their registration takes longer to complete and process. Supervisor Chiodo questioned the requirement for all family members to be present, at the time of registration. Ms. Tucker stated it is to make things easier but there can be exceptions. Mr. Kloptosky indicated if all family members are not present, the registration will be set aside, as an incomplete registration; if attendance is required, processing can be completed. Ms. Tucker confirmed that requiring new residents to make an appointment will allow staff to process the registrations in a more timely and caring manner.

Discussion ensued regarding the required proof of residency and/or ownership and vehicle registration documents.

Ms. Tucker reviewed the change form for resident information updates and the process to be utilized. She presented a reminder notice to residents to provide their vehicle registration information within 30 days, otherwise, their gate activation devices will be deactivated.

Ms. Tucker stressed that staff is trying to make this entire process as easy as possible.

Ms. Tucker reviewed the Grand Haven CDD Office Procedures handout regarding new resident intake procedures, current/pioneer resident file maintenance procedures and miscellaneous questions and suggested solutions. She indicated the office receives many calls from residents who are unsure about whom to contact for specific matters and asked if there is a document which provides this information and the possibility of an e-blast containing the information. Supervisor Davidson indicated the information is in the resident directory and has been disseminated; however, confusion remains. Supervisor Davidson recommended staff direct the caller to the correct entity and provide the phone number. Supervisor Gaeta discussed revisions to the resident directory to better clarify and inform residents of the District's, HOA's, etc. responsibilities and provide contact information.

Ms. Tucker asked the Board to clarify the age requirement for photo ID cards. Supervisor Davidson indicated the age is currently 13 years old. Recalling an incident where a young child was left unattended, Supervisor Davidson spoke in favor of requiring photo IDs for all children who are able to walk, or beginning at age five (5). Supervisor Pollinger noted the unlikelihood of a child carrying their ID card and wondered what the requirement would accomplish. Supervisor Davidson suggested that the system be enforced such that children must have their ID with them, in order to gain access, regardless of whether they are with a parent, adult, etc. Supervisor Chiodo stated that the minimum age for using the facilities, without adult supervision, is 13 and recommended the photo ID requirement correspond to the set age for using the facilities. Mr. Wrathell felt the District can only do so much to ensure parents responsibly supervise their children and wondered how much is gained by requiring photo IDs for young children. In response to Supervisor Gaeta's question about other CDDs, Mr. Wrathell confirmed the level of identification that Grand Haven is looking to enforce exceeds that of most other CDDs he manages. Mr. Deary indicated other communities were designed for control and while this community cannot be redesigned, it can be retrofitted to attain a level of control that is not currently in place. Mr. Deary stressed that this would also require a change in people's behavior, in order to comply with the new requirements, such as reducing the number of access

points. Mr. Deary noted other communities use photo IDs but warned against putting a child's name on a photo ID. In his experience, Mr. Deary confirmed the age to require a photo ID is rarely younger than 13. Discussion ensued regarding retrofitting the two (2) main facilities and pools to limit the access points. Citing the residence currently occupied by 15, many of which are children, Supervisor Davidson stressed his concern about the changing ages of the community and the need to reduce the photo ID age requirement. Supervisor Gaeta recommended obtaining quotes for surveillance of the areas. Supervisor Lawrence voiced his concern that the District may be overreacting and letting one situation drive the Board's decision making; the Board should look to the normal situations to make its decisions. Mr. Wrathell reiterated that the District should make its rules, regulations and policies clear; however, in the end, it is the parent who takes full responsibility for the supervision of the child.

Mr. Bob Hopkins, a resident, spoke in favor of keeping 13 as the photo ID age requirement.

Mr. Bob Crouch, a resident, indicated he recently moved into the community and has used all of the facilities on numerous occasions but has never once been asked to show his ID. He spoke of the irresponsibility of parents attending the community's Thursday night happy hour while their children are playing in the pool.

Supervisors Pollinger, Gaeta, Chiodo and Lawrence were all in favor of maintaining 13, as the age requirement for photo IDs. The Board agreed to requiring photo IDs for age 13 and above, with the resident's name imprinted on the ID.

- **Unanticipated Situation in Original Master Plan: Problems/Solutions and Policy Determination**

Ms. Tucker referred to the Grand Haven CDD Procedure/Policy Questions handout and posed the following gate access Device (GAD)/Amenity Card questions:

*1) What if a prospective buyer wants to go into Wild Oaks or Crossings without their Realtor to view a property for Sale? Karen from Golf Club called to ask this question.*

Mr. Wrathell indicated, as it is a public road, they must be allowed access; however, they may need to obtain a pass. The Board discussed referring unattended prospective buyers to the sales office and/or realtor and only allowing access if the person demands access, as it is a public road or enacting policy requiring prospective buyers to be accompanied by a realtor. Mr. Wrathell stressed his belief that the District must allow access, as it is a public road. Restricting or denying access could result in the bonds becoming taxable. The Board agreed to instructing

prospective buyers to the CDD office, to grant clearance, then directing them to the main gate to obtain a day pass. Supervisor Pollinger voiced his opinion that this situation rarely arises; the Board is addressing anomalies.

2) *Rental Car issue: A resident came in to inquire about extended stay for her relatives. They will come here on and off for extended stays. They drive a rental car each time they are here. The resident wants to get a GAD for them. What do we do?*

Mr. Wrathell advised against distributing a GAD. The Board discussed having the visitor obtain an extended pass.

Supervisor Davidson voiced his opinion that GADs be tied to the officially authorized motor vehicle, and limited to garage and driveway capacity. Short-term rental cars using main gate, should be allowed to enter with a pass or be placed on the VIP list.

3) *What about college kids who come throughout the year? Amenity Cards? GAD?*

Mr. Wrathell recommended allowing them normal access, as with any other family members, provided they are properly registered and obtain the amenity card, etc.

4) *Extended stays?*

This item was not discussed, as it was covered under #2 and #3.

5) *Age for photo ID card? Minor ID process, parents' presence required?*

As previously discussed, minors 13 and over will be required to have a photo ID card. The Board agreed that a parent must accompany a minor obtaining a photo ID.

6) *Is there a limit on vehicles residing at residents address? Maximum number of GADS?*

The Board discussed limiting the number of vehicles and GADs to the number that can be accommodated on the resident's property. Properties with a two (2)-car garage would be allowed a maximum of 4 GADs, based on the allowance of two (2) vehicles parking in the garage and two (2) in the driveway. Similarly, a home with a three (3)-car garage would be allowed a maximum of six (6) GADs. Mr. Wrathell confirmed the District is not obligated to provide any gate access devices; however, it does so as a convenience.

Mr. Hopkins felt the existing policy puts the discretion with the Operations Manager for the distribution of any more than two (2) GADs. Acknowledging Mr. Wrathell's opinion that a GAD is a courtesy item, Mr. Kloptosky commented that if the Board stands firm on this policy, it may result in numerous residents coming before the Board to be heard. Mr. Wrathell advised that residents should swap their GADs between their vehicles, if necessary.

7) *Company cars – are they allowed?*

Supervisor Lawrence felt a company car should be allowable, the same as any vehicle owned by the resident. The Board agreed and included handling lease vehicles and dealer cars in the same manner.

8) *Black Market Remote – accept them under normal vehicle registration policy?*

Regarding remotes purchased from a previous owner, the Board agreed to deactivate the remote and reactivate it with the new registration; however, the used remote will not be under warranty. Should it break, it will not be replaced by the CDD.

9) *Golf Club Membership for non-residents to have GAD – continue allowing or discontinue? What about those whom already have them.*

Mr. Wrathell felt nonresident golf club members should not be given GADs. The Board noted that some members have them and they are not tracked to determine if still active. The Board agreed to no longer distribute GADs to golf club members who are nonresidents.

10) *Nonresident amenity membership form – need to review and update if needed to have available.*

- a. Number of family members allowed?
- b. Fees for guests if they have them, number of guests allowed?
- c. Overnight fees vs. daily?
- d. Currently \$2500 – per household or per person?

Mr. Wrathell suggested any nonresident member be given the benefits of a two (2)-car garage household, meaning, up to four (4) GADs and four (4) amenity cards but guests should not be allowed. He discussed that while the District cannot disallow people using the facilities, it can charge a membership fee and recommended making the membership restrictive, by not giving GADs, issuing only four (4) amenity cards and not allowing guests. Supervisor Lawrence noted that this membership option has only been used by one (1) person, in all the time it has been offered. The Board discussed and agreed to the \$2,500 fee, including up to four (4) amenity cards for household members and a prorated fee for each additional card, no GADs and no guests. Proper registration will be required.

11) *New owner – moved in July 14, 2011 and registered using old forms. On September 19, 2011 a tenant registered using the new forms and obtained amenity cards and GADs. How should we proceed with this in terms of the amenity transfer/beneficial user agreements?*

Mr. Wrathell felt the benefits should be with either the owner or the tenant but not both. Discussion ensued regarding the registration form wording and changing it from “I have leased” to “in the event I do lease”. The Board agreed that if amenity cards and GADs were issued to the property owner, they will not be issued to a tenant until the owner returns the items. The issue must be handled between the owner and tenant; it is not a CDD issue. The tenant must register properly to have their GADs and amenity cards activated.

Supervisor Gaeta recommended an e-blast reminding owners that they cannot simply turn over their GADs, amenity cards, etc. to the new owners, tenants or real estate agents; they should be turned in to the CDD office.

Mr. Crouch discussed the transfer and/or sale process used in other developments, which requires the seller to turn in their access devices, etc., at the closing; if they do not, the property cannot close. Supervisor Davidson asked that this question be posed to District Counsel.

*12) Length of time for passes? : Vendor, guest, overnight guest, Grand Haven Realty guest, Hampton Golf full member.*

Supervisor Davidson clarified this question refers to passes, not GADs or amenity cards. The Board agreed to issuing yearly passes to Hampton Golf full members, one (1)-day passes for vendors and daily guests, weekly passes for contractors and major service providers, including UPS, contracted lawn companies, etc., who will be on a list at the gate. The Board agreed to issuing length of stay passes to guests staying longer than a day and up to three (3) months, as requested by an adult owner. The Board agreed to issue day gate and amenity passes, for \$10 per guest, to Grand Haven Realty guests who are preregistered, with fees collected and paid to the CDD in advance.

**\*\*\*The workshop recessed at 12:19 p.m.\*\*\***

**\*\*\*The meeting reconvened at 12:29 p.m.\*\*\***

**The following portion, beginning at 12:29 p.m., was not recorded due to audio device failure.**

The Board discussed the following renter/lease questions presented by Ms. Tucker:

*1) What has been decided in terms of Month-to-Month renters? Do we need something in writing – if so, how often? By whom?*



- 2) *What if an owner rents to a renter for an extended time period – ex. 5 years – but it is non and off and they want the renter to keep GAD/AC throughout? The owner also wants to keep renter name on Door King.*
- 3) *What if an owner rents to a family member without a lease and does not want to provide a lease? Do they need to provide a lease or is an email or something in writing sufficient?*
- 4) *What if an owner wants someone to reside in their residence with no lease and no rental payment to basically “house sit” for them? We have an email from the owner giving them permission and describing the arrangement.*

**Audio resumed at 12:47 p.m.**

- 5) *Should there be a pre-approval rental committee to review leases before resident come to CDD office to register? What do we do when leases are not signed or half signed?*

The Board agreed to not be involved in any pre-approval, renter or lease reviews. Only fully executed leases will be considered valid.

- 6) *Who is responsible for providing CDD office the leases – homeowner, renter or rental agency? Who is responsible for providing renewals? Who is responsible for informing CDD office that the renter has moved out? How does this work with the Amenity Transfer Form? We really need a clear, concise user-friendly process to be in place for CDD office to implement this Amenity Transfer forms/Beneficial Users Rights Clause. THIS IS A BIG GAP IN OUR POLICY AND PROCEDURES.*

Supervisor Davidson referred to the Master Association declaration, noting it says a copy of the fully executed lease shall be delivered by the owner to the secretary of the association. Discussion ensued regarding the association’s handling of leases. Mr. Wrathell reminded the Board that the CDD cannot ‘police’ leases; the only reason the CDD wants a copy is for proof to issue GADs and amenity cards. Additionally, the CDD is under no obligation to ensure leases are up-to-date, etc.

Referring back to questions #1 and #2, the Board confirmed that the CDD should not be concerned with lease terms; the CDD assumes the leases continue until such time as they are informed otherwise. Additionally, renters and/or owners seeking GADs and amenity cards must obtain the issued devices from the renter or owner previously in possession of them, before new ones will be issued by the CDD.

Ms. Tucker reported the CDD office currently has approximately 125 leases, on record. She indicated, under the current system, both the owner and renters have GADs, as there has not been a process for retrieving them. Over the past months, staff contacted those with expired leases and obtained new leases. Staff has deactivated the GADs for those that moved. Ms. Tucker asked for confirmation that staff should not follow up on the expired leases, going forward.

Mr. Wrathell reminded the Board that the CDD's purpose relates to amenities, facilities and infrastructure, not policing the community. Supervisor Davidson suggested staff record the term of the lease but do nothing until someone new requests GADs and amenity cards.

Ms. Tucker reiterated her question of whether staff should approach the 125 leased property owners and/or renters requesting the return of the GADS and amenity cards from either the owners or renters, as only one or the other should have them. Supervisor Davidson recommended pursuing this during the universal reregistration process.

Discussion ensued regarding when and how to remind owners of the GAD and amenity beneficial users rights clause and its impact on them.

7) *Lease Renewal will require a new Amenity Photo ID Cards – do we charge that \$5?*

The Board determined that new amenity ID cards will not be required upon lease renewal but will be required when current cards expire. Going forward, renter amenity cards will contain the word 'tenant' but will not contain an expiration date.

The Board addressed Ms. Tucker's remaining questions:

1) *How many family members can occupy a residence? Anything specific on this?*

Mr. Wrathell indicated this is out of the CDD's realm of responsibility. The CDD can only control amenities and facilities.

2) *E-blasts:*

a. *What is the responsibility of the CDD office in terms of residence (residents) calling in for questions/concerns/issues/complaints?*

b. *What is the responsibility of the Southern States/HOA office in terms of residence calling in for questions/concerns/issues/complaints?*

These questions were previously addressed.

c. *Do we need an e-blast to inform residents from time-to-time of the difference?*

The Board agreed that e-blasts should remain short and specific. The necessary information will be posted on the CDD website with hyperlinks.

3) *What about any future policy/procedure issues that come up? What will be the procedure to handle these?*

Supervisor Davidson indicated temporary policies and procedures will be codified by the Board at a later time. He stated that the Operations and District Managers have the power to provide temporary policies.

4) *Where there is lack of policy in individual unique circumstances – need a degree of flexibility for Field Operations Manager to make exception on a case-by-case basis. Need discretion to interpret, then monitor, respond and enforce.*

This question was answered under item #3, above.

5) *How do we handle complaints going forward? Can we set up a grievance policy and mediation process as part of this to resolve conflict but more importantly give both sides a chance to be heard to find a solution that will make the PROCESS better.*

Mr. Wrathell felt that the CDD does not need to bureaucratize this process any further; if someone behaves inappropriately to Staff, District Counsel will send a letter and, if the person wishes to respond, they should put it in writing and it will be made a part of the District's record. Second offenses warrant a letter and the person's privileges will be revoked. Mr. Wrathell indicated Staff should provide periodic reports of any new situations that arise which can be discussed by the Board. Supervisor Davidson recommended the use of audio visual devices.

Ms. Tucker questioned what should happen when or if the rebuttal letter contains lies. Supervisor Davidson and Mr. Wrathell indicated it does not matter, no further response is needed. Supervisor Lawrence questioned what the Board is to do when the rebuttal letter requests or insists that the District's original letter be rescinded. Supervisor Davidson indicated that under the current Amenities Rule & Policies, it cannot be rescinded. Supervisor Lawrence felt a followup letter is necessary, if the rebuttal letter has asked a question or asked the Board to take some type of action. Mr. Wrathell likened this to the public comment section of the meeting where the Board is under no obligation to respond to the public's comments.

Supervisor Lawrence wondered if the District should provide Staff with training on how to handle difficult customers/situations. Mr. Wrathell felt it would be a good idea.

- **“KGGH” PI/PR Campaign Communications (SD)**

Supervisor Davidson reported that an initial e-blast was sent regarding Keeping Grand Haven Grand; he anticipated a total of five (5) e-blasts prior to the new year and the kickoff of the re-registration process. Supervisor Gaeta asked if the e-blasts could contain subject identifications or an attention grabber.

- **Continued Discussion: Resident Directory (MG)**

Supervisor Gaeta reported that the resident directory is being proofread again. The internal Grand Haven and all other information was updated. She spoke of working towards continuity. Supervisor Gaeta asked the Board if the directory should include the information, as prepared, but also have a separate publication of the rules, regulations and policies. She suggested distributing the rules publication during re-registration and having the owners sign off. Supervisor Gaeta felt if the CDD plans to enforce policies, the residents should receive a document containing the policies. Mr. Wrathell noted that the District’s rules will likely change at a pace different than when the directory is published; therefore, separate publications makes sense. Supervisor Gaeta spoke of uses for the directory and benefits of owners, residents and realtors having the rules and/or policies. The Board agreed to separate publications.

Supervisor Gaeta suggested offering the directory on various formats, such as thumb (USB) drive, CD and hard copy. Supervisor Davidson indicated the CDD is currently committed to a paper format and he has reservations about providing it in an electronic format.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**REPORT: Field/Operations Manager**

Noting the Workshop Agenda is beginning to resemble meeting agendas, Supervisor Lawrence recommended skipping this item, as Mr. Kloptosky has another section in the agenda, to cover items. The Board agreed.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**A. Access Control Services Consultant**

- **Community Access Management, LLC (RD)**
  - **Revised Proposal**

Mr. Kozak recalled the presentations at the last meeting and noted it is now apparent that the District’s surveillance equipment has issues.

Mr. Deary reviewed the proposal and proposed cost of \$2,155. He indicated the activities outlined are geared towards what the District asked for in the revised proposal. Mr. Deary discussed the District's objectives and development of a plan to meet those objectives.

Mr. Kozak discussed a conversation with Mr. Troy Railsback, of Southern States, regarding other security companies. He mentioned Securitas and a tech person. Mr. Kozak will make calls for further information.

Supervisor Gaeta felt the District should employ someone with the necessary experience and understanding to properly oversee the project, comparable to Ms. Leister's work, throughout the landscaping project.

Mr. Wrathell felt the development of a master plan includes taking what is already in place and identifying what needs to be done to improve or fix it, trains staff and oversees implementation. He wondered if Bright House's new cable system will be key in making the system effective. Mr. Wrathell summarized the approach being to look at what the District has and make it work correctly; master plan the big picture regarding cameras, priorities and budgeting and then design the system. Supervisor Davidson felt the District should tune up what is in place and wait to see what cable provider can meet the District's needs. In addition to the cameras, Supervisor Davidson felt the master plan should include gate access, roving security and man versus unmanned video monitoring. The macro plan encompasses the remainder.

**B. Access Control Services (*proposals to be provided under separate cover*)**

Mr. Kozak noted that Envera Systems was not interested any further. He reviewed the revised proposals received from Dolphin Technical Solutions, LLC and TEM Systems, Inc. Mr. Kozak indicated the scope of work is nearly identical. Dolphin Technical Solutions proposal covers the North, South, Main, Wild Oaks, Crossings, Village Center and Creekside areas and includes tuning up the equipment already in place so it fulfills its intended function. Dolphin Technical Solutions proposal is to validate cameras are pointing in the proper directions, ensure cameras are properly focused, clean DVRs and check video output, label each camera properly in the DVRs so video retrieval will be easier, install new video card in Ms. Farngoli's computer to improve video quality of DVR files being viewed and train staff on use of DVRs for a cost of \$3,000. Mr. Kozak indicated, for an additional cost of \$1,000, Dolphin Technical Solutions will install web cams in offices [three (3) in CDD office and one (1) in Amenity Center office], train staff on use of DVRs, set up a simple network in the CDD office so staff can share printer, files

and internet access and potentially transition the DVRs in Creekside and the Village Center to high speed internet from DSL. Supervisor Lawrence pointed out that the proposal implies the mentioned items are included in the total proposal. Mr. Kozak noted the price was not updated on the proposal but he has an email indicating the \$1,000 cost for the additional services. Discussion ensued regarding the District's computer networks, the need for a server for backup purposes. Mr. Wrathell suggested asking Mr. Gaeta to rework the proposal to include an onsite server. In addition to the proposed cost, travel and living expenses and/or material expenses incurred are to be reimbursed by the District.

Supervisor Davidson reviewed the TEM Systems' proposal, which includes installation of four (4) webcams, [three (3) in the CDD office and one (1) in the Amenity Center], setup of a simple network in the CDD office so staff can share files, printers, etc., and training staff on use of DVR equipment, for a cost of \$6,637.13. TEM Systems' proposed cost for the tune up is \$5,803.36.

The Board discussed the difference in cost between the proposals.

As a Board Member is related to one of the proposers, Mr. Wrathell recommended Mr. Kozak speak to both companies regarding the server issue and obtain revised proposals for consideration on the next agenda. He noted that District Counsel should determine whether Supervisor Gaeta must recuse herself from voting on the matter.

Supervisor Davidson asked Supervisor Gaeta if Mr. Gaeta plans to travel to Florida to perform the work or if he will work through a subcontractor. Supervisor Gaeta believed Mr. Gaeta and a representative of Dolphin Technical Solutions both plan to travel to Florida. Supervisor Davidson noted the proposal requires the District to reimburse travel and living expenses and questioned if two (2) flights and living accommodations for two (2) people need to be considered, as it will change the quote. Supervisor Gaeta indicated Mr. Gaeta stayed with her on his last trip. She felt Mr. Gaeta would drive a truck down this time. Mr. Kozak will inquire as to the ancillary costs.

**C. Additional Areas of Major Security Concerns**

- **Security Camera Locations – Village Center and Creekside (BK)**
- **'No Parking' Signage**
- **Speeding Solutions (JP)**

**D. AMG Profit & Loss, Village Center Café – Amenity or Business (TL)**

- **Café Profit Sharing Between AMG & CDD (RD)**

Supervisor Lawrence suggested the CDD needs to determine if the café is a standalone business or if it is an amenity. He feels it is probably more an amenity, similar to the pool, as there are expenses or costs to having it in the community. Supervisor Lawrence noted the café has always lost money, including when the CDD ran it. Supervisor Pollinger agreed that it is like an amenity; it is a restricted venue for the community's convenience. Supervisor Chiodo discussed the utility costs for the café, similar to those of other amenities.

Supervisor Gaeta felt the café was a marketing tool for the developer, especially since there were no other restaurants in the area, until a few years ago. She discussed the definition of an amenity and, acknowledging that the café may be an asset to the community, she did not necessarily agree that it is an amenity.

Mr. Deary noted that all of the other amenities are subsidized through CDD fees and the only difference is AMG is providing the service to man the café, so the residents can enjoy it. Mr. Deary felt Supervisor Gaeta's definition implies that, in order to be an amenity, the café would have to give food away for free and provide the free labor, which is not feasible. He indicated AMG is trying to provide the food at a reasonable cost which will cover the labor costs. Supervisor Gaeta voiced her understanding but felt the café is a benefit, not an amenity.

Supervisor Gaeta questioned Mr. Deary's letter and the contention that AMG is providing \$30,000 annually out of its contract with the CDD. She stated AMG is not putting \$30,000 out of its pocket into the café; rather, AMG is relegating \$30,000 from its contract, towards the café. Mr. Deary stated that Supervisor Gaeta's interpretation is correct and, referring to his letter, he noted it clearly states 'AMG is providing \$30,000 annually out of its contract. Mr. Deary confirmed that, if the \$30,000 was not needed to subsidize the café, it would be removed from the contract with the CDD. Supervisor Gaeta questioned if that \$30,000 is included in AMG's contract because they know it will be needed for the café. Mr. Deary replied affirmatively. Supervisor Chiodo confirmed this has always been the case and has not changed.

Supervisor Davidson suggested the Board discuss this further, should the café reach a point when it is truly profitable. Mr. Wrathell noted if this were a private restaurant, it would fail.

**E. Preliminary 5-Year Assessment Projections *(to be provided under separate cover)***

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

**F. Approvals of FY2012 Capital Plan (TL)**

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

**G. Analysis of Stormwater Credits (MK)**

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

**H. Community Bank of Broward – Request to Close Account (CW)**

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

**I. Business Plan: Program Descriptions (BOS)**

This item was deferred to the next meeting

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**REPORT: District Manager**

This item was not discussed.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**OPEN ITEMS**

This item was not discussed.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**SUPERVISORS' REQUESTS**

Supervisor Chiodo provided a handout about the J. Cullis property tax issue and explained it to the Board. He indicated Mr. Cullis is asking that the CDD remove assessments from two (2) of the properties, as they are not saleable. Supervisor Chiodo proposed ways to handle the assessments on those properties.

Mr. Wrathell discussed the bond debt on the lots and the possibility of allowing Mr. Cullis to pay off the bond debt on the two (2) lots. He indicated the Board has the ability to make a decision regarding the O&M assessments if only four (4) of the lots are platted. He noted Mr. Cullis would need to complete the platting in time for next year's tax rolls, so the CDD can assess accordingly.

Mr. Wrathell confirmed this issue is different than where one (1) residence was built on two (2) lots.



Supervisor Davidson asked that Supervisor Chiodo approach Mr. Cullis to establish a process for preregistering those he is inviting into the community.

Supervisor Lawrence indicated he is holding a town hall meeting and asked if any Supervisors plan to attend, so he knows whether to notice the meeting. Mr. Wrathell confirmed an ad is not required unless another Supervisor attends; however, he recommended advertising, in order to avoid any Sunshine Law problems.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**On MOTION by Supervisor Davidson and seconded by Supervisor Pollinger with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 2:18 p.m.**

---

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

---

Chair/Vice Chair