

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

A Regular Meeting of the Grand Haven Community Development District's Board of Supervisors was held on **Wednesday, July 24, 2013 at 9:30 a.m.**, in the **Grand Haven Room, Grand Haven Village Center, 2001 Waterside Parkway, Palm Coast, Florida 32137.**

Present at the meeting were:

Dr. Stephen Davidson	Chair
Peter Chiodo	Vice Chair
Marie Gaeta (<i>via telephone</i>)	Assistant Secretary
Tom Lawrence	Assistant Secretary
Raymond Smith	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Craig Wrathell	District Manager
Howard McGaffney	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Scott Clark	District Counsel
Allen Skinner	District Engineer
Liam O'Reilly	Genesis Group
Robert Ross	Vesta/Amenity Management Group (AMG)
Roy Deary	Vesta/AMG
Joe Montagna	Vesta/AMG
Barry Kloptosky	Field Operations Manager
Louise Leister	Horticulturalist
Roy Search	Resident
Janet Search	Resident
Richard Thomas	Resident
Betty and Larry Kersey	Residents
Walter McRae	Resident
Mia Marchio	Resident
Chip Howden	Resident
Diane Layng	Resident
Richard Burns	Resident
Vic Natiello	Resident
Gary Noble	Resident

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Mr. Wrathell called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m., and noted, for the record, that Supervisors Davidson, Chiodo, Lawrence and Smith were present, in person. Supervisor Gaeta was not present at roll call.

Mr. Wrathell noted that today’s meeting was rescheduled and presented the proof of publication.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

**AUDIENCE/RESIDENT RESPONSE,
REPORT & COMMENTS (3-Minute
Rule; Non-Agenda Items)**

Ms. Janet Search, a resident, read the following statement:

“I am here on behalf of Fairways Edge and Linkside East. We have a problem with vines taking over the Reserve areas. One area goes from #11 tee box to Waterside Parkway and the other is between Player’s Circle and St. Andrews Court. These preserve areas, apart from being a barrier between the homes on Augusta Trail and Linkside East and between St. Andrews Court and Player’s Circle are very important wildlife habitat. Without the natural barriers, the homes would be exposed to each other, something that does not exist in Grand Haven. We chose these properties because the trees and vegetation and the barrier that they provided between the homes. Also, as trees start falling, and I have been told that two (2) have fallen already, we just don’t know which way they will fall or on whose homes they may fall on. I have heard that a Board Member made the statement “If we provide good croquet courts, we will increase the value of the homes in Grand Haven”. What that is attracting is the people that are moving here from Hammock Dunes, where they had to pay \$7,000 to play croquet; they get it here for free and still want the same conditions they had when they paid \$7,000. Maybe you should think about the home values the current residents will have. Without our natural barrier, it will be a total, horrible sight to see. Many of us in these two (2) communities have paid in to the CDD for between 12 to 14 years and have had nothing more than a few flowers at the

entrance, which I believe has also been eliminated. We are not asking for the desecration that occurred on Chinier Street. You should probably check with the State of Florida for the best proven ways to get rid of these invasive vines. There are applications that can be sprayed on the vines or cutting the vines and using methods to destroy the root. Bulldozing the vines does not kill the imbedded root and is never mentioned in the State of Florida website as a way to destroy invasive vines. Many neighbors have been fighting the vine problem with a lot of time, money and effort. We can only take care of the properties that are behind our homes; we cannot go into other areas.”

*****Supervisor Gaeta joined the meeting at 9:38 a.m.*****

Ms. Search continued her statement:

“We need to get workers to go in the area to find the origin of the vines and properly kill them. If it were your personal home and you had the resources for one choice, would you choose to fix the tree that would fall on your home or buy a video gaming system? When my husband and I purchased our Grand Haven property in 1998, we accepted supporting the tennis court, which have been expanded and improved. We accepted supporting a croquet court, for which we now have three (3). There will be new lighting put in at the tennis courts and I would bet there has not been a survey done to see how many courts really need to be lit, based on the usage at night and I have yet to find out the cost per month to maintain the croquet courts and the tennis court; these costs should be able to be defined. I would hope the Board would look at the vine issue not only in Fairways Edge and Linkside East but in all of Grand Haven and realize this is a much more urgent problem than games. I would hope that you would look to allocate as much money as possible at this problem that affects the entire community and I have yet to understand how croquet gets mentioned in every year’s budget. I understand that they do not get the money every year but at least they are there as a possible, which is more than most of the villages are. Last year the community let you know that the maintenance of Grand Haven is all they want and not wasteful spending on lavish upgrades of amenities. I am sure if questioned this year, their response would be the same. The logo for Grand

Haven is a tree; please help the community to preserve as many of them as possible. Please, we really need your help.”

Mr. Richard Thomas, a resident, read the following statement:

“I stand before you to address a serious problem that is invading Grand Haven and it appears that I am not the only one that is worried about this project. I am talking about the wild grapevine problem that is rapidly choking our beautiful trees. It’s an eyesore along Waterside Parkway and in all of the Reserve areas of Grand Haven; it is not just isolated in one (1) place. I think you all know that, you’ve seen it. It is getting to be so invasive it is going to start depleting the value of our homes. These trees will eventually die, as a result of the invasion of these wild grapevines and it will have a strong detrimental effect on overall property values. The type of vine that I am talking about was identified by Flagler County Extension as a wild grapevine and they stated that the damage that they are doing will result in the eventual death of the trees. I, along with many other concerned citizens of our beautiful community, would like an answer as to what is being done to address this problem. Secondly, at the risk of offending at least a couple members of this Board, I, along with many other members of this community, are not happy with the money that appears to be working its way into the budget, for a new croquet court.”

Mr. Thomas asked if money is budgeted for a new croquet court.

Supervisor Davidson replied to Mr. Thomas’ question, stating that money is not budgeted for a new croquet court; there will be no new croquet court. The question is what can be done to take the ‘lumps and bumps’ out of the existing court; it has nothing to do with building a new court. Supervisor Davidson reiterated that a new croquet court is not contemplated in this budget.

Mr. Thomas stated that he asked because it was brought up in previous meetings. He acknowledged that the croquet players wanted to bring the courts up to Hammock Dunes’ standards; however, this is not Hammock Dunes. Mr. Thomas feels that the entire population of Grand Haven should not have to pay for these upgrades. He recalled that he was charged a fee when he joined the golf course and was surprised to discover that no fees are assessed to tennis or croquet players.

Mr. Thomas continued his statement:

“I, along with other members of Fairways Edge, are getting highly irritated at being treated like a ‘redheaded stepchild’. I am referring to the obvious favoritism shown to the so called ‘wealthier’ communities within Grand Haven, vis-a-vie Front Street and the Osprey Lakes area. We, the citizens of Fairways Edge, would be delighted to sit with you anytime to talk about the lack of attention that we are getting. Things that are being cited for in Fairways Edge are being overlooked on Front Street and the Osprey area and this has become highly inflammatory. If you do not believe me, ride through these areas and see the violations for yourself. We need to protect our lovely community and spend our money fairly and wisely.

Thank you for your time, I hope these problems will be addressed with unbiased considerations.”

Regarding the violations to which Mr. Thomas alluded in his statement, Supervisor Davidson clarified that those are CC&R issues and the violations were issued by the GHMA; the CDD has nothing to do with those. In response to Mr. Thomas’ comments, Supervisor Davidson indicated that Mr. Troy Railsback works for the GHMA and recommended that Mr. Thomas attend the GHMA meetings and speaks to their President.

Ms. Betty Kersey, a resident, presented letters from residents in the areas who are unhappy about the vine issue.

Mr. Walter McRae, a resident, stated that he is greatly concerned about the vines and what they are starting to do. He discussed a tree on Augusta Trail that was covered in vines and fell. A portion of the tree fell in his yard. Mr. McRae contacted the office and was told that he cannot cut the tree down but someone would investigate. He noted that he was never contacted, so he had his lawn service cut off the top portion of the tree, which was in his yard, and return it to the CDD’s property. He stated that the vines cause the trees to rot. Mr. McRae voiced his concern about a pine tree, behind his home, which is completely covered with vines, and will probably fall into his house, when it falls. He indicated that all of the trees are being attacked and something needs to be done. Mr. McRae asked for the Board’s help.

Mr. Roy Search, a resident, voiced his opinion that it is time for the Board to seriously look at the way the Board is formed and the way communication comes to the Board. He feels that, instead of having just five (5) presidents, the District needs to add a ‘congress’ or ‘house of representatives’. He believes that the Board should have a representative of each community, as

well as from each cost center in the amenity package, such as tennis, croquet, etc. Mr. Search suggested that those representatives could meet and talk, which this Board cannot do. Those representatives can then bring the information to the Board. He feels that this would eliminate the fussing that the Board does when special interests need to be addressed. Mr. Search thinks that there should be a connection between the CDD Board and the golf club, as there are benefits from the golf course but the District is not in communication with it. He suggested an ambassador to the country club. Mr. Search voiced his opinion that, “without the country club, we are crap, here. You’ve got to realize that. All the croquet courts and tennis courts; it don’t mean anything, it is the golf course”.

Ms. Diane Layng, a resident, voiced her agreement with the previous speakers regarding the vine issues. She recalled previous reports about vines. Ms. Layng noted that she bought her property because of the beauty behind the home; the vines are causing the trees to die and impacting home values. Ms. Layng acknowledged that the vines are not an easy fix; however, she feels that residents are not getting much action on the issue.

Regarding Mr. Search’s statements about the ‘country club’, Ms. Layng clarified that it is a golf club, not a ‘country club’, and the CDD has no part of it; however, it would be nice if the CDD and the golf course coordinated events to avoid overlap.

Supervisor Davidson recalled that, a few years ago, the District initiated a landscape rejuvenation program, which is now complete. The \$50,000 that was previously set aside for that program now goes largely to vine removal. He assured the residents that Ms. Leister knows what to do with the vines. Supervisor Davidson stated that the majority of that budget is now set aside to address vines; however, it is very expensive to remove the vines, due to the amount of manual labor involved. He suggested that Ms. Leister try to prioritize the various areas, with life and property being the most important. Supervisor Davidson recalled that Ms. Leister worked with other areas where the communities worked together to eradicate the vines that were overtaking the area; however, the cost was in excess of \$200,000. He asked that residents understand how expensive it is to deal with this relentless problem. Supervisor Davidson stated that, if vines are originating from the golf course, there is nothing that the CDD can do.

Regarding comments about communication between the golf course and the District, Supervisor Davidson indicated that the District has an ambassador, as well as Mr. Kloptosky, who communicate with the golf course, quite frequently. He stressed that the CDD cannot force

the golf course to address the vine issue. Supervisor Davidson advised that, if a lot that backs up to the golf course, the issue is different than for those that back up to CDD property.

Supervisor Davidson stressed that the Board is aware of the vine issue and is spending money on it every year.

Mr. Kloptosky acknowledged that the District has limited funds for addressing vine removal but suggested that, near the end of each fiscal year, the Board consider allocating some of the left over funds in the ‘community’ line item, for vine removal.

Supervisor Davidson suggested that a representative from each village meet with Mr. Kloptosky to identify problem areas so that Ms. Leister can visit the areas and prioritize them.

Supervisor Lawrence noted that the District has miles of common land, behind resident homes, which is covered with vines. He feels that the Board never really did anything about the problem but has begun to address it. Supervisor Lawrence suggested budgeting an extra \$50,000 in the capital improvement program (CIP) budget, each year, for five (5) years, dedicated to vine removal, in order to more aggressively address the problem. He stated that the problem will only get worse. Supervisor Lawrence noted that, while nobody wants another Chinier situation, once the vines are removed, the underbrush might be dead and need to be removed, as well. Residents must understand that the process would not be ‘cut the vines and we are done’.

In response to Supervisor Chiodo’s question, Supervisor Lawrence estimated that approximately \$200,000 was spent on vine removal, over the past four (4) or five (5) years. He advised that vine removal takes a lot of money.

Mr. Kloptosky voiced his opinion that Ms. Leister has a very good understanding of the problem areas; however, he asked residents to contact his office to report vine issues so that he can compile a list, in order to prioritize the areas and begin a systematic approach.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

A. Approval of Minutes

- i. June 6, 2013 Community Workshop**
- ii. June 20, 2013 Regular Meeting**

B. Approval of Unaudited Financial Statements as of June 30, 2013

Mr. Wrathell presented the Consent Agenda Items for the Board’s consideration. Regarding the Unaudited Financial Statements as of June 30, 2013, Mr. Wrathell reported that assessment collections were at 99%.

On MOTION by Supervisor Chiodo and seconded by Supervisor Davidson, with all in favor, the Consent Agenda Items, as presented, were approved.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**STAFF REPORTS****A. Amenity Manger**

Regarding scanning smart amenity access cards (SAACs), Mr. Ross reported that the process is going very well; there has been little resistance. He feels that most residents are carrying their cards and he does not anticipate much trouble, once the program rolls out on August 5, 2013. Mr. Ross indicated that nonresidents come to Grand Haven, on the weekends, and he requested to add one (1) more facilitator, at The Village Center and Creekside, on the weekends, for another four (4) to six (6) weeks, to conduct extra card checks. In response to a question, Mr. Ross advised that each extra facilitator costs \$15 per hour. He estimated the work hours to be 10:00 a.m., to 5:00 p.m., each day.

Prior to moving forward with the extra facilitators, Supervisor Chiodo suggested counting the numbers, over the weekend, to determine the actual amount of people that the facilitators encounter, who do not have SAACs, etc.

Mr. Ross reported that nine (9) people were refused entrance, over the last weekend.

Supervisor Smith indicated that he supports the extra \$500, per weekend, expense to have two (2) additional facilitators on site. He feels that the District should make a strong statement that Grand Haven is not a 'weekend playground for anybody'; it will push people away and will not need to be enforced, long term.

Supervisor Lawrence asked if the people that were turned away are strangers, who are not the guest of a resident, etc. Mr. Ross replied affirmatively.

Mr. Ross recalled previous discussions regarding a punch card system for certain nonresidents. He noted that the discussion was related to people playing cards in the Grand Haven room. Mr. Ross advised that, as a result, the card players are now taking their card games into the café, which is turning the café into a card room.

Supervisor Lawrence recalled discussion about setting times for card playing in the café. He felt that cards should not be allowed during lunch and dinner.

Supervisor Chiodo noted that a bridge group used to eat lunch in the café and play bridge but has not done so for more than two (2) years because they were refused; he questioned why

that procedure is not being followed for everyone. Supervisor Chiodo supported not allowing card playing in the café during lunch and dinner hours.

Supervisor Smith suggested that Mr. Ross prepare a draft policy for presentation to the Board, at the next workshop.

Mr. Ross spoke about water aerobics. He indicated that, currently, two (2) hours of water aerobics are held at Creekside and one (1) hour at The Village Center. Mr. Ross pointed out that only five (5) or six (6) participate at Creekside, which limits use by anyone else from 8:00 a.m., to 10:00 a.m., four (4) days per week. He reported receiving justified complaints from other residents stating that they cannot use the facilities because these five (5) or six (6) participants control the pool four (4) days per week. Mr. Ross suggested sectioning off a portion of the pool for water aerobics and leaving the other portion for residents to use.

Supervisor Chiodo questioned why The Village Center is one (1) hour but Creekside is two (2) hours. Mr. Ross did not know.

Supervisor Lawrence felt that the facility should be available to everyone; he supports sectioning a part for water aerobics.

Mr. Kloptosky suggested alternating the water aerobic times, at each pool, so that one (1) pool is always available. Mr. Ross indicated that the times do not overlap; Creekside is currently 8:00 a.m., to 10:00 a.m., and The Village Center is 10:00 a.m., to 11:00 a.m.

Supervisor Chiodo pointed out that a lot of people attend water aerobics at The Village Center location.

Regarding AMG's proposal for next year, Supervisor Lawrence asked if dinner is only served on Tuesdays. Supervisor Davidson replied no; the information is old and must be updated.

B. District Engineer

Mr. Skinner indicated that permitting is underway for the Sailfish Drive project. He reported that the City of Palm Coast is struggling with how to permit the work, as it is not a normal building permit. Mr. O'Reilly is working with the City. Mr. Skinner and Mr. O'Reilly will mark the trees that will be replaced, so that the City's arborist can inspect them.

Mr. O'Reilly estimated that the tree removal process does not involve a permit; therefore, he does not anticipate any issues. He anticipates a three (3)-month timeframe for the infrastructure permit for the drainage improvements, unless something unforeseen comes up.

Supervisor Smith voiced his understanding that the root problem is that the road grade is not sufficient, which is exacerbated by the oak trees, as street trees, which have raised the curbs. He pointed out that the street has 30 or more trees, all of which will raise the curbs. Supervisor Smith stated that the current project does not address either of those subjects; the grade or the remaining 25 trees, along Sailfish Drive. He asked Mr. O'Reilly to provide him comfort that, after the District spends \$80,000 to repair this specific area, two (2) or three (3) years from now, the area will not have the same puddling problems.

Mr. O'Reilly indicated that, as previously stated, the grade issue is being improved; however, to completely fix the grade problem, the entire road would have to be rebuilt, which is not feasible. Genesis is improving the grade issue; they are proposing to rebuild the curb at a slightly increased grade but cannot increase it a lot without creating a 'snowball' effect. Regarding the trees, Mr. O'Reilly agreed that lifting will eventually occur. He recalled that Genesis recommended replacing the removed trees with non oak trees but that recommendation was rejected; oak trees must be planted. Mr. O'Reilly explained that the space between the back of the curbs and the sidewalks is not sufficient for oak trees to grow without eventually causing damage. Mr. O'Reilly stated that there is no guarantee that the problem will not come back.

Mr. Skinner acknowledged Supervisor Smith's questions and noted that, in Genesis' opinion, Sailfish Drive has a less than target slope issue. When this happens, tree root issues are more problematic. He stated that trees might cause lifting in other areas of Grand Haven but the slope, in those areas, might be such that it is not as noticeable or creates no issues. Mr. Skinner advised that the surveys of Sailfish Drive reveal a very flat slope, which is less than designed. He discussed the slope, noting that the street has flat areas, which are where the drains would be installed and the trees would be removed and replaced with younger trees. Although the other trees along Sailfish Drive could cause lifting, they are in areas that have a little more slope.

Noting ponding issues in other areas of Grand Haven, Mr. O'Reilly pointed out that irrigation is a major contributor to ponding. He suggested that, if there is ponding in curb lines but it has not rained for a week, there could be an irrigation issue where the irrigation heads are going onto the road, instead of the grass; that problem could be easily fixed by the landscaper.

Supervisor Davidson asked Ms. Mia Marchio, a resident, if she, or her neighbors, believe it is essential to replace the trees with oak trees, or would they be willing to accept a different type of tree.

Ms. Marchio indicated that she had not thought about it and must discuss it with her neighbors. She stated that the live oak trees are beautiful, which is a reason she moved to that street; therefore, she must reserve judgment, as she cannot picture the area without the oak trees. Ms. Marchio confirmed her understanding of the problems created by the live oak trees. She acknowledged that she should have brought the problem to the Board's attention sooner; however, the puddling is not a new problem. Ms. Marchio discussed the conditions along Sailfish Drive, stating that it is not simply a matter of puddling. She feels that anything that can be done to improve Sailfish Drive should be done at this time. Ms. Marchio indicated that one (1) drain was installed near her house, which improved the areas, somewhat; however, she thinks that the project should continue.

Supervisor Chiodo took umbrage with Ms. Marchio's statement, noting that she used to have a 'lake' on her corner but the 'lake' has not been there for some time. The major issue was resolved; the rest of the street is a problem and the Board is addressing it. Supervisor Chiodo pointed out that proposals were obtained and permitting is underway. He stated that the Board is trying to ensure that the fix, which is not inexpensive, will actually resolve the problem for a while. The District prefers that the issue not be further exacerbated by the oak tree issue. Supervisor Chiodo noted that this is the first he heard that irrigation is also creating a ponding issue, when it does not rain, and asked if Ms. Marchio's neighbors understand that.

Ms. Marchio indicated that she has not spoken with her neighbors at the end of the street; however, there is irrigation puddling in front of her house, although water is only going where it should. Supervisor Chiodo stressed that residents should be aware of the potential irrigation issues and, if they are not full-time residents, they should have someone monitor their irrigation.

Supervisor Davidson recalled that the Board approved a motion to proceed with permitting; however, the Board has not formally approved the project for completion in Fiscal Year 2014.

Supervisor Smith stated that he is not comfortable that the problem will be solved. He feels that the Board is only reacting to the situation. Supervisor Smith views this as an opportunity for the Board, residents and Staff to find a long-term solution, rather than 'put a Band-Aid on it'. For this reason, he will not support the proposed repair of Sailfish Drive.

Supervisor Lawrence pointed out that every street in Grand Haven has oak trees; ultimately, they will all cause lifting. He supports a policy to address puddling issues, as the streets are repaved, unless the problems are serious. Supervisor Lawrence believes that residents

cannot expect there to never be puddling; there is not enough money in the budget to immediately address every instance of puddling. The District can fix these issues in a routine, professional way.

Supervisor Chiodo agreed with Supervisor Lawrence's statements. He noted that the District Engineer identified the grade problem. The Board is doing as much as it can, without completely rebuilding the street.

Supervisor Gaeta agreed with Supervisors Lawrence and Chiodo.

Supervisor Davidson noted that puddling occurs in the non rainy seasons, due to irrigation. He stated that the conditions are much different during a heavy rain; the area has a heavy stream of water.

On MOTION by Supervisor Gaeta and seconded by Supervisor Chiodo, with Supervisors Gaeta, Chiodo, Davidson and Lawrence in favor and Supervisor Smith dissenting, authorizing the District Engineer to proceed with completion of the Sailfish Drive project, in Fiscal Year 2014, once the permits are issued, was approved. (Motion passed 4-1)

▪ **Update Policy: Best Management Practices for Pond Bank Plantings [SD]**

****This item, previously Item 6.F., was presented out of order.****

Supervisor Davidson recalled that, in 2009, a statement was approved and adopted by the Architectural Design Committee (ADC) and the GHMA, regarding the specific types of plants allowed on pond banks. It was a general statement of the four (4) types of plants but did not amplify how to care for them, when or where to plant, etc. He indicated that the ADC recently received requests for other types of plants, which is why the issue is being discussed.

Supervisor Davidson recalled that the principle is that the District has stormwater retention ponds and does not want extra fertilizer, pesticides, herbicides or grass clippings to go into the ponds because it promotes algae growth and weeds. Additionally, these are controlled structures that eventually drain in to Class 1 water bodies, which are controlled in terms of the maximum daily load limits of 'bad' things that can enter into them. The District could face very heavy fines if these 'bad' things enter the common water body.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that the community adopted "Florida-friendly" principles, which call for no fertilizer, pesticides, herbicides and no mowing within a ten (10)-foot perimeter

around each stormwater pond. In this regard, the District reviewed the old planting list and talked with the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD). The 2009 document was expanded to include what Supervisor Davidson just explained. Additionally, three (3) of the plants that were originally listed were removed and information about how, when, where, etc., regarding the allowed plants, was added.

Supervisor Davidson asked that the Board adopt the revised planting scheme. He explained why the three (3) plants were removed and noted that SJRWMD's guidelines allow the District to select the allowed plants.

Ms. Leister indicated that the *spartina bakeri*, otherwise known as sand cordgrass, is the fix all. The problem that people have with spartina is when it is over pruned. She advised that spartina should almost never be pruned, which makes it a great grass for the pond banks; it becomes attractive, as it grows. Ms. Leister discussed the growth process of spartina and noted that herbicides will kill it.

Ms. Leister indicated that she will hold two (2) classes in August, the first in the afternoon and another in the evening, regarding the planting, growth and care of spartina; the purpose is to help residents understand how to plant and maintain spartina. She stressed that, when done correctly, spartina is virtually maintenance-free.

Supervisor Smith asked District Counsel to comment on the paragraphs in the text that assign responsibility to the homeowner to maintain the CDD's property.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that the current discussion is about what and when. The direction Supervisor Smith is taking is an issue between certain residents, the GHMA and the residents' attorneys. The GHMA President asked Supervisor Davidson to leave the language, as currently written, as it is the GHMA's current position, until challenged and litigated.

Given Supervisor Davidson's explanation, Supervisor Smith suggested that the District leave the matter to the GHMA to resolve but leave them out of the District's draft. Supervisor Davidson reiterated that the GHMA requested that the wording remain.

Supervisor Lawrence felt that it has always been understood by the residents along the pond that maintenance is their responsibility. He feels that the wording should remain.

Supervisor Chiodo recalled that it clearly states that this is not a CDD generated policy; rather, it is a GHMA policy. He questioned Supervisor Smith's issue.

Supervisor Smith indicated that the issue is that the CC&Rs do not place that requirement on all of the villages, which is generating the debate. He is suggesting that the District remain neutral and silent on the issue, rather than inflame it by adopting a policy in support of it.

Supervisor Lawrence stated that, no matter which village a resident lives in, when they built their home, they received a package that clearly defined that those living on a pond were accountable for maintaining the pond bank. Supervisor Smith contended that the CC&Rs do not say that and reiterated his opinion that the District should remain out of the fray until the matter is resolved. Supervisor Davidson indicated that the District is remaining neutral by restating the policy that dates back to 2009 and before.

Regarding the wording in question, Mr. Clark advised that, instead of stating that ‘it is the responsibility’, the statement could read ‘the GHMA requires each owner of a lot...’; to avoid suggesting that the District will enforce the policy. For clarification, Mr. Clark suggested the following changes:

Page 1, last paragraph: Change “It is the responsibility of each owner of a lot” to “The Master Association requires each owner of a lot”

Page 3, fourth paragraph, fifth line: Change “Responsibility” to “Per Master Association policy responsibility”

Page 2, second to last paragraph: Remove “Pine straw shall be placed short of the high water line so as not to float into the pond during a high water event.”

Page 3, fourth paragraph, fourth line: Change “Responsibility for maintenance” to “Responsibility for replacement”

On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Chiodo, with all in favor, adoption of Revised Best Management Practices for Pond Bank Plantings, as amended, was approved.

Regarding Chinier Street, Ms. Leister indicated that a tentative plan was submitted to SJRWMD, for review. She noted that SJRWMD determined that no additional irrigation will be allowed. She stated that the plan includes all native plants and is hopeful that SJRWMD will adopt the plan.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled discussions with SJRWMD regarding the perimeters. He stated that SJRWMD was never adversarial about what the District wants to do; their only statement

was that they did not have plat maps on file, for reference, which is why they were not allowing the District to move forward. He explained that SJRWMD needed the plat map, which was subsequently provided.

In response to a question, Ms. Leister confirmed that all of the proposed planting would be within the perimeter; SJRWMD does not want anything planted in the interior. SJRWMD wants the District to maintain a non exotic, invasive environment, on the interior of the field. She stated that SJRWMD has been very cooperative with the District.

Voicing his appreciation for Ms. Leister's comments, Supervisor Chiodo stated that his question to Mr. Clark, at the workshop, about why SJRWMD has authority over the perimeter, which is outside the buffer. Ms. Leister noted that SJRWMD probably does not have authority. Supervisor Chiodo recalled his question of whether all of the plantings would be in the perimeter, to which Ms. Leister replied affirmatively and indicated that the District must await SJRWMD's approval. Ms. Leister clarified that the District submitted a plan that shows plantings outside of SJRWMD's boundaries; she believes that SJRWMD wants to be sure that the plantings are outside their boundaries and that the plan meets with what they want out of their restricted areas. SJRWMD is reviewing to ensure those items and that the District's plantings do not block their access to their areas. Supervisor Chiodo stressed that he wants to be sure that SJRWMD is not assuming responsibility for the perimeter area, which he believes is not within their jurisdiction.

Supervisor Lawrence questioned if, once SJRWMD acknowledges that the perimeter areas are out of their jurisdiction, the District can choose to install irrigation and SJRWMD could say nothing about it. Ms. Leister advised that SJRWMD has a say in the irrigation matter because it would drain into their area. In response to Supervisor Lawrence's comment about SJRWMD being difficult to work with, Ms. Leister stressed that SJRWMD has been easy to deal with; they are pleased with what the District is trying to do.

Supervisor Smith recalled discussion, earlier in the meeting, regarding allocating an additional \$50,000 per year, for vine removal and asked how much can be accomplished.

Ms. Leister explained that vine removal is based on the locations of the vines. She discussed an accessible area, near Ms. Marchio's home, that will be addressed within the next few days, due to a safety issue. Ms. Leister stressed that some areas are more difficult to access, which is costly. The location determines the cost.

Speculating that it would take at least five (5) years, Supervisor Lawrence asked Ms. Leister for an estimate of how many years it would take to remove all of the vines in Grand Haven.

Ms. Leister felt that it would take every bit of five (5) years of constant care. She noted that vines on vacant lots or unmaintained properties are a particular problem, as they are not maintained. She stressed that, unless the golf course does something, the natural areas will never achieve 100% vine removal. Ms. Leister pointed out that Jasmine would have to be destroyed in order to even begin addressing the vine issue. She would like to spray certain areas, during winter, during the dormant period, which can help kill the vines.

Supervisor Davidson explained to Ms. Leister that residents were instructed to contact Mr. Kloptosky with their vine issues so that the areas can be investigated and prioritized.

Ms. Leister stressed that the District needs to put pressure on the golf course to do something, as it is a major issue. She reminded that everyone must understand what happens when they are done removing the vines; the area will be left with open, bare ground. Ms. Leister reiterated that the end result of Firewise vine removal is open, bare ground; the area will not be reforested.

Supervisor Lawrence asked Ms. Leister to identify the areas that are golf course areas. Ms. Leister discussed the various areas where the golf course vines are causing problems in the CDD.

In response to Supervisor Chiodo's question, Ms. Leister indicated that everything is ready to proceed, once SJRWMD gives approval. Supervisor Chiodo asked that residents who will be most affected be given the opportunity to see the plan before work commences.

Supervisor Lawrence asked Ms. Leister to be prepared to discuss what she plans to do in the common areas, behind homes, where access is difficult. Recalling discussion about lifting, caused by oak tree roots, Supervisor Davidson asked Ms. Leister if residents should be advised to cut the roots of their oak trees so that they do not raise the curbs.

Ms. Leister indicated that there is no fix to the tree problem because the trees are too big for the location; cutting the roots could result in the trees falling and damaging property. She advised that there will be lifting; oak trees cannot grow in those locations, without causing damage; it is like putting a St. Bernard in a Chihuahua crate.

Regarding the plan, Supervisor Gaeta noted that the Board has final approval of what is planted in the area.

C. Field/Operations Manager**▪ Alternative Croquet Court Repair Measures (SD/BK)**

******This item, previously Item 6.G., was presented out of order.******

Mr. Kloptosky recalled discussion about repairing the croquet court. He advised that a proposal was obtained from Master-Turf Farms, Inc. (Master-Turf), and the Chair requested that they make a presentation and answer questions. Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that he emailed Master-Turf with a list of meeting dates but has not heard back. He indicated that he researched what the National Croquet Court Association does with courts that need to be leveled and rolled. The suggestions included rolling the courts with a large roller. Austin Outdoor (Austin) has a contact that has the proper roller; Austin is willing to use the other contractor to roll the court, at no extra charge to the District, as they acknowledged that their roller is not large enough.

Supervisor asked if there is a downside to rolling the courts during the wet season. Mr. Kloptosky did not know.

Mr. Richard Burns, a resident, felt that rolling may solve the underlayer but it will not solve the surface layer problem; the grass is ten (10) years old and needs to be replaced. He discussed the court conditions and stated that the small roller only creates waves. Likening the court conditions to a softened ice cream sandwich, Mr. Burns noted that the large roller may cause sloughing off, forcing the undersurface out.

Supervisor Lawrence suggested putting this item on hold until the Master-Turf responds. He reminded the residents that items on the Fiscal Year 2014 CIP are potential projects; just because it is on the list does not mean the project will be completed. He stressed that the Board will prioritize and decide what projects to do.

Supervisor Davidson felt that he cannot make an informed decision at this time; he wants an expert to make a presentation.

In response to Mr. Kloptosky's question, the Board confirmed that Austin should proceed with the larger roller, once Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that it is okay to do so, during the wet season.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled discussion regarding an emergency identification system for the Esplanade. He spoke with a representative from Palm Coast Emergency Services who felt this is a great idea. A similar plan is underway for all walking paths, etc., in Palm Coast. The City is more than happy to incorporate the Esplanade into their system. Mr. Kloptosky has a meeting planned next week.

Regarding the Pelican Court mailbox relocation, Mr. Kloptosky advised that there are permitting issues with the City. He reported that the contractor had an engineer and an architect prepare drawings, which were submitted to the City. The plans called for columns. The City notified the contractor that they have an issue with the 4” slab, with rebar; the City wants a 6” slab. The contractor had the plan revised and resubmitted it. Subsequently, the City advised that they are not satisfied with the rebar inside the slab and wanted more rebar added. Mr. Kloptosky pointed out that the permitting process is becoming very costly to the contractor. He explained that the contractor had the plan revised for the new rebar requirement and resubmitted it, only to be told by the City that an inspector happened to see the plans and they are now not happy with the plans using blocks, with brick around them; the City wants it framed out of wood and the brick around the wood.

Mr. Kloptosky questioned how the inspector can interject his opinion on this; his job is to accept it based on the state’s codes, not interject an opinion of what he thinks should be done. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he wants to take this matter before the City Council; however, the contractor is nervous about putting this situation in writing or testifying about anything with the city, as he fears retaliation. Mr. Kloptosky acknowledged that the contractor’s fears of retaliation by the City are real, as it is what happens to Grand Haven every time he takes issue with something.

Ultimately, the contractor revised the plans a third time and resubmitted to the City; however, the permit has not been issued.

Supervisor Lawrence voiced his opinion that the City’s actions are clearly retribution against Grand Haven and asked Mr. Clark if there is anything that the District can do.

Mr. Clark stated that there is nothing effective that the District can do on this issue. He recommended reserving a stand for a time when there is a larger scale matter. Mr. Clark asked Mr. Kloptosky to keep a list.

Mr. Kloptosky voiced his desire to speak to a Council Member about this so that they are aware of the problems; it is the principle of the matter.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled previous discussions regarding the American Eagle Foundation, which is willing to sponsor and fund the project. He researched the organization’s credentials, which appear impressive. Mr. Kloptosky’s only remaining concern was the legal implications or liability issues of another entity installing equipment on CDD property.

Mr. Clark recommended an indemnity clause; the organization has likely done this before and knows what they are doing.

On MOTION by Supervisor Chiodo and seconded by Supervisor Smith, with all in favor, directing District Counsel to draft an agreement with the American Eagle Foundation for the installation and maintenance, in perpetuity of the eagle cam at Wild Oaks, incorporating indemnification language for the benefit of the CDD and authorizing execution by the Chair or Vice Chair, were approved.

Discussion ensued regarding electric bills, etc.

Mr. Vic Natiello, a resident, indicated that the eagle cam could create an issue for residents in Wild Oaks and asked if the location can be generalized. Supervisor Davidson advised that the location will not appear on the website; it will only state Palm Coast, Florida. Mr. Natiello stressed that this stipulation should be included in the agreement.

Ms. Layng asked if the Board discussed the possibility of school or other groups entering the community to see the eagles. Supervisor Davidson recalled discussion years ago, where he was against field trip groups visiting the site; however, the remainder of the Board approved it. Mr. Kloptosky estimated that only two (2) groups have visited, over the years. Discussion ensued regarding the camera and Mr. Kloptosky explained that anyone will be able to access the video online; the camera is focused on the next.

Mr. Kloptosky reported that 1,200 shellcracker fish were installed in Pond 4, to address the midge fly issue. He recalled that the fish will not be effective this season.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that painting the Creekside building's exterior, along with the tiki bar and the Main Gate House, is underway; the contract is in place, pressure washing will begin tomorrow and painting will commence on Monday. The painters feel that the gate house should not be painted white and Mr. Kloptosky suggested an earth tone, similar to the South Gate. The Board agreed.

Mr. Chip Howden, a resident, asked if the installation of shellcracker fish to address midge flies is an experiment to see if it works and in preparation for putting them in all the lakes or if it is purely a response to one (1) group of people. Supervisor Davidson indicated that it is not an experiment and, when it was approved, the Board acknowledged that it was only for this specific pond, based on feedback from Flagler County Mosquito Control and the District's

aquatic services contractor. Mr. Kloptosky stated that it was based on the volume of complaints; that pond had the most complaints. Supervisor Smith recalled that a requirement of the shellcracker fish option was that the pond be aerated. Supervisor Lawrence stated that, in the future, if other ponds manifest a similar issue, they will be addressed; however, Pond 4 is currently the most troublesome.

Mr. Kloptosky reported that a contractor is working on wire replacement related to the camera issues. He indicated that it was determined that the cameras are ruined due to the lightning strike; five (5) cameras are down. Mr. Kloptosky discussed the expenses related to the two (2) lightning strikes and noted that the District has a \$5,000 deductible; it would not be worth making a claim on the Creekside damage. The damage at The Village Center is approximately \$8,605, not including replacement of the DVR; those costs were submitted to the insurance company and a response is pending. Overall the expenses related to both strikes total approximately \$12,000. In response to Supervisor Lawrence's question about submitting a single claim, Mr. Kloptosky indicated that there were two (2) strikes on different days and at different locations.

Mr. Kloptosky advised of an air conditioner failure at Creekside last Friday. A new unit is being installed today for \$4,823, which includes an interior air handler.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that condensation issues in the café and café kitchen are getting worse. He presented photographs of the damage. Water is dripping down and destroying the ceiling tiles. Mr. Kloptosky felt that airflow is an issue, as well as replacing the wrapped duct work. The ceiling tile throughout the café must be replaced. This will be a major repair and Mr. Kloptosky estimated \$10,000 to \$15,000.

In response to Supervisor Gaeta's question, Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he did not observe mold.

Mr. Kloptosky is searching for a single contractor, who will take responsibility for all phases of work.

On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Gaeta, with all in favor, the Café repair project, in a not-to-exceed amount of \$17,500, was approved.

****The meeting recessed at 11:55 a.m.****

****The meeting reconvened at 12:15 p.m.****

D. District Counsel

Mr. Clark indicated that he received a response from the developer regarding the District assuming the deeds for various parcels, as part of the District assuming the pier. He had suggested that the District wanted the developer to pay the 2013 taxes on the parcel. The developer does not want to pay those taxes and proposed that the taxes be prorated. Mr. Clark reminded the developer that the District would be relieving them of a major liability in the pier.

Supervisor Davidson asked if the developer is willing to complete the deal, without the pier. Mr. Clark reported that, if the District demands this, the option will be presented to the developer.

Mr. Wrathell pointed out that the developer acknowledged that they own the pier and, although they are trying to negotiate a package deal, with the other parcels, the District can let them keep the pier. Mr. Clark felt that, if they say no, the District should demand that the developer repair the pier.

Mr. Clark indicated that he spoke to the City Attorney's office regarding the District's request to split the cost for a survey; however, the City currently has no response.

- **Consideration of Resolution 2013-9, Authorizing ABM to Issue Trespass Notices and District Officers to Issue Arrest Warrants**

****This item, previously Item 6.B., was presented out of order.****

Mr. Clark recalled a meeting with Undersheriff, Rick Staly, regarding the SAAC rollout and trespass notices. He stated that Undersheriff Staly's recommendation was to have badged private security officers available to deal with trespass situation. Mr. Clark noted that the District's previous trespass resolution did not include security personnel; therefore, the resolution was essentially revised to include them.

Mr. Clark recalled that, in instances when the trespasser refuses to leave, a District representative must be available to authorize security to arrest the person. In this resolution, the Board Members, District Manager, District Counsel, Field Operations Manager and security personnel may authorize an arrest.

Mr. Clark indicated that he is reviewing the District's insurance policy, in this regard, and advised that the public official's portion of the policy includes specific coverage for false arrest; he is trying to clarify that it also covers the District Manager, District Counsel and the Field Operations Manager. Mr. Clark was reasonably sure that Mr. Kloptosky is covered, as he is a District employee; however, he was less sure about whether the coverage extends to himself and

Mr. Wrathell. He noted that, according to the Sheriff’s office, the District must be willing to complete the procedure, if they start the arrest process, meaning, the District must be willing to prosecute.

Mr. Clark presented Resolution 2013-9 for the Board’s consideration.

Supervisor Lawrence suggested the following change:

Page 1, Section 2., second line: Insert “or their successors” after “Inc.”

On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Davidson, Resolution 2013-9, Authorizing ABM to Issue Trespass Notices and District Officers to Issue Arrest Warrants, as amended, was adopted.

Mr. Clark recalled discussion, at the last meeting, regarding issues with the Marlin Drive Pump House Agreement. He reviewed the agreement and discovered that it was with Hampton Golf and was not recorded. Additionally, the agreement does not contain an assigns and successors clause; he feels that the District should enter into an agreement with Escalante. This affords the District the opportunity to change the agreement.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he spoke with Escalante regarding the possibility of a new agreement and maintenance, which was not being done, under the previous agreement.

In response to a question, Mr. Kloptosky stated that the parking lot is under a separate agreement. Mr. Clark explained that the golf course easement agreement runs with the land, whoever owns the golf course.

Regarding the pump house agreement, Supervisor Lawrence recalled that it involved sharing costs based on usage and noted that the District has not recalculated the percentage. Mr. Kloptosky clarified that he did the recalculation and it is very close; he recommended leaving the percentage alone. Supervisor Davidson suggested including 25% in the agreement.

This item will be presented at the next meeting.

E. District Manager

i. Upcoming Community Workshop/Regular Meeting

o COMMUNITY WORKSHOP

▪ August 1, 2013 at 10:00 A.M.

The next workshop is scheduled for August 1, 2013. The Board discussed possibly cancelling the upcoming workshop.

- **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING**
 - **August 15, 2013 at 9:30 A.M.**

The next meeting is scheduled for August 15, 2013.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

BUSINESS ITEMS

A. **Continued Discussion: Game Plan for Implementation of SAACs and Deactivation of GADs [BOS]**

Discussion ensued regarding having additional facilitators on duty, on weekends, during August.

Mr. Deary recalled that the Board previously approved an extra facilitator every day, beginning August 5, 2013, for the first week of the hard rollout. Supervisor Davison confirmed that an extra person is necessary every day, for the first week; the extra weekend coverage, during August, should begin August 12, 2013.

Mr. Wrathell summarized that there will be two extra facilitators, working eight (8)-hour shifts, on weekends, during August.

Mr. Deary indicated that AMG already has additional staff in place on the weekends.

Supervisor Davidson presented a chart detailing the status of re-registrations. He indicated that there are currently 339 unregistered lot owners; 29 are rentals, 52 are snowbirds, 102 are current residents and 156 are vacant lots.

Supervisor Smith asked about an action plan for the 102 residents who have not reregistered. Supervisor Davidson indicated that postcards were sent; all were directly contacted by mail and eblast. The Board directed Mr. Kloptosky to have staff call the 102 households.

Supervisor Davidson presented an eblast that will be sent to residents and posted within the community. Mr. Wrathell felt that the term ‘supplemental facilitators’ gives the impression that this procedure is temporary and recommended removing ‘supplemental’. The Board agreed.

Supervisor Davidson recalled the anticipated problems at the Main Gate and noted that the problems might be less, as so many have reregistered.

In response to a question, Supervisor Davidson indicated that the Saturday appointments were successful.

- **Compliance: Overnight/Day Guest Passes When Owner Away**

****This item, previously Item 6.H.i., was presented out of order.****

Supervisor Davidson referred to an email that was sent and indicated that there was controversy, as the information contained in the email is not the District's policy.

Supervisor Gaeta asked who sent the email. Supervisor Davidson stated that there is dispute regarding who authorized the email. Mr. Deary advised that AMG takes responsibility for the email. Supervisor Gaeta questioned who authorized AMG to send it. Mr. Deary felt that 'authorized' is not the correct word; AMG sent the email based on their understanding that it was the District's current policy and was accurate. Supervisor Gaeta asked who the sender, Patricia, is. Mr. Deary felt that the sender's email address is a holdover from a previous employee and should be corrected.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he spoke to Mr. Ross regarding this issue and the constant contact passwords were changed, as well as the header, with the former employee's name.

Supervisor Gaeta asked who reviews AMG's eblasts, before they are sent. She discussed AMG eblasts containing CDD information.

Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that AMG eblasts containing his name are his drafts, which are sent to the District Manager's office, which sends them to The Village Center.

Supervisor Gaeta reiterated her question regarding who reviews the eblasts for content, grammar and spelling, as she finds they are often not well written.

Supervisor Davidson asked to move on from this topic and the matter can be discussed with AMG after the meeting.

Supervisor Davidson read the following proposed policy procedure:

"When an owner of a property in Grand Haven wants to obtain a guest pass for guests staying at their home when the owner is away, the owner of the property must write a letter of request, addressed to the CDD office, for the guest passes, outlining the names of the guests, the dates and the letter must be signed by owner with a contact number for verification and a copy of their Grand Haven ID. Once this letter is obtained by the CDD office, we will verify the information and send authorization to AMG office. Once authorized with the CDD office, the guest can come to the AMG office with their IDs and sign the appropriate documentation."

Supervisor Gaeta asked how far in advance the authorization letter must be submitted.

Mr. Deary suggested changing "AMG office" to "The Village Center office". The Board agreed.

On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Gaeta, the proposed procedure for overnight/day guest passes when the owner is away, as amended, was approved.

- **Elderly Person With No Registered Vehicle But Has Caregiver, GAD?**

****This item, previously Item 6.H.ii., was presented out of order.****

Supervisor Davidson recalled that it was previously decided by the Board to allow issuance of a GAD to the caregiver of an elderly person with no registered vehicle. Supervisor Chiodo voiced his opinion that issuance of GADs, in these types of situations, should be at Mr. Kloptosky's discretion. Supervisor Chiodo clarified that the GAD would be issued to the resident.

Mr. Kloptosky pointed out that this is the second request of this type; the first request was granted. He noted that the person making the current request has not reregistered.

- **Frequency of Auto Registration Verification Every Two (2) Years?**

****This item, previously Item 6.H.iii., was presented out of order.****

Supervisor Davidson indicated that the CDD office staff began to email residents to update their vehicle registration information, as GADs are tied to the vehicles. He clarified that GADs will only be deactivated due to failure to reregister, not because the vehicle registration information is not updated. Supervisor Davidson suggested holding off on determining the frequency; this matter can be discussed at a future workshop.

Mr. Kloptosky advised that the CDD office encountered a lot of resistance to the requirement to provide updated vehicle registrations.

- **Establish Maximum Number of Day/Overnight Guests Per Property Owner**

****This item, previously Item 6.H.v., was presented out of order.****

Supervisor Davidson indicated that this item is related to a request from Mr. Jim Cullis, of Grand Haven Realty, that, as a property owner, they want to invite guests to utilize the amenities, play golf, etc.

Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that Mr. Cullis retracted the request, as the matter would be discussed at a meeting. He noted that, although the request was retracted, Grand Haven Realty continues to advertise the "Stay and Play" program.

This item was deferred to the workshop.

- **Request for Proposals**

- i. **Security Services/Access Control Services**
- ii. **Amenity Management Services**

******This item, previously Item 6.E., was presented out of order.***

Mr. Wrathell referred to the documents located behind Tab 6.E., and suggested that the Board modify these over the next few weeks and, once the Board approves them, Management will advertise for proposals. As both current contracts expire on September 30, 2013, Mr. Wrathell suggested that the Board consider continuing them, on a month-to-month basis, as needed.

Supervisor Smith asked if AMG will review the sample RFP documents, as there may be things that AMG does that are not in the old document but should be included in the RFP. Supervisor Davidson pointed out that the post orders need to be included in the security RFP.

Regarding whether the contracts must be bid, Mr. Clark indicated that the amenity services contract is a gray area because the District can elect to sole-source the amenity service; however, due to the language in the law, they probably cannot simply renew the contract. He explained that the District could terminate the current contract and prepare a new one.

Mr. Wrathell suggested including a statement in each RFP that both amenity and security services are out for bid so that contractors can submit a combined proposal for both.

B. Consideration of Resolution 2013-9, Authorizing ABM to Issue Trespass Notices and District Officers to Issue Arrest Warrants

This item was discussed during the Fifth Order of Business.

C. Continued Discussion: Fiscal Year 2013/2014 Proposed Budget [BOS]

Mr. Wrathell recalled that the last major change was related to increasing the infrastructure reinvestment component. He referred to the 'General infrastructure replacement/repair' line item, on Page 4, which was increased from \$554,437 to \$662,000. Referring to Page 17, Mr. Wrathell pointed out that the 'Admin & Field Ops' assessment went down by \$34.92, over last fiscal year, the 'Infrastructure Reinvestment' assessment is set to increase by \$101.04 and the debt service fund assessment increases by \$32.56, resulting in an overall, combined increase of \$98.68. The golf course increase is \$12.

Supervisor Smith stated that he wants to include the previously discussed \$50,000 but keeping the assessment increase in the 4% range, rather than 5%. Supervisor Smith referred to the 'Interest and miscellaneous' revenue line item, on Page 2, and voiced his opinion that the

\$10,000 proposed amount is under budgeted; he suggested that revenue could be adjusted to offset the expense and assessment increase.

Mr. Wrathell clarified that the current year amounts referred to by Supervisor Smith include insurance proceeds of about \$25,000; the line item includes interest and miscellaneous income. The problem with trying to bump up interest income is that interest rates are not expected to improve very soon.

Mr. Wrathell indicated that the budget contains a \$38,913 surplus.

Supervisor Lawrence stated that he included a \$27,000 line item in the CIP for croquet court repair, which could be removed, as the Board has not approved it. He could also remove the \$36,500 for Creekside painting from the 2014 CIP, since the work will be completed in Fiscal Year 2013. This frees up enough to budget \$50,000 for vine removal, while keeping a contingency and maintaining the desired assessment increase level.

Supervisors Chiodo and Smith agreed with Supervisor Lawrence's suggestion.

Regarding items on the CIP, Supervisor Lawrence stressed that residents must understand that only those items, which are approved by the Board, will be completed; the items can change during the fiscal year, as unanticipated expenses arise.

Supervisor Davidson noted that the "Bucket List" of unapproved items is not included in this version of the budget. Mr. Wrathell voiced his opinion that it is better to leave it off until the Board makes a decision. Supervisor Chiodo felt that the "Bucket List" sends the wrong signal.

It was noted that the proposed assessment increase is 4.88%; the average increase over the years has been 4.5%.

D. Discussion: Status of CIP [TL]

This item was discussed during Item 6.C.

E. Request for Proposals

iii. Security Services/Access Control Services

iv. Amenity Management Services

This item was discussed during Item 6.A.

F. Update Policy: Best Management Practices for Pond Bank Plantings [SD]

This item was discussed during the Fifth Order of Business

G. Alternative Croquet Court Repair Measures (SD/BK)

This item was discussed during Item 5.C.

H. Update: Keeping Grand Haven Grand [SD]

i. Compliance: Overnight/Day Guest Passes When Owner Away

This item was discussed during Item 6.A.

ii. Elderly Person With No Registered Vehicle But Has Caregiver, GAD?

This item was discussed during Item 6.A.

iii. Frequency of Auto Registration Verification Every Two (2) Years?

This item was discussed during Item 6.A.

iv. Data Regarding Current Unregistered Property Owners

This item was discussed during Item 6.A.

v. Establish Maximum Number of Day/Overnight Guests Per Property Owner

This item was discussed during Item 6.A.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

OPEN ITEMS

This item was not discussed.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

SUPERVISORS' REQUESTS

Supervisor Davidson asked if Lakewatch services are being completed. Mr. Kloptosky advised that the contract was executed.

Supervisor Smith asked if the District Engineers are ever going to be paid. Mr. Kloptosky stated that he approved their bills but does not know the status of payment checks. Supervisor Smith indicated that \$12,000 is owed. Discussion ensued regarding how bills are coded. Mr. Wrathell advised that, through June 30, 2013, \$130,869 was paid, some of which is engineering related.

Supervisor Davidson recalled legislative changes regarding rules or procedures for public participation at meetings and asked Mr. Clark if the District complies with the changes. Mr. Clark felt that the District's procedure complies; the purpose of putting it in writing is a safe-harbor provision that prevents people from suing for noncompliance, which is why he recommended adopting a policy. Mr. Clark suggested addressing this matter in October.

Supervisor Lawrence noted that the District is giving AMG the opportunity to submit a combined quote on amenity and security services, which will likely undercut the current security contractor. He voiced his concern about putting so much of the District's work in one (1) place

or concerned about changing providers, for such a small amount of money, when their current security company does a very good job.

Supervisor Davidson agreed with Supervisor Lawrence's comments and indicated that the District is not required to make a decision solely on price. Mr. Clark confirmed that the District has flexibility and would not want to award them based only on lowest price. Mr. Clark confirmed that the ranking criteria should be included in the RFP documents to clearly state that award of the contract will be based on a variety of factors. In response to Supervisor Smith's question, Mr. Clark indicated that the criteria must be predetermined and weighted and included in the RFP documents.

The Board agreed to cancel the August 1, 2013 Workshop.

Supervisor Davidson advised that two (2) more scanners will be purchased; each facility will have three (3) scanners available, two (2) in the field while one (1) is recharging.

Supervisor Davidson reported that a new Grand Haven resident inquired about the black, moldy gutters along Waterside Parkway. Supervisor Davidson asked when the gutters were last cleaned. Supervisor Lawrence recalled that it was less expensive to complete the work in-house than to hire a contractor. Supervisor Davidson recommended future consideration of this matter.

Supervisor Chiodo asked if Mr. Deary provided Mr. Kloptosky with contact information for an audio specialist. Mr. Kloptosky advised that he contacted the person but received no response; he will try again. Discussion ensued regarding the microphone system. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he received a quote from a contractor but it was very expensive; wireless is more expensive.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

There being nothing further to discuss, the meeting adjourned.

On MOTION by Supervisor Smith and seconded by Supervisor Lawrence, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 1:26 p.m.

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chair/Vice Chair