

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

A Community Workshop of the Grand Haven Community Development District's Board of Supervisors was held on **Thursday, August 2, 2012, at 2:00 p.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	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)
Robert Ross	Amenity Management Group (AMG)
Brett Markovitz	District Engineer
Lawrence Morey, Jr.	CPH Engineers, Inc.
Sabah Blaney	CPH Engineers, Inc.
Vic Natiello	Resident
Ken Heritage	Resident
Ginger Richards	Resident
Gloria Schleith	Resident
Marti & Ozzie Garziglia	Residents
Janet Search	Resident
Ray Smith	Resident
R.J. Carlton	Resident

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Mr. Wrathell called the workshop to order at 10:05 a.m., and noted, for the record, that Supervisors Davidson, Gaeta, Lawrence and Pollinger were present, in person. Supervisor Chiodo was not present at roll call.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

UPDATES: District Engineer

- **Road Repair Criteria and Prioritization**

Mr. Markovitz introduced Mr. Lawrence Morey, Senior Roadway Engineer.

Mr. Morey gave a brief history of his roadway experience. He provided the Board with a handout containing the functional classifications of the arterial, collective and local roads. According to his calculations, the District has three (3) arterial roads comprising approximately 2.43 miles, eight (8) to nine (9) collective roads totaling 3.5 miles and about 13.3 miles of local roads. The first step will be to review the original plans and as-builts to determine what was intended or built for each segment, as the development was built in phases. He noted that some roads are older than others and will be more critical.

Mr. Morey stated that, for each roadway, they are trying to determine the type and thickness of the settlement base, the base composition and the asphalt layer. Once the information is obtained, they calculate the original design structural number of each roadway segment. For example, the original design structural number for Grand Haven Village D1 was 2.59; however, over time and, as the pavement matures and weathers, the pavement degenerates. After determining the layer coefficients, they conduct a visual qualitative field review of each roadway segment.

Mr. Morey explained the three (3) general categories that for identifying road conditions. The “good” category includes no cracking, only minor rutting and distortion. New pavement is rated 10.0. As time passes, deterioration occurs and a crack rating of 8 or higher, with minor rutting or distortion places the roadway into the “fair” category. Anything below 8 is considered to be “poor”. For example, Mr. Morey noted a portion of A1A that would rate a 7 and another roadway that was down to 4.5 before it was resurfaced. Technically, anything below 6 is considered substandard.

Mr. Morey stated that, when it is time to rehab a road, the general goal will be to restore the original design strength by building or using a method that leaves the roadway curb, gutter and drainage system alone.

Mr. Morey explained that, for pavements showing signs of structural failure or significant rutting, the visual evaluation might need to be augmented by specific minor geotechnical analyses to determine if there is something underneath causing the problem.

The District Engineer would like to complete the evaluation, categorize each roadway segment with a number and prioritize them. He noted that other factors, such as the types of vehicles using the roadway and the traffic volume, can impact the road and its priority level.

In response to Supervisor Lawrence's question, Mr. Morey stated that a 6 or lower rating is a major problem. Supervisor Lawrence suggested that roads rated 6.5 or 7 should be considered for repair first.

Supervisor Pollinger asked if the District Engineer has reviewed the budget numbers to determine if the Board is being realistic in the amount it is setting aside for the project. Mr. Morey replied no and stated that the evaluation has not been completed.

Mr. Markovitz stated that the purpose of the evaluation today was to confirm the District's desired level of evaluation and obtain approval to move forward. He estimated that it would take two (2) weeks to complete an evaluation of all roads, at a cost of approximately \$5,000 to \$6,000.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that Sailfish Drive should be addressed as a first priority and recommended including it as a consent item on the next agenda. In response to a question, Mr. Wrathell recommended waiting until the District Engineer completes a review and provides a cost proposal for the project. Regarding anticipated cost, Mr. Kloptosky stated that his preliminary estimate was \$150,000. Mr. Wrathell envisioned the District Engineer evaluating the road and preparing bid specs for the project.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the District Engineer toured the items that the Board discussed at the last few meetings and asked for their opinion.

Mr. Sabah Blaney, of CPH Engineers, indicated that he was asked to evaluate the croquet court, spa, pool and various other items. Regarding the croquet court, he noted depressions and general wearing out of the court. He recommended minor repairs to the court, including refilling and laser leveling, at an estimated cost of \$2,000. He saw no problems that would cause severe repair work. Supervisor Davidson asked if CPH has contractors for this type of work. Mr. Blaney stated that he is working with a few.

Mr. Blaney advised that he did not have time to investigate the The Village Center croquet court, as he only found out about it yesterday.

Regarding The Village Center parking lot, Mr. Blaney indicated that due to the age and state of it, he recommends resurfacing it, including milling, leveling and repaving. The estimated cost is \$48,306. Mr. Morey advised that the estimated cost is based on standard unit costs; it is not a proposal. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he obtained a proposal from S.E. Cline for \$40,891, which includes repairing lifted curbs, cutting tree roots; however, it does not include removal of the imposing tree. In response to a question from Mr. Blaney, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the curb repair costs were not isolated in the proposal. Supervisor Lawrence asked where CPH would place the parking lot, on a scale of 1 to 10. Mr. Blaney rated it a 7. Mr. Morey suggested that this could be part of a bulk project, depending on the findings on the community roads.

Regarding Sailfish Drive, a CPH representative stated that the road surface is not too bad; the problem is related to the flat grade, preventing water from moving. CPH is looking at options, such as regrading the entire road. Mr. Morey noted that the correct, long-term fix would be regrading; however, that is the most expensive options. Alternatively, they will research installation of a small inlet system to remedy flooding without regrading.

Regarding the spa at Creekside and The Village Center pool, Mr. Blaney indicated that White Sands reviewed each and provided proposals. White Sands found that the water loss and paver damage is related to the skimmer leaking. The proposal to repair the skimmer, replace tide caps, prep and remarcite was \$3,025. For The Village Center pool, White Sands proposed \$28,847.50 to remarcite the entire pool, replace all tiles and bring the pool up to code. Mr. Kloptosky pointed out replacement of the nonskid tiles, which requires a permit, and asked if the District would be required to address other issues, such as handrail heights, that currently do not meet code, as a condition of the new permit. Mr. Blaney advised that White Sands did not feel there was a problem with the handrails and other items.

Mr. Blaney discussed pool lift requirements, stating that White Sands advised that if tenants are on short stay, a pool lift is required; however, if they are long-time residents, it is not required. It was noted that if a pool lift is required, the cost would be an additional \$5,500.

Mr. Kloptosky questioned what will be done to address the bulging tile area. Mr. Blaney stated that the tile will be removed, the crack will be identified and epoxy will be injected into

the cracks. Mr. Wrathell asked for confirmation that White Sands does not feel the bulging problem issue is structural and will result in larger problems; they feel it is a settling problem that will not worsen. Mr. Blaney replied affirmatively. Mr. Lawrence noted the five (5)-year warranty and asked if that will include repairs if there is future bulging. Mr. Blaney replied affirmatively. Mr. Kloptosky questioned what will be done to address the bulging in the sidewall of the pool and whether it would result in additional costs. Mr. Wrathell explained that Duda Pools felt the bulging is the result of faulty construction and will continue. Mr. Wrathell voiced his concern that just epoxying the cracks will not resolve the continual bulge situation. Mr. Blaney will address those concerns with White Sands. Supervisor Davidson asked if White Sands recommended a time to complete the work. Mr. Blaney stated that it will continue cracking. Supervisor Gaeta asked for a time frame for the pool closure. Mr. Blaney indicated that the pool must be closed for two (2) weeks and the spa will take two (2) days to repair and must remain closed another two (2) days. Supervisor Davidson asked if the outside temperature impacts the repair. Mr. Blaney felt it would be minimal; the pool may take slightly longer to cure, in colder temperatures. Supervisor Davidson asked Mr. Blaney to inquire about performing the work in January. In response to Supervisor Gaeta's question, Mr. Blaney stated that the pool lift estimate of \$5,500 is the cost per battery-operated lift, including installation.

Mr. Morey explained the cost difference between the proposals, stating that CPH first contacted larger pool contractors who recommended working directly with the marcite subcontractor.

Supervisor Gaeta asked about the scope of work and whether pool closures would be necessary, should pool lifts be required, and recommended postponing the repair work until the status of pool lifts is known. Mr. Blaney stated that the District can schedule the repair work whenever they want.

Supervisor Lawrence asked if the alternate solutions for Sailfish Drive will be available for the next meeting. Mr. Blaney replied affirmatively.

Mr. McGaffney recalled that Duda Pools recommended having a pool engineer give a rendering of what the project should entail, from which a proper bidding could be done, and asked if CPH had a pool engineer do so. Mr. McGaffney noted that, presently, it appears there are two (2) vendors giving two (2) different opinions but neither is a pool engineer's, fact-based opinion. Supervisors Lawrence and Davidson stated that CPH did. Mr. McGaffney pointed out

that CPH stated that they went to a pool or marcite company and asked for an opinion. Mr. McGaffney asked if the District has a pool engineer or a fact-based assumption of the problem that can be used to obtain bids from several pool companies. Mr. McGaffney noted that most contractors want to know what they are bidding on. Mr. Morey asked Mr. McGaffney to define what he means by “pool engineer”. Mr. Wrathell advised the District Engineer that the District wants the problems resolved and as close to a new pool condition that will last 12 to 15 years. Mr. Wrathell stated that the District is relying on the District Engineer to evaluate the entire issue, including structural matters, and bring in the professionals they feel are needed. Mr. Wrathell did not disagree with Mr. McGaffney’s point and the need for pool contractors to fully understand the scope of the problem, which is the bulging issue. Mr. Wrathell stated that the District is looking for the District Engineer to evaluate the problem and structural concerns and determine whether there is a structural issue. Mr. Kloptosky agreed with Mr. Wrathell, noting that Duda Pools evaluated the pool when it was drained, including the sidewall, and made his determination based on that. Mr. Kloptosky stated that the sidewall repairs were what drove Duda Pools’ proposal up. Mr. Kloptosky suggested that CPH have their pool contractor conduct a similar evaluation, through either lowering the pool or using a diver, to more closely evaluate it. Mr. Wrathell stated that the bulging is of concern and Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the problem was not observed two (2) years ago, leading him to believe something is happening.

▪ **Operational Plan for Firewise Gates**

****This item, previously Item 5H, was presented out of order.****

Mr. Vic Natiello, a resident and Firewise Board Member, discussed recommendations after conducting on-site inspections of all six (6) gates. He noted that the bolt cutters being used could not cut the existing chains. He thanked Mr. Kloptosky and his staff who took it upon themselves to rechain the gates and ensure that the bolt cutters worked, etc.

Supervisor Davidson presented his second draft of the emergency exit gates protocol. He indicated that the chains are now standardized and the same for all gates. Different sized chain cutters are stored in the North, Main and South Gate guardhouses, The Village Center and a set will be placed at The Crossings pool and Creekside office. He advised that all gates have combination locks. Supervisor Davidson stated that four (4) residents of The Crossings will be titled “Wildfire Marshalls of the Crossings”. The marshalls will be on call 24-hours per day and will have the lock combinations and keys to the storage room with the chain cutters. On the

Grand Haven side, the field operations staff will be in charge of opening the gates during regular working hours and, during off hours, two (2) CERT team members will be responsible. Supervisor Davidson stated that the CERT Team, plus members of the Firewise Board, will establish an “On Call Chain Cutter Squad” who will be in charge of opening gates on the Grand Haven side, after hours.

Mr. Kloptosky asked Supervisor Davidson for the wording for the signage he wants installed. Supervisor Davidson indicated that the information is pending.

It was recommended that the procedures specifically state that the person take the chain cutters with them when going to the gates, to avoid needing to return to retrieve them, in an emergency.

DISCUSSION ORDER OF BUSINESS

DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Proposed Fiscal Year 2013 Budget

1. Review of 2013 Capital Plan (TL)

- **Proposed Budget Additions**
 - **Priority: “Must Do” Items**
 - **“Want to Do” Items**

Mr. Wrathell presented the proposed budget and noted that the budget public hearing will be held on September 6, 2012 at 5:00 p.m.

Supervisor Lawrence pointed out that the District plans to put \$466,927 into the Fiscal Year 2013 capital projects budget. He recalled that, from that amount, the District will repay the overage in this fiscal year, which is currently estimated to be \$161,044. He recommended leaving leeway in projects and voiced his feeling that the safety and health must do items are critical. The tree root project, Creekside spa, Creekside building repainting, The Village Center pool, lifts and smart cards are the priorities, followed by stop bars and redoing Sailfish Drive.

Supervisor Davidson asked that the estimates for these projects be updated with the most current estimates. Supervisor Chiodo asked if there is a contingency figure in the capital. Supervisor Lawrence felt that the way to accomplish a contingency is to not spend all that is proposed for the capital projects. Discussion ensued regarding whether the budget is sufficient.

Supervisor Pollinger voiced his concern that the District continues to be blindsided by unexpected disasters. Supervisor Lawrence suggested waiting until the District Engineer completes their review and makes a determination about resurfacing the roads.

Regarding road and parking lot repairs, etc., Supervisor Chiodo recommended factoring those into the budget and not always assuming that the costs will come from the road reserve fund. The Board agreed to include The Village Center parking lot project in the list.

Regarding the proposed budget, Supervisor Davidson noted that an estimate was obtained and the oak tree pruning line item should be \$14,400, not 12,000.

Supervisor Gaeta recalled that the Board previously voted to eliminate one (1) workshop, bringing the Supervisors' fee down by \$1,000. Rather than eliminating a workshop, she recommended eliminating a meeting and saving not only the Supervisors' fees but also District Counsel's fee. She stated that the December meeting is scheduled for December 21, which is in the middle of the holiday season and questioned the need for a meeting. Supervisor Davidson felt that the problem with that suggestion is that the Board would not be able to set policy for two (2) months. Regarding the impact, as suggested by Supervisor Davidson, Mr. Wrathell stated that it would only be an issue if the Board was trying to advance a new project; something previously authorized would not be interrupted and it does not stop the paying of bills, etc. Mr. Wrathell recommended moving the December meeting to the workshop date and only assembling once during December. Mr. Wrathell confirmed that this change will be included on the upcoming proposed meeting schedule.

Regarding the new gym bikes and treadmills on the CIP list, Mr. McGaffney advised that all can be removed, as he feels repairs will be sufficient.

Discussion ensued regarding whether the projected legal fees are realistic. Mr. Wrathell noted that Mr. Clark requested that any legal fees related to infrastructure reinvestment be coded to that area. Mr. Wrathell pointed out that this approach would further impact the available CIP budget. Supervisor Lawrence stated that if this will be the way it is accounted for, then the CIP must be increased and the O&M side should be reduced by a similar amount. Mr. Wrathell stated that if this change will be made, it must be done so today, as the 197 letters will be sent prior to the next meeting. Mr. Wrathell noted that this adjustment would, in effect, increase the assessment even more; however, to avoid that, a separate legal line item could be created in the

regular budget. It was noted that including legal fees in the infrastructure section could create confusion.

******The workshop recessed at 11:33.******

******The workshop reconvened at 11:44.******

Supervisor Davidson discussed security and community access data solutions. He stated that there are several components in the \$50,300 figure related to hard and software to meld the Door King and Master databases. The next component is shown in the Dolphin Technical Solution \$10,000 proposal and relates to upgrading the electronic DVRs located at all of the Main Gates, Creekside and The Village Center.

Supervisor Lawrence voiced his opinion that \$50,000 sounds like a lot of money if it will only accomplish real time interaction between the two (2) databases and asked for an explanation of what the cost covers.

Supervisor Davidson stated that a single, very old computer, in the Creekside office contains the Door King information. This information cannot be shared with the CDD's other computers; everything must be done manually. He explained that a network was recently created so that the various computers could share information and the next step is to create the software that allows for creation of a master, relational database.

Supervisor Davidson detailed the utilization of the current computers for different uses and the need for new computers. He advised that the original proposal also includes more powerful data processing software for all computers and licensing. The new system would allow for utilization of the Smart Amenity Access Card (SAAC) system, while the current system does not. He reminded the Board that once the systems are integrated, weekly printing of lists for use at the guardhouse would be eliminated. The proposal includes costs for amenity card printers, 4,000 cards, accessories for software and camera, a backdrop, three (3) barcode readers for permanent attachment to the Creekside office computers, four (4) portable barcode readers for use at Creekside and The Village Center.

Supervisor Davidson stated that, with the new system, all information can be updated daily, viewed and the SAAC system will recognize unauthorized users, etc. Supervisor Lawrence asked if the system will work with the gate access devices (GAD). Supervisor Davidson replied no.

Supervisor Pollinger questioned the proposed cost of \$3,000 per person, per week, for IT personnel. Supervisor Davidson stated that the labor cost covers three (3) IT people working on site for two (2) weeks to install and implement the system and train all users.

Supervisor Davidson reviewed other items included in the original proposal.

Supervisor Davidson presented the \$10,000 DVR upgrade proposal from Dolphin Technical Solutions. He indicated that the current DVRs are antiquated and six (6) are needed. He explained that these DVRs are not like the standard home DVR; they are much different. Mr. Kloptosky spoke of the cumbersome nature of the existing DVRs and the benefit of upgrading.

Supervisor Davidson summarized that the original and new proposals total \$60,300 for the data solution work.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that the next step is determining how to implement the SAAC system. He felt that Mr. McGaffney and Mr. Deary should look to reassigning staff hours during the initial implementation phase. Supervisor Davidson stated that the SAAC system will save the District money because it will eliminate usage of the facilities by unauthorized users. Safety and security within the community will be improved, once the District can track who is using the facilities and when. He feels that the facilitators currently lack the tools to quickly detect unauthorized users.

Regarding personnel costs related to implementation of the SAAC system, Supervisor Davidson discussed the need to employ former military or similar people for enforcement during the early stages but envisioned volunteer residents being able to monitor it once the system is fully implemented.

Supervisor Davidson recalled the need to deactivate unassigned GADs but recommended not doing so until the CDD office staff is prepared to handle the Beneficial User Rights (BUR) policy. Supervisor Lawrence recalled the 1,400 GADs that were found to not be in use and questioned why deactivation continues to be delayed. Supervisor Davidson voiced his concern regarding whether the office staff is currently prepared to handle things if some of those people are rightful users and need to be processed.

Supervisor Chiodo asked if the office has a plan if someone comes in because their GAD is not working and, if so, what is the plan.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he and Supervisor Davidson discussed the importance of first disseminating the BUR policy to the community to alleviate the possibility of

confrontations. He is working on filling the second office position and would like to delay implementation until the office is fully staffed and trained.

Supervisor Chiodo stated that Mr. Kloptosky's response did not answer his question. He asked if the office has a process, written instructions, for the office staff to use when someone comes in because their GAD does not work. Supervisor Chiodo asked Mr. Kloptosky what steps staff will go through with the person to deal with the issue of a GAD that is not working.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that he does not know of a written procedure. If a person comes in, they obtain the necessary credentials to verify that the person is a legitimate resident. If so, their file is pulled and the card is either reissued or their name is attached to the card. If they are not a legitimate resident, staff explains that fact and informs them that they cannot obtain a card.

Supervisor Chiodo recommended that Mr. Kloptosky prepare written procedures for his staff to follow. Mr. Kloptosky agreed that a written policy is essential.

Supervisor Davidson recapped that the total proposed cost for this program is now \$60,300 and suggested budgeting no more than \$5,000 to \$7,000 more for additional personnel during implementation, which would bring the total budget to approximately \$67,300. Mr. McGaffney stated that personnel costs may not be greatly impacted to the degree he originally thought; if monitoring is random, it could probably be accomplished using existing personnel but not if it is full-time monitoring.

Supervisor Pollinger stated that he favors the concept of this project but questioned the driving factor being to eliminate overutilization of the facilities, noting that he does not see overutilization. He is not convinced that the budget can support all of the components presented, as it is already a tight budget. Supervisor Davidson stated that the pool area was overrun at Easter by people who appeared to have no business being in Grand Haven.

Mr. Gary Noble, a resident, contended that it is ridiculous that the Board is considering spending \$60,000 to keep six (6) people out of the pool, periodically.

Supervisor Gaeta stated that she has encountered numerous people during the week. She also disagreed with Supervisor Pollinger's position that the facilities might not be being overutilized.

Supervisor Pollinger stated that he would like convincing evidence of overuse and noted that it is possible for the Board Members to disagree without being disagreeable.

Supervisor Chiodo noted that the problem is that this entire proposed project is being based on anecdotal testimony; the last time a study was conducted to determine unauthorized users was approximately eight (8) years ago. It was before Creekside was built. The findings were that there were hardly any interlopers using the amenity facilities. Supervisor Chiodo stated that the District is about to spend a lot of money to solve a problem but does not have hard data to support the perceived problem. He suggested full-time checking for two (2) weeks to determine the magnitude of the problem. Supervisor Chiodo felt that the only way residents will be convinced that the District is completely secure would be to check users 100% of the time; rule breakers would quickly figure out a random check system.

Supervisor Gaeta reminded the Board that she has not voted on this item and that, although she has a family member involved, he is only a consultant to Dolphin Technical Solutions. She stated that the District asked him and several consultants to evaluate the situation. Regarding Supervisor Chiodo's comments about eight (8) years ago, Supervisor Gaeta stated that the community dynamic is different now. She questioned if there are more than the known renters. She stated that she moved into this community for the perceived security and the similar social class of people; however, a lot has changed in the past eight (8) years.

Supervisor Chiodo reiterated that most of the information presented is based on individual perception and recommended conducting a check. Supervisor Pollinger questioned if this project can be accomplished, given the tight budget. Supervisor Lawrence stated that the District should be realistic about the reregistration process, noting that an attempt to reregister 1,999 properties, at the estimated 45 minutes per property, equates to 38 person weeks. Supervisor Lawrence stated that he has no problem with reregistration but feels that the District must determine how it would be accomplished. The last time it was done, community volunteers were used and the community was one-tenth the size.

Supervisor Davidson stressed the importance of tracking renters because the problem will only worsen. He voiced his opinion that the SAAC system is essential because an ID card with only a picture cannot be read and tied to the database. He pointed out that the amenity card portion of the overall proposal is only \$12,000, which could easily be recouped through reduced wear and tear by unauthorized users and the possibility of people purchasing memberships.

Supervisor Chiodo noted that the project might be worth the piece of mind it gives residents and the perceived security, which may be enough to get resident support.

Supervisor Lawrence stated that the Board must ask Mr. Kloptosky how his two (2)-person staff can handle reregistering 1,600 home sites. He noted that the Board has discussed disseminating the BUR information *ad nauseam* and questioned what they are waiting for. Supervisor Davidson stated that there was a staffing problem.

Mr. Kloptosky felt that there is no reason to delay sending the BUR policy for the purpose of informing the community that it will be coming, in the future. He confirmed that the reregistration process will take months with only the current staff but stated that there is no problem spreading it out in a systematic way.

Mr. Wrathell discussed the benefits of implementing this type of program, as opposed to hiring additional security or roving patrols.

Mr. Kloptosky stressed the need to implement a database system in order to keep better records.

Supervisor Gaeta distributed and presented her illustration entitled ‘Critical Component Requirements For Project Support & Enforcement “The Three Legged Stool” Approach’. She voiced her feeling that the security and safety of the residents is paramount to anything the Board does. She noted that the current recordkeeping system uses an Excel spreadsheet, which is a cumbersome method. She detailed the components involved in the security project and concluded that it takes all parts working together for the project to be successful. Supervisor Gaeta asked Mr. McGaffney to prepare and make a visual presentation at the next meeting detailing what his staff does to support and enforce security.

Discussion ensued regrading keeping the capital projects as is and then further discussing certain items on the bubble over the next few months and into the new fiscal year.

B. Development of BOS Policy Regarding the Removal and/or Addition of an Amenity to the Existing Amenity Package (SD/TL)

- **REDRAFT: Proposed Criteria for Adding or Eliminating an Amenity (*to be provided under separate cover*)**

Supervisor Davidson asked for comments on the draft policy.

In response to Supervisor Gaeta’s question regarding available space on the master plan, Mr. Wrathell explained the requirements when a community’s master plan is submitted. He concluded that Grand Haven’s space has been fully platted and laid out. Supervisor Lawrence recalled that the only amenity areas in Wild Oaks were the dog park, basketball courts and a small field.

Discussion ensued regarding how to gather community input when considering the addition or elimination of an amenity and how to use or value the information obtained. Eliminating the specification of “Survey Monkey” as the survey tool and having the Board develop the survey instrument, not the amenity manager, was suggested. Mr. Wrathell felt that surveys or public hearings are not required; public input can be heard at a regular meeting.

Supervisor Gaeta questioned if the Board can legally eliminate an amenity. Mr. Wrathell stated that the benefit to the property owner must be equal to or greater than the assessment; therefore, if an amenity is removed but replaced with another, they are still receiving a benefit. If an amenity is removed and not replaced, the cost is reduced so, arguably, the assessment should be reduced. In summary, Mr. Wrathell advised that the Board has the ability to remove an amenity and/or replace it.

Mr. Wrathell stated that the 197 letter must be sent soon. He noted that a 1% or 2% cushion is usually included in the noticed amount and asked the Board how much to include. He stated that projected increases over several years could be included in this letter, to avoid needing to send a 197 letter every year. The Board preferred to maintain a yearly notice. Mr. Wrathell asked if the Board is comfortable with Management adding a 2% cushion to the amount currently being considered. The Board concurred with that approach.

C. Possible Elimination of Call Boxes

- **Benefits/Losses**
- **Door King/Master Database Reports Now Available for Review**

Supervisor Davidson stated that some are in favor of removing the call boxes and some are not. Supervisor Lawrence felt removal of the call boxes would create an inconvenience for residents and visitors. Supervisor Chiodo noted that the North and Main Gates are only 500 yards away from each other and questioned whether there would be an inconvenience. Supervisor Chiodo acknowledged that the two (2)-mile distance between the South and Main Gates could be an inconvenience. A Supervisor discussed the data confirming that certain households are allowing numerous, unknown people into the community, by way of the call boxes. Mr. Kloptosky noted the negative resident response to additional wait time, when a gate must be closed.

Mr. Wrathell wondered if the database and enhanced DVR system will eliminate many of the concerns about people entering using the call boxes.

Supervisor Pollinger suggested tabling this matter until the District determines if a problem really exists. The Board agreed.

D. Special Services Agreement from Aquatic Systems, Inc., for LAKEWATCH Water Sampling (BK)

Supervisor Davidson explained that LAKEWATCH water sampling was typically performed by community volunteers; however, there were never enough volunteers. As a result, the District plans to hire Aquatic Systems, Inc., to sample the lakes.

Supervisor Davidson stated that the overall cost is approximately \$4,000 per year. Supervisor Davidson recalled that he was told that the District would be the only entity paying someone to sample, as a part of the LAKEWATCH program. He reminded the Board that there are no workman's comp or liability issues with having volunteers sample the lakes.

Mr. Kloptosky informed the Board that the estimated cost does not include delivery of the samples for analysis; staff, or someone else, would need to deliver the samples to the lab. Supervisor Davidson indicated that the data will be forwarded to Supervisor Lawrence for compilation.

Mr. Wrathell asked if the Board agrees to increase the aquatic budget by \$4,000. The Board was agreeable. Mr. Wrathell noted that this increase will be reflected by a decrease of another \$4,000 in the miscellaneous contingency line item.

E. Redirecting Flow of Traffic at Amenity Center (MG)

Supervisor Gaeta stated that, at her invitation, the City of Palm Coast Fire Marshall inspected the amenity facilities and property and informed her that there are multiple points of egress at both The Village Center and Creekside. For this reason, she requested that the Board approve redirecting pedestrian traffic around each area, after the office closes each day, to limit access to a single point.

Supervisor Pollinger voiced his concern about Board Members independently bringing in city officials to conduct an assessment. Supervisor Gaeta stated that she did not do that; she only called the Fire Marshall. Supervisor Pollinger interjected that this is his concern. Supervisor Gaeta indicated that, prior to calling the Fire Marshall, she spoke to Mr. Deary and Mr. McGaffney. Supervisor Chiodo felt that this type of matter should come before the Board to seek direction. Supervisor Gaeta stated that she did not intend for the Fire Marshall to visit the facilities; she only invited him to attend a workshop or meeting.

Supervisor Chiodo asked if this is a security issue related to minimizing the number of entrance and egress points after the office closes, each day. Supervisor Chiodo asked the difference and Supervisor Pollinger questioned the fire department's involvement. Supervisor Gaeta felt that people are aware that they can access the facility at certain times without needing to identify themselves. In response to a question, Mr. McGaffney stated that a facilitator is present at the various entrances but it is not 100% covered for checking everyone that enters; their contract calls for random checks.

Supervisor Pollinger reiterated his concern when a Board Member acts independently to bring issues and officials into the community to assess the District's facilities, prior to presenting it to the Board. He is concerned when the Board begins acting as if they are the day-to-day operations personnel, when they are not.

Mr. Wrathell speculated that this was a good intention that had an unintended consequence. Mr. Wrathell felt that this matter is a part of the overall safety and security project being considered.

F. Security Gate Access Protocol

Supervisor Chiodo stated that this relates to the Main Gate guards allowing people access through other gates. He noted that the speakers at last month's meeting indicated that the guards do not do this but Supervisor Chiodo voiced his opinion that it is not true. He feels that the guards are not following the procedures.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he spoke to the security company representative and told her that he does not believe that the only people being allowed access are mail carriers, etc., as there were more entries than what could be accounted for. He asked the security company to provide a clear explanation. He confirmed that the representative was able to correctly tell him the specific process; however, he still questions whether the process is being followed and if new employees are receiving proper training. Supervisor Chiodo noted that anyone can approach even the Main Gate, state that they want to see the community and they cannot be stopped from entering. Mr. Kloptosky agreed with that statement. Supervisor Pollinger commented that the security company is not asserting that as the reason for allowing entrance.

Mr. Wrathell suggested asking Mr. Clark to comment on what the District can do, given the difference between someone wishing to enter the community at 2:00 p.m., versus 2:00 a.m. Mr. Wrathell was not sure the District's rules and procedures clearly define reasonable hours that

the public can enter the community. Supervisor Lawrence felt that the guidelines are specific; additionally, the guards should never allow anyone through to see an individual resident, as that is the purpose of the call boxes. Supervisor Lawrence felt that the only people the guards should allow through at the call boxes are UPS, mail carriers, garbage collectors, etc.

Supervisor Davidson questioned why the guards are not greeting and waving at people entering the community. Mr. Kloptosky stated that he discussed this with the security company representative.

Supervisor Lawrence indicated that the City of Palm Coast is holding monthly 5K races and would like to hold one in the community. If the District is amenable, Mr. Jim Cullis, of Grand Haven Realty, agreed to sponsor the race. Supervisor Lawrence detailed the race route. Supervisor Davidson asked the Board to bring their opinions to the next meeting and asked Supervisor Lawrence to gather more information, such as the race route, date, time, etc.

G. Wi-Fi Not Working in Village Center Café (TL)

Regarding the Wi-Fi issue, Mr. Kloptosky stated that he obtained a proposal of \$4,132 from Dolphin Technical Solutions to rectify the problem. Mr. Kloptosky explained that there are not enough hot spot ports and additional equipment must be installed. Supervisor Davidson concurred that additional information is needed and felt that the cost could be significantly reduced if the work is performed in conjunction with other work.

H. Operational Plan for Firewise Gates

This item was discussed earlier in the meeting.

I. Installation of Electronic Gates for Checking Amenity Cards (TL)

Supervisor Lawrence discussed his vision for electronic gates for checking amenity cards and securing the amenity facilities.

Regarding the proposed Senior Care Project, Supervisor Davidson indicated that Mr. Cullis is in the process of addressing the Board's questions. An agreement is forthcoming granting the CDD the right to use the Grand Haven oak tree logo. A document dedicating at least one (1) handicapped parking space to the District, near the main guardhouse, is being drafted. Regarding Mr. Cullis' intention to name the senior care facility "Grand Haven North", Supervisor Davidson stated that he stressed to Mr. Cullis the need to be very clear that there is no relationship between his facility and the Grand Haven CDD or access to the CDD's amenities. Mr. Cullis did not agree to change the name but has agreed to include a disclaimer in his

advertising. Discussion ensued regarding preventing this project from becoming student housing, etc.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

UPDATES: District Manager

- **NEXT MEETING/WORKSHOP**

- **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING**

- **August 16, 2012 at 9:00 A.M. (Shaded Meeting)**

Mr. Wrathell reminded the Board that a shaded meeting will be held at 9:00 a.m., just prior to the August 16, 2012 regular meeting.

- **August 16, 2012 at 9:30 A.M.**
- **September 6, 2012 at 3:00 P.M. (Regular Meeting)**
- **September 6, 2012 at 5:00 P.M. (Public Hearings)**

- **COMMUNITY WORKSHOP**

- **September 20, 2012 at 10:00 A.M.**

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

UPDATES: Field Operations Manager

- **Maintenance Crew**

This item was not discussed.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

UPDATES: Amenity Manager

This item was not discussed.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

OPEN ITEMS

This item was not discussed.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

SUPERVISORS' REQUESTS

- **Final Distribution of Community Directory (MG)**

This item was not discussed.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the workshop adjourned.

On MOTION by Supervisor Gaeta and seconded by Supervisor Lawrence, with all in favor, the Workshop adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chair/Vice Chair