

**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 **Thursday, February 21, 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 (via telephone)	Assistant Secretary
Tom Lawrence	Assistant Secretary
Raymond Smith	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Doug Paton	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Bissi Di Censo	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Scott Clark	District Counsel
Sean Marston	District Engineer
Howard McGaffney	Amenity Management Group (AMG)
Roy Deary	Amenity Management Group (AMG)
Barry Kloptosky	Field Operations Manager
Ashley Higgins	CDD Office Staff
Victoria Kane	CDD Office Staff
Sterling Colee	Grand Haven Realty
Karen Durand	Resident
Sharon Downes	Resident
Debs Hugill	Resident
Diane Layng	Resident
Jan Struble	Resident
Ginger Richards	Resident
Mia Marchio	Resident
Chip Howden	Resident
Vic Natiello	Resident
Hugh Black	Resident
Gloria Schleith	Resident
Rob Carlton	Resident
Joanna Salkowitz	Resident
David Alfin	Resident
Graham Cook	Resident
Lisa Mrakovic	Resident

Frank Mrakovcic	Resident
Ron Merlo	Resident
Frank Benham	Resident
D.W. Ferguson	Resident
Janet Search	Resident

**DUE TO TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES WITH THE AUDIO,
THE FOLLOWING PORTION WAS
TRANSCRIBED FROM THE MEETING NOTES**

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Mr. Paton called the meeting to order at 9:38 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.

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)***

Audio was not available during Mr. Jan Struble’s comments.

Audio was not available for the beginning of Ms. Diane Layng’s comments.

*****TRANSCRIPTION FROM AUDIO COMMENCED*****

Ms. Diane Layng, a resident, discussed plantings and asked the Board to ensure consistency, throughout the community. She noted that nothing has been done on the CDD property behind her home.

Ms. Debs Hugill, a resident, recalled past comments about the café and expressed her opinion that the service in the café is the best it has ever been. She finds the staff to be courteous, respectful and helpful. The managers are attentive and have earned the respect of

their customers by ensuring that all jobs are done and that the customers have an enjoyable experience. She applauded their efforts.

Ms. Sharon Downes, a resident, asked the status of the preserve area on Chinier and Front Street, where vine and dead tree removal was completed. Ms. Downes voiced her opinion that the preserve area should not be made to look like the rest of Grand Haven; it was a preserve and should remain a preserve. She felt that it should contain more than a few beds of decorative grasses and coquina rocks.

Ms. Ginger Richards, a resident, stated that she and other residents are concerned about Sailfish Drive. Residents want confirmation that the Sailfish Drive project is moving forward now that the new District Engineer is in place and since the project was approved by the Board in 2012 for completion in Fiscal Year 2013. Ms. Richards felt that further delays would be disappointing; the residents of Sailfish Drive ask to be notified of when this project will go forward.

Ms. Mia Marchio, a resident, presented photographs of the drainage issues on Sailfish Drive. She noted that the standing water has advanced to being a mosquito problem, as well. She reiterated the resident concerns and that they want to know when the work will begin.

Ms. Karen Durand, a resident, noted that the preserve area was a reason that she moved onto Chinier Street. She understands that, after years of neglect, the area needed to be addressed. Ms. Durand stated that residents were told that vine removal would be completed; they were not told that it would look the way it does now. She indicated that residents liked the privacy of the preserve and want the area to look as natural as possible. She noted the lack of communication during this project. Ms. Durand discussed the distress that the current appearance causes her and voiced her hope that the Board will consider the residents' concerns and their suggestions for how the preserve should look.

******Supervisor Gaeta joined the meeting, via telephone.******

Ms. Durand discussed trees and landscaping for the preserve. She stressed that she wants the preserve to be natural, not a park setting.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

CONSULTANTS, GUEST REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS

A. Update: Keeping Grand Haven Grand**i. SAAC Distribution and Resident Re-Registration [F/OM Staff]**

Supervisor Davidson indicated that Ms. Ashley Higgins and Ms. Victoria Kane, CDD Office Administrative Assistants, were asked to provide the Board with an update on the re-registration process and distribution of the Smart Amenity Access Cards (SAACs).

Ms. Higgins advised that residents were contacted, by village, via e-blast. As residents call in, appointments are scheduled and they are informed of what to bring with them to their appointment. She indicated that approximately 60 resident volunteers rotate to assist with the re-registration process. The registration hours are 9:00 a.m., to 11:30 a.m., and 2:00 p.m., to 4:30 p.m. Two (2) resident volunteers are at each time block to assist the residents with completing the documents. Ten (10) residents can be accommodated during each session, with a goal of completing 20 re-registrations per day; the entire process takes approximately 20 minutes.

Ms. Higgins indicated that, since commencing approximately 45 days ago, 332 of the 1,866 properties have been re-registered.

Regarding the gate access device (GAD) clean up/deactivation, Ms. Higgins reported that there were 5,400 active GADs prior to the re-registration process. After the initial clean up/deactivation and the first month of re-registration, there are 3,717 active GADs. Approximately 1,600 GADs have been eliminated from the system.

Ms. Higgins discussed the main problems or issues encountered during this process. She noted issues with lot owners only being allowed one (1) GAD; spouses feel that they should receive two (2), one (1) for each of their vehicles. Ms. Higgins stated that lot owners receive two (2) SAACs so they feel they should also receive two (2) GADs. She advised that about ten (10) lots were re-registered and four (4) had extreme issues and were very upset; the remainder were upset but did not pose problems.

Ms. Higgins reported the residents' disbelief that these steps will stop unauthorized people from entering through the gates. She noted that residents who share a vehicle, such as spouses, are upset that they can only be issued one (1) GAD; they feel that they should be able to receive two (2) so that the spouse can utilize it when traveling in a friend's vehicle. Ms. Higgins stated that this relates to many in the South Entrance because those residents would be forced to travel five (5) miles to the Main Gate, in order to enter with a friend, which they find inconvenient.

Ms. Higgins advised that a few residents find it intrusive to ask how many bedrooms are in a home, requiring yearly vehicle registration information, etc.; they feel it is almost a form of harassment.

Ms. Higgins noted a situation with a resident who had two (2) vehicles, both with a GAD. The resident is selling one (1) vehicle and refused to give the registration information. The spouse was informed that the second GAD would be deactivated. The resident called to complain, used profanity and stated that if his second GAD is deactivated, he will no longer pay his CDD fees. She asked the resident to calm down and advised him that she would bring the matter to the Board. Ms. Higgins indicated that she and Ms. Kane did not appreciate the way the resident and his wife spoke to them.

Mr. Kloptosky advised that this presentation is taking place to let the Board know the situations that the CDD Office is encountering, daily. He acknowledged that issues were anticipated. Mr. Kloptosky noted that the majority of the residents have been wonderful; the process is moving much smoother than anticipated. He stated that a small percentage of the residents are problematic and intimidating to Ms. Higgins and Ms. Kane, bordering on abusive. Mr. Kloptosky wants the Board to support his staff in dealing with this; he suggested immediately stopping the re-registration of a resident, when it reaches a certain level of confrontation.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that these issues will be discussed later in the meeting.

Supervisor Chiodo stated that the Board's support is a given; the Office Staff must be treated with respect and those who do not are not allowed in the office until they calm down.

Ms. Higgins summarized that the process is progressing well; they are busy and it is enjoyable 95% of the time.

Ms. Higgins read the following statement received from Ms. Joan Carranza, of 10 Pine Harbor Drive:

"I am unable to attend the meeting but I would appreciate if you could consider my two issues.

The first is a safety issue. I live at Southlake Village and when you enter Waterside parkway there is a blind spot as the road curves and there is a slight hill. The bump is not big enough to slow any oncoming traffic. Would you consider making a larger bump as there has been a accident there already.

The second is about getting an extra gate card as we live at the south gate. I know that it is an exception and you do not want residents to have too many cards. If you could consider the following exceptions I would appreciate it.

One 2 registered autos 1 card and 2 electronic gate openers

Two 2 registered autos 2 cards and 1 electronic gate openers

When we go out with friends that do not live here and we forget to take the electronic opener (which is not easy to carry with you) we need to go 5 miles out of the way to the main gate. Maybe you could give Barry a little leeway to issue an extra gate key..

*Thank you Joan Carranza 10 Pine Harbor Drive
2/20/13”*

Supervisor Davidson thanked Ms. Higgins and Ms. Kane. He acknowledged that there have been many questions. He prepared an article for the upcoming Oak Tree publication which reviews the entire project. Supervisor Davidson read the goals from the article, which include increased safety and security by more accurately verifying those using the District amenities are actually authorized to do so and better controlling repair and maintenance expenses of the amenities by reducing unauthorized overutilization of the District’s facilities. He summarized that the District is maintaining or increasing property values and continuing to protect the amenities from overuse, which would cause more maintenance expenses, earlier.

Supervisor Davidson thanked everyone for their cooperation.

▪ **Amenity Manger**

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

Mr. Deary indicated that he notified the Board on Friday of a management change that was taking place. He noted that Mr. McGaffney has worked with Grand Haven for a number of years and has tried to build a team so that the operations do not revolve solely around him. Mr. Deary announced that, effective March 1, 2013, Mr. McGaffney will be promoted to a General Manager position within the company. Part of Mr. McGaffney’s responsibilities will be to continue overseeing the Grand Haven team and contract. Mr. Robert Ross will be promoted from Mr. McGaffney’s assistant to the General Manager position at Grand Haven. Mr. Ross will continue to report to Mr. McGaffney. Mr. Deary anticipates a smooth transition.

Supervisor Chiodo commended Mr. McGaffney on a great job as Grand Haven's General Manager. Supervisor Lawrence echoed Supervisor Chiodo's comments and thanked Mr. McGaffney. Supervisor Davidson congratulated Mr. McGaffney and Mr. Ross.

Supervisor Davidson noted upcoming amenity rule changes and asked who will be the contact person to obtain Vesta and AMG's input. Mr. Deary confirmed that Mr. McGaffney will continue as the contact person.

Supervisor Gaeta congratulated Mr. McGaffney and Mr. Ross, stating that they are both doing a wonderful job.

Mr. McGaffney thanked the Board and audience, noting that working in and serving Grand Haven has allowed him to grow and become the manager that he is today.

▪ **District Engineer**

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

i. Revised Proposal for Sailfish Drive Improvements

Mr. Marston recalled the Board's request to revise the engineering proposal to design the Sailfish Drive improvements to include engineering services during construction. He indicated that S.E. Cline (Cline) estimated construction time of approximately four (4) weeks; therefore, the construction administration services were tailored to that time estimate. The services include a preconstruction meeting, three (3) site visits per week, review of drawings and any requests for additional information from the contractor. The proposal was adjusted, accordingly, to include these services.

Supervisor Davidson asked Mr. Kloptosky the amount of Cline's proposed project costs. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that Cline's proposal, based on the conceptual drawings, is \$50,280.17, which includes installation of drains, milling and repaving the repaired section, certain curb removal and repair, as well as asphalt paving from the repair to Waterside Parkway. He stated that the cost to pave the entire road was an additional \$19,612.85. He reminded the Board that this is not a firm proposal, as the District Engineer's scope of work, plan, permitting and construction subs is pending.

Mr. Marston stated that he met with the City of Palm Coast for a presubmittal meeting and was told that they must complete the site development permit process, which is why that task is included in the proposal.

Mr. Kloptosky summarized that the combined total of Genesis' proposal and Cline's conceptual proposal is the approximate cost. Once the scope of work is received, he will submit it to Cline and other bidders to obtain a hard figure.

In response to a question, Mr. Marston confirmed that the permit fees are not included in the proposal. Mr. Kloptosky recalled that a couple of oak trees must be removed and the proposal does not include the removal costs. Supervisor Gaeta asked if the figure contains a contingency. Mr. Kloptosky replied that it does not; a contingency was not built in. Supervisor Davidson summarized costs of approximately \$80,000 for the repair and partial resurfacing and \$100,000 for the repair and to resurface the entire road.

Supervisor Davidson asked if the project is ready to proceed. Mr. Kloptosky replied affirmatively, stating that Genesis needs to move forward first with creating the design.

Supervisor Lawrence voiced his belief that the Board committed to completing the drainage repairs on Sailfish Drive and supported completing the repair and partial resurfacing. He recommended beginning work as soon as possible.

Supervisor Smith wishes to review the rest of the engineer's report, prior to making a decision. He discussed the District's long-term road repair and resurfacing needs and the estimated costs. Supervisor Smith did not object to completing the Sailfish Drive project but feels it should be considered in the context of the overall plan. He acknowledged the Sailfish Drive residents' frustration; however, he feels that the Board's responsibility is to plan, rather than begin with a single project.

Mr. Kloptosky noted that the photographs presented by Ms. Marchio were taken before the drains were installed. He advised that he observed the area, since the drains were installed, and there is still some puddling, which remained three (3) days after a rain.

Supervisor Lawrence asked Mr. Marston if his proposed project will cure the Sailfish Drive issues. Mr. Marston replied affirmatively.

Supervisor Chiodo stated that he observed the area after the recent rains and noted that puddling continues, even after the initial drain installations were completed, it is not as bad as it was. He clarified his opinion that the area flooded previously, now it has puddles. Supervisor Chiodo voiced his feeling that something must be done on Sailfish Drive but that the Board must also develop a plan for the next five (5) years and determine how to pay for the work. He feels that an analysis is needed before the upcoming budget season, which begins in a few months.

Supervisor Chiodo was not convinced that they should hold off on the Sailfish Drive project, since the Board already committed to completing it.

Supervisor Gaeta agreed with Supervisor Chiodo. She recalled that when the Board committed to the Sailfish Drive project, they were not faced with the issues at Wild Oaks. Supervisor Gaeta felt that a long-term plan, with prioritization, is needed.

Supervisor Chiodo noted that the Wild Oaks issue is still being investigated; however, it must be addressed in the short term. He indicated that the District Engineer provided a prioritized list; the District has the necessary information to begin an analysis and determine how to pay for the work.

Supervisor Lawrence spoke of the ten (10)-year capital plan, which included approximately \$1 million for road resurfacing. He offered to utilize the District Engineer's information to draft a ten (10)-year plan. Supervisor Lawrence recommended authorizing Mr. Kloptosky to obtain bids.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that he cannot obtain bids until the Board gives approval for Genesis to prepare the scope of work and plan.

Supervisor Smith referred to Wild Oaks and the barriers in the middle of street. He asked the District Engineer about the recommendation to obtain cost estimates in terms of densifying the roads.

Mr. Marston indicated that he spoke with the Mr. Nick Oweis, Geotechnical Engineer for Ellis & Associates, Inc., (E&A), who prepared the report. He stated that borings were installed at six (6) locations, at depths of 15 to 20 feet, to determine the compaction in those areas. Loose compaction was discovered beyond three (3) feet below the surface, leading him to believe that it was not compacted during construction. Mr. Marston indicated that the City of Palm Coast was contacted because their sewer main is their utility, for which they are responsible for maintenance. The City videoed the areas to locate any cracks; however, none were found.

Mr. Marston reviewed the recommendations in E&A's report, including pavement repair, cement compaction grouting of surrounding soils or urethane injection. He explained each of the options and concluded that the cement grout option is reasonable, at a cost of approximately \$5,000 per manhole. Discussion ensued regarding the number of manholes in Wild Oaks. Mr. Marston noted that the City was confident that there were no leaks in their pipes; however, prior to proceeding, he recommends meeting with the City regarding E&A's recommended repair

option. He recommended approval to obtain proposals for the cement grouting option and to meet with the City.

Supervisor Davidson summarized that, just to repair the six (6) known manholes, the District is facing a \$30,000 unexpected expense. Mr. Marston replied affirmatively, approximately \$30,000 for the repair and resurfacing portion. He explained that the main problem is within the subsurface, which must be densified.

Supervisor Smith questioned if the urethane injection option is more expensive. Mr. Marston stated that it is the high-end, most expensive option because it would seal everything. Mr. Marston explained that the cement grout option is contingent upon the City agreeing to seal the pipe 50 feet in either direction but the urethane injection option does not rely on the City to do anything. Mr. Marston offered to obtain estimates for that approach, as well.

Supervisor Lawrence asked if the responsibility is transferred to the City if the problem persists after the District makes a repair. Mr. Clark was not sure that it would transfer responsibility. Mr. Clark explained that the City could argue that there were preexisting soil conditions for which they were not responsible.

Supervisor Davidson recapped the work to be completed and recommended obtaining a firm bid to complete the Sailfish Drive project. He wondered about having Staff push the puddling water into the drains or street, in the interim, to temporarily alleviate the problem.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that Supervisor Davidson's suggestion is not practical.

Mr. Clark indicated that he has issues with the form of proposal, as he finds it inconsistent with matters negotiated in the Engineering Services Agreement with Genesis. He stated that it dictates an indemnification provision, which is unacceptable to him. Additionally, the proposal contains liability limitations, which he believes are different from the terms negotiated. Mr. Clark noted language in the proposal regarding public records connected with the reuse of documents provision. He summarized that it may be sufficient to delete several of the paragraphs in the proposal and incorporate the main contract, by reference.

Mr. Marston stated that he has no problem with Mr. Clark's suggestion, noting that this is Genesis' first proposal. Mr. Clark stated that the Board could approve the proposal conceptually.

Supervisor Smith questioned if the budgeted engineering expense is \$25,000 for the entire CIP and noted that this project would absorb half of that budget. Supervisor Chiodo pointed out that the engineering work is necessary in order to obtain a better quote for the

Sailfish Drive road repairs. Supervisor Smith referred to the CIP and voiced his understanding that the District has spent all of the CIP budgeted money, except for \$60,000.

Supervisor Lawrence voiced his concern as well, regarding the difference between what was budgeted for CIP related engineering expenses and Genesis' proposal. He wondered how the figure got so high but does not know what to do about it, as it seems to fit Genesis' fee structure. Supervisor Lawrence speculated that the District either underestimated the expense or it is in trouble. He noted that many of the CIP projects will not require engineering input. Supervisor Lawrence asked Mr. Marston to look at the CIP and comment on whether the amount budgeted for engineering support is sufficient.

Mr. Marston stated that he cannot make that determination; Genesis was not around when the District prepared its budget. In response to a question, he confirmed that engineering support for the Wild Oaks project would be minimal.

Regarding the Sailfish Drive repairs, Supervisor Lawrence asked if the approval would be for the repair and partial resurfacing from the site of the repair to Waterside Parkway, only. Supervisor Davidson replied affirmatively. Supervisor Chiodo pointed out that the remainder of the road is only an aesthetic matter; resurfacing is not necessary.

Supervisor Gaeta agreed that Sailfish Drive needs to be completed.

Ms. Marchio stated that she was pleased when the Board agreed to install the drains on Sailfish Drive. She recalled that, at a previous meeting, the Board said it would put aside up to \$130,000 to repair Sailfish Drive. She feels that the residents have been very patient and are dissatisfied to hear the Board discussing other, new projects; Sailfish Drive should be a priority. Ms. Marchio stressed that the Board needs to come through on its promises.

Mr. Struble stated that he is in construction management at an engineering firm and commented that a scope of work from the District Engineer is necessary in order to obtain quotes. He feels that a survey is necessary.

Mr. Chip Howden, a resident, voiced his concern that the long-term paving plan does not contain an engineering evaluation of what is happening in certain areas, such as the northwest corner of Flamingo and Heron, where oaks are lifting the gutters or the gutters are sinking. He discussed issues in that area when it rains.

Mr. Marston indicated that the District Engineer was asked to provide a priority list and the estimated costs to repave. If requested, the curbs could be evaluated in the future.

On MOTION by Supervisor Chiodo and seconded by Supervisor Lawrence, with Supervisors Chiodo, Lawrence, Davidson and Gaeta in favor, and Supervisor Smith dissenting, the Genesis proposal for professional services, subject to District Counsel's review and revisions, and authorizing the District Engineer to perform the work proposed, in preparation for obtaining bids for the Sailfish Drive improvements, including repairs and repaving from the point of the repair to Waterside Parkway, only, with the construction administration costs contingent upon the work proceeding, was approved. (Motion passed 4-1)

Regarding Wild Oaks, Mr. Marston will obtain estimates for the cement grouting and urethane injection options for presentation to the Board at the upcoming workshop.

- ii. **Long Range Road Resurfacing Capital Improvement Plan, February 13, 2013**
 - **High Priority Road Repairs Capital Improvement Plan, January 30, 2013 (included for reference)**

Supervisor Smith pointed out that the long-range road resurfacing costs are estimated to be \$5.6 million. He asked about the cul de sac and Front Street items, noting that those estimates are not included in the total, which would add another \$338,000 to the \$5.6 million figure, bringing the total closer to \$6 million.

Supervisor Smith asked if these projections include costs for engineering support. Mr. Marston confirmed that costs for engineering support are not included. Pointing out the \$17,000 for engineering support related to the \$50,000 Sailfish Drive project, Supervisor Smith asked what the average cost percentage related to engineering support is. Mr. Marston estimated 10% as the average engineering support costs related to a project. Supervisor Smith noted that, with the addition of the engineering support fees, the project costs increase to approximately \$6.6 million. Supervisor Smith suggested using the \$6.6 million figure when looking forward.

Supervisor Lawrence voiced his opinion that, for a large project, such as roads, the engineering support percentage of 10% seems high. He questioned what work the engineer must really do, when a road is being resurfaced.

Mr. Marston offered to research the percentage fee that the Department of Transportation (DOT) pays for typical road resurfacing projects so that the District can use it as a baseline figure.

Noting that the roads are public and were turned over to the District by the developer, Ms. Layng asked who confirmed that the roads were built properly. She spoke of Wild Oaks, which is the newest but was not properly compacted and questioned if the District has any recourse and, if so, against whom.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that R.A. Scott built the roads and recalled that the District just settled a lawsuit with them and wrote off R.A. Scott's further responsibilities, going forward.

Ms. Layng asked if the City approved the roads before they were turned over to the District. Supervisor Davidson replied no, the roads are owned by the District; however, they are obligated to allow public entry.

Mr. Struble voiced his opinion that the gutters should also be considered, if the District is developing a long-term plan.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if the community has recourse against the City, as they permitted the roads, but the roads were not built to code.

Mr. Clark indicated that the City's position will be that the District wanted to build and own its own roads; therefore, while the City may have issued permits and conducted a few inspections, the District should have relied on its engineers and consultants to satisfy them. He spoke of another district with costly road problems. In that case, the Board wanted to sue the City; however, Mr. Clark could not find a theory that would be worthwhile and not cost a lot of money litigating. Mr. Clark advised that the law is clear, such that, when a governmental entity performs inspections, it does so for its own benefit, not someone else; this is a dead end, in Mr. Clark's opinion.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he halted The Village Center parking lot paving project because of issues that needed to be corrected. He reviewed the matter this morning with Mr. Marston and asked him to comment.

Noting that Mr. Kloptosky halted the project, Mr. Marston stated that it does not look like a completed job. He indicated that he would expect new pavement to be clean; however, there are a lot of stains and seams that would normally be smoothed during resurfacing.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that he halted the project prior to the striping phase of the job. He did not want them to stripe it, until he was satisfied with the paving. Mr. Kloptosky voiced his opinion that the contractor's equipment was leaking oil onto the pavement. He stated that the contractor will return on Saturday to repair the problems.

Supervisor Lawrence asked if there is a way to remove oil from asphalt. Mr. Marston felt that there is a method but was not sure what it is.

*****Mr. Marston left the meeting.*****

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

A. Approval of Minutes

- i. January 3, 2013 Community Workshop**
- ii. January 17, 2013 Regular Meeting**

B. Approval of Unaudited Financial Statements as of December 31, 2012

C. Establishment of Floor for Current Below Market Value Leases

Mr. Paton presented the Consent Agenda Items for the Board's consideration.

Supervisor Davidson referred to the Unaudited Financial Statements as of December 31, 2012 and noted that the District needs to submit the IT Project bill so that the remaining construction bond money can be transferred over to repay the account. Mr. Kloptosky recalled that he coded an IT invoice to separate it; Management should have the invoice.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that Item C was discussed at the workshop.

Supervisor Smith requested the following change to the January 3, 2013 Community Workshop minutes:

Lines 647-650: Delete entire paragraph

Regarding making changes to the minutes during the Consent Agenda Items, Supervisor Davidson reminded the Board and Staff that the minutes are included in the preliminary agenda, in correctable Word format. He asked that changes be made at that time so the corrected minutes can be included in the final version of the agenda package.

<p>On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Chiodo, with all in favor, the Consent Agenda Items, as amended, were approved.</p>

****The meeting recessed at 11:22 a.m.****

****The meeting reconvened at 11:38 a.m.****

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

STAFF REPORTS

A. Amenity Manger

This item was discussed during the Fourth Order of Business.

B. District Engineer

iii. Revised Proposal for Sailfish Drive Improvements

iv. Long Range Road Resurfacing Capital Improvement Plan, February 13, 2013

- High Priority Road Repairs Capital Improvement Plan, January 30, 2013 (included for reference)

These items were discussed during the Fourth Order of Business.

C. Field/Operations Manager

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the streetlight for River Trail was ordered, the conduit is set and everything is ready, once the light is received. Regarding the issues with The Village Center pergola, Mr. Kloptosky stated that he received an email from the contractor and is working on a response.

i. Irrigation Options for Chinier and Front Streets

Mr. Kloptosky reported that he discussed this matter with Ms. Louise Leister, the District's horticulturalist. He obtained quotes to install irrigation in the area from Austin Outdoor (Austin). According to Austin, the island on Front Street has City water, which is expensive. Reuse water would require borings. The other option is to install two (2) wells. Mr. Kloptosky presented a proposal of \$14,359.22 from Austin to install two (2) wells, two (2) borings, materials and labor. The proposal does not include electrician costs of approximately \$700. He summarized that the cost to irrigate Chinier is approximately \$15,000. The reuse water option is more expensive, costing about \$20,000 to \$25,000.

Discussion ensued regarding the original conditions of the preserve area. It was noted that the area never had irrigation. A resident pointed out that it will do no good to plant grass if there is no irrigation.

Supervisor Lawrence noted that this area is the only one without irrigation and, as a result, it is not up to Grand Haven standards. He feels that irrigation is necessary; the only question is which option the Board will choose.

In response to a question, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that this proposed project is not budgeted. A resident asked what Mr. Kloptosky would eliminate from the budget in order to complete this project. Mr. Kloptosky stated that the only line items that could be used are community maintenance, general infrastructure or landscaping, if funds are available in those categories. Regarding whether all of the landscape funds have been spent, Mr. Kloptosky felt that not all were spent; however, the funds are set aside for specific items. Supervisor Chiodo suggested that the Board may need to readdress what was planned versus what needs to be spent, as the vine removal project left an unexpected outcome, in terms of its impact on the preserve area.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if anyone asked Ms. Leister about using drought tolerant ground covering, in lieu of grass. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he and Ms. Leister discussed this option but decided not to proceed pending a decision from the Board regarding whether irrigation would be installed. In response to Supervisor Gaeta's question about other areas within Grand Haven that fall into the same category, Mr. Kloptosky noted there are other natural areas.

Supervisor Smith echoed Supervisor Lawrence's opinion that the District created the problem, as a result of the vine removal project; therefore, the District should fix it to be compatible with the rest of the community. He recommended directing Mr. Kloptosky and Ms. Leister to develop a plan based on the assumption that there will be irrigation.

Supervisor Davidson felt that Supervisor Smith's directive could not be given until the Board approves the expenditure to install irrigation. Supervisor Smith felt that the irrigation must be completed and Mr. Kloptosky should determine where the funds can come from and/or what can be eliminated so that the irrigation project can take place. Supervisor Smith feels that this item is at the top of the District's "needs" list.

Supervisor Davidson stated that he is not fully convinced that the District should spend money installing irrigation where it never previously existed.

Ms. Durand indicated that the ill feelings relate to the lack of communication. She noted that Ms. Leister did her job; however, the Board did not have a clear vision, given the fact that they all seemed shocked about the outcome. Ms. Durand noted that, now that the work is done,

the Board is still struggling with developing a vision for the area. She acknowledged that she does not know if spending \$15,000 on irrigation will satisfy residents and give the area what it needs. Ms. Durand questioned how the Board can consider spending \$15,000 for irrigation when it has no idea what the area would look like after. In response to Supervisor Smith's question, Ms. Durand stated that she recommends getting a vision of what the area could look like with and without irrigation.

Ms. Downes recalled being told years ago that irrigation was to be installed once the road was built out. She noted that it is 14 years later and the area is still not built out. She stated that the CDD let the vines grow for 14 years and accused the CDD of not doing its job. Ms. Downes feels that the residents deserve something.

Supervisor Chiodo voiced his opinion that there is no question that the CDD should fix the issue. He pointed out that no one believed that the vine removal project would turn out the way it did, including Ms. Leister. Supervisor Chiodo recommended obtaining options with and without irrigation from Ms. Leister and evaluating those.

Regarding the landscape renderings, Supervisor Davidson pointed out that, if the Board wants Ms. Leister to give a professional opinion and presentation, it must approve the expense to obtain those renderings.

Mr. Kloptosky reminded the Board of Ms. Leister's time, noting that she spends a lot of time in the community and is only paid a set amount; she has not charged the District extra for her additional time. Supervisor Davidson reiterated that if the Board wants to correct this problem in a professional manner, it must be willing to expend the required money.

ii. ADA Compliance for Pool Lifts

Mr. Kloptosky recalled his presentation at the last workshop and, since that time, he obtained another quote. He recalled his concerns about whether Sun Coast Pools could perform the work at its proposed price of \$4,990 per lift, for either a portable or permanent lift. Since the workshop, Sun Coast Pools called and rescinded its proposal. Mr. Kloptosky recalled the proposal for \$8,300 from Duda Pools, per permanent lift, or \$8,800 if an extended lift is necessary. He obtained a quote from another contractor, whose price was within a few hundred dollars of Duda Pools' price. Given the similar price, Mr. Kloptosky voiced his preference for Duda Pools.

In response to Supervisor Gaeta's question, Mr. Kloptosky stated that the price is increasing daily, based on need. He reported that some contractors are buying the lifts in bulk.

Regarding the question of whether portable pool lifts meet ADA requirements, Mr. Kloptosky stated that Mr. Duda told him of a meeting he attended where he was informed that the portable lifts are compliant and considered permanent, as long as they are attached with a bolt. The representative further stated that the bolted lift could still be removed if the pool is not open and/or is closed for a specific event. Mr. Kloptosky offered this information because portable lifts cost less.

Mr. Clark stated that he has not seen that determination and questioned who the "they" are that say it is compliant. Mr. Kloptosky thought that representatives from the Department of Justice were present at the seminar.

Supervisor Davidson recalled that the portable lifts are much larger than the permanent lifts. He encouraged the Board to remember that time is of the essence. Additionally, there is the question of where portable lifts would be stored. Supervisor Davidson pointed out that, according to the newspaper article, the fine associated with a first offense is \$55,000 and \$110,000 for the second. He stated that, according to Mr. Ray Tiner, the City has established an expedited permitting process so that work can be completed quickly. Supervisor Davidson recommended quick action.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that Duda Pools' proposed cost for portable lifts was \$7,211 per lift; a difference of \$1,600 per lift between the portable and permanent lifts.

On MOTION by Supervisor Smith and seconded by Supervisor Davidson, with all in favor, the Duda Pools proposal for two (2) permanent pool lifts, including installation, and authorizing Mr. Kloptosky to proceed expeditiously, was approved.

iii. Marlin Drive Water Main Break

This item was discussed during the Engineer's Report.

iv. Gate/Amenity Access Issues

This item was not discussed.

D. District Counsel**i. District Contraction**

Mr. Clark indicated that the contraction was completed.

ii. Guardhouse Parking

Mr. Clark indicated that the document was finalized with Mr. Cullis. The work was completed and a final as-built from Mr. Cullis is pending.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled discussion that Mr. Cullis was to install a handicapped parking space, along with a regular one. He reported that only the handicapped space was built, which still leaves the guards no place to park.

Discussion ensued regarding a patch of land that could be used to create a second space. Mr. Kloptosky noted that the second space was not on the permitting documents. Mr. Clark confirmed that a second space was discussed and included in one (1) set of drawings, although it may not have been in the drawings submitted for the permit.

On another point, Mr. Kloptosky reported a problem related to irrigation. The CDD previously irrigated all of the lots in that area. He informed Mr. Cullis that the CDD will cut the irrigation and Grand Haven Realty will need to make its own accommodations for irrigation.

Supervisor Chiodo suggested leaving the handicapped spot in place but redesignating it for the guards. Mr. Kloptosky questioned how that would meet ADA requirements, since only those with placards are allowed to park in handicapped spaces. Supervisor Lawrence suggested requiring Mr. Cullis to add the second parking space, as was previously discussed. The Board agreed. This item remains open.

iii. ADA Update

Mr. Clark reported that he found no updated information on the ADA pool lift issue since the deadline was extended to January 31, 2013.

iv. Marlin Drive Letter

Mr. Clark indicated that he has not received a response from the City regarding the Marlin Drive incident.

Supervisor Davidson pointed out that Bright House caused the break in the City's water main and questioned if a letter should be sent to Bright House. Mr. Clark explained that the District is addressing repairs that were performed by the City, leading to the theory that the City acknowledged responsibility for the situation. The District notified the City that the repairs were

not completed correctly. Mr. Clark stated that, if Bright House did not make the repairs, the District cannot ask them to do it.

v. Pier Adjacent to Golf Club – Consideration of CDD Taking Ownership

Mr. Clark recalled that the Board asked for a letter to be sent to the golf course owner regarding the condition of the pier. He reported that a title report obtained several years ago shows that Grand Haven Developers, LLC, owns the pier. Mr. Clark reviewed the Escalante deed and determined that the pier was not conveyed to the golf club. According to the property appraiser's records, the pier is sovereign property in the Intracoastal Waterway. Mr. Clark stated that the question is whether the Board wants to obtain a quitclaim deed, if that is possible.

Supervisor Davidson stated that it would be a positive for the District to own something it is supposed to maintain. The District could also stop the six (6) planned boat slips from being built. Supervisor Davidson discussed the poor condition of the pier and voiced his opinion that it could cost the District \$100,000 to rehabilitate the pier. He suggested that, prior to taking ownership, the District should have a marine expert evaluate the condition of the pier and provide an estimate of the costs to repair it.

Supervisor Gaeta agreed with Supervisor Davidson's suggestion.

Mr. Kloptosky discussed the condition of the pier and stated that the repairs appear to be similar to what was completed at the other pier, for approximately \$4,000; however, that pier does not have the extensive canopy, etc., that this pier has. He concluded that the costs would be more because the pier is larger, contains a canopy and requires deck work, which was not completed at the other pier.

Supervisor Gaeta asked the ramifications of not proceeding with ownership.

Supervisor Chiodo suggested that the District has not allocated enough money for this project. He questioned if the District could inform the developer of the safety hazard, that the District does not want the pier and ask the developer to dismantle it.

Mr. Clark indicated that the District can make that request; however, he feels that the bankrupt developer, who was cleansed of all prior liabilities as a result of the recent settlement, will likely not be concerned about the pier.

Discussion ensued regarding whether the District can dismantle the pier. Mr. Clark felt that any work, including significant repair work, would require a permit from the state. No one has approached Escalante to determine if they want the pier.

Supervisor Smith was in favor of the District acquiring the pier through a quitclaim deed to give the District control of the asset and because it mitigates the possibility of boat slips, etc. He felt that the District could immediately close the pier, to remove liability, and decide what to do with it in the future. He feels that the upside is better than the downside.

Mr. Clark felt that Supervisor Smith’s suggestion is plausible but recommended having an inspection conducted first because, once the District owns the pier, it also owns the baggage that comes with it.

Mr. Natiello felt that the Board is underestimating or not considering the importance of the pier to the general population in Grand Haven. He surmised that it is of far more interest to Grand Haven residents than either the Chinier or Sailfish Drive projects.

Supervisor Lawrence questioned how Mr. Natiello is sure that the pier is used by Grand Haven residents. Mr. Natiello stated that he observes people using it all the time.

On MOTION by Supervisor Gaeta and seconded by Supervisor Davidson, with all in favor, authorization to conduct an engineering inspection of the pier to determine its structural integrity, in a not-to-exceed amount of \$2,500, was approved.

On MOTION by Supervisor Smith and seconded by Supervisor Gaeta, with all in favor, authorizing District Counsel to begin the quit-claim deed process to obtain ownership of the pier, with acceptance of ownership contingent upon receipt of the engineering evaluation, was approved.

vi. Update: 37 Jasmine Drive, Easement for Encroachment, Village E-1

Mr. Clark recalled the response received from the resident and questioned if the Board wishes to further discuss this matter, as it previously made a decision. He explained that the resident does not want the easement offered by the District; they want the District to simply give them the property. Mr. Clark noted the problems related to a District “giving away” property.

Supervisor Smith voiced his opinion that the retaining wall is worthless to anyone other than the adjacent property owner. He suggested offering to deed it to the resident.

Mr. Clark explained the problem with deeding CDD property to a private owner. He felt that the District would need an appraisal to ensure that the purchaser paid fair market value; however, he does not believe the resident is interested in purchasing the property.

On MOTION by Supervisor Gaeta and seconded by Supervisor Davidson, with all in favor, rejection of the property owner's proposal, with no further negotiations, was approved.

▪ **Cell Tower**

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

Supervisor Davidson indicated that letters were exchanged between the City and the County regarding the proposed cell tower location. He stated that the County located a parcel and is in negotiations for the cell tower and asked the City and CDD to sign off, allowing them to negotiate. Supervisor Davidson reported that the City said no, as they were trying to have the cell tower located on its property; a suitable location could not be found on the CDD's property.

On MOTION by Supervisor Gaeta and seconded by Supervisor Davidson, with all in favor, authorizing District Counsel to prepare and send a letter of no objection to the County stating that the District has no objection to the County negotiating to locate the cell tower on County property, was approved.

▪ **Waterside Parkway**

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

Mr. Clark indicated that Mr. Natiello brought to his attention a piece of property that is owned by the City. He researched the matter further and discovered that the property appraiser lists this particular piece of property as belonging to the City of Palm Coast. Mr. Clark discovered that this was a separate property that includes the roadway and a piece with the pump station. He located a 2005 deed from the CDD to the City, which includes several parcels, including Parcel 3, which includes the pump station parcel.

Mr. Clark stated that the clear intent was for the CDD to convey the pump station parcel; however, the plat does not accurately reflect that; it appears to refer to the entire area and, as a result, the entire parcel was conveyed. He stated that the bottom line is that the City now owns this; the question is what can the CDD do about it. Mr. Clark relayed Mr. Natiello's suggestion that the City be required to maintain the area. It was pointed out that the first time the District asked the City to maintain any portion of the road, the City demanded removal of the gates into the community.

Mr. Clark suggested approaching the City, explaining the mistake and asking them to work together to clear it up by deeding the property back to the CDD.

On MOTION by Supervisor Gaeta and seconded by Supervisor Smith, with all in favor, authorizing District Counsel to draft a letter to the City to have the City deed the property back to the CDD, was approved.

E. District Manager

i. Upcoming Community Workshop/Regular Meeting

○ **COMMUNITY WORKSHOP**

▪ **March 7, 2013, at 10:00 A.M.**

The next workshop is scheduled for February 7, 2013 at 10:00 a.m.

○ **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING**

▪ **March 21, 2013 at 9:30 A.M.**

The next meeting is scheduled for February 21, 2013 at 9:30 a.m.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

BUSINESS ITEMS

A. Consideration of Resolution 2013-4, Authorizing the District Manager to Participate in Insured Cash Sweep (ICS) Through Existing Money Market Account with FineMark Bank

Mr. Paton presented Resolution 2013-4 for the Board's consideration. In response to Supervisor Smith's question, Mr. Paton indicated that wire fees are the only costs associated with this account, which are typical for any money transactions.

On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Smith, with all in favor, Resolution 2013-4, Authorizing the District Manager to Participate in Insured Cash Sweep (ICS) Through Existing Money Market Account with FineMark Bank, was adopted.

B. Consideration of Smart Amenity Access Card (SAAC) Policies/Decision Tree (SD)

Supervisor Davidson recalled previous discussions regarding this matter and requested Supervisor feedback on the draft presented.

Supervisor Smith referred to the Partial Privileges section, in the center column, and questioned why a snow bird's immediate family members would be treated differently than a full time or registered renter's. Mr. Clark clarified that the criteria states that the non-primary person must live full time in the household with the property owner or registered renter, not in the "house", meaning, living full time in the snow bird's household.

Supervisor Smith voiced his opinion that the decision tree chart could be laid out better, with more legs containing unique situations. Supervisor Davidson noted that the chart should not become so complicated that it is no better than a longhand written explanation.

The Board agreed that the most complicated part is the partial privileges section.

Mr. Natiello agreed with the policy as written. He stated that he has a problem with a property owner who wants SAACs for all of their adult children residing across the country; in his opinion, those children are the property owner's guests.

Mr. Clark recommended changing the statement to include "(Must live full time in same household with Property Owner or Registered Renter)".

Mr. Hugh Black, a resident, voiced his concerns about identity theft, as a result of the re-registration process. In the event of misuse of information, Mr. Black questioned if the CDD has liability because of the information it controls.

Supervisor Davidson confirmed that the District is not requesting social security numbers and the driver's licenses are only for identification verification; driver's licenses are not recorded and, if a copy is maintained, the number is blacked out. He explained that the SAAC cards contain a photograph and the bar code relates to the database information.

Mr. Howden took issue with having a decision tree with a "NO" branch with two (2) additional branches. He feels that there should be a question to separate the branches under

“NO”. Discussion ensued regarding adding a box on the “NO” side which asks a question lead to the other branches.

On MOTION by Supervisor Gaeta and seconded by Supervisor Smith, with all in favor, acceptance of the Smart Amenity Access Card (SAAC) Policies/Decision Tree, as a living document, was approved.

C. Gate Access Device (GAD) Policies [SD] (*for informational purposes*)

******This item, previously Item 7E, was presented out of order.******

Supervisor Davidson stated that allowing the owner of an unimproved lot to only have one (1) GAD is an unpopular decision and recommended changing it to allow two (2). He noted that the Policies will be updated to state that it was revised February 21, 2013. Supervisor Davidson pointed out the highlighted changes and strikeouts on Pages 2 and 3.

Supervisor Gaeta recalled the question of GADs for Escalante employees and asked that this item be included on the next workshop agenda. She stated that Mr. Kloptosky spoke to someone at Escalante who agreed that their employees do not need GADs; however, they want their invitational members to receive GADs.

On MOTION by Supervisor Gaeta and seconded by Supervisor Chiodo, with all in favor, the Gate Access Device (GAD) Policies, as revised, were approved.

D. FY2013 Capital Plan [TL]

******This item, previously Item 7C, was presented out of order.******

This item will be discussed at the next workshop.

E. CDD Communications [RS]

******This item, previously Item 7D, was presented out of order.******

i. Examples of Previous Meeting Summaries

Supervisor Smith recalled discussion of providing additional communication to residents and that he volunteered to compose unofficial notes. He reviewed the prepared samples.

Supervisor Smith stated that the purpose is to relay information about hot subjects to residents so that they know what is being talked about and know to attend meetings if they wish.

Supervisor Chiodo stated that he likes Supervisor Smith's samples and suggested a two (2)-month trial period.

Supervisor Davidson noted that he has experience drafting e-blasts and communication to residents, as previously and duly appointed BOS Public Information Officer and Public Relations Liaison and, given the sensitive nature, he obtains District Counsel or the District Manager's input on items sent to residents. He stated that he is uncomfortable with the fact that Supervisor Smith wants no oversight of the notes he prepares, prior to sending them. Supervisor Davidson also found Supervisor Smith's notes to include his personal observations. He agreed that the notes should be brief; however, they should not include Supervisor Smith's personal observations. Supervisor Davidson noted the need for caution with information disseminated to the public.

Supervisor Gaeta suggested that Management and District Counsel review Supervisor Smith's notes, along with the Board, prior to it being sent to the community.

Supervisor Davidson noted that District Counsel and Management exhibited their reluctance to that suggestion. Mr. Clark explained the possible Sunshine Law violations if Supervisor Smith circulates the draft to other Board Members.

Supervisor Smith indicated that he included his "My take" portion because he believes that people must be led to understand what is being communicated. He assured the Board that he will not use this to state his own policy positions; rather, he might include the descriptive nature of the policy to catch interest. He feels that his "My take" portion makes the notes personal and brands them, which will encourage residents to read them.

Supervisor Davidson discussed the bombardment of emails.

Regarding whether Supervisor Smith's notes should be sent through the CDD or AMG's e-blast systems, Mr. Clark voiced his preference for using AMG's system, so that it is not perceived as a CDD communication. Mr. McGaffney asked that the communication come to him through Mr. Kloptosky.

Mr. Paton asked who will field resident questions resulting from Supervisor Smith's notes. He pointed out that, while communication is important, the District must be very careful about what is sent to residents. Mr. Paton noted that meeting and workshop agendas are posted

on the website ahead of time and minutes are posted afterwards; residents can review those to determine whether to attend meetings and workshops.

Mr. Howden agreed that residents can refer to the agendas to find out what is going on in the CDD. He likes the idea of communication after the meetings about what happened but feels that the “What Will Happen at the Next CDD Meeting” communication is not necessary.

A resident asked if Supervisor Smith’s notes will replace the regular minutes. Supervisor Davidson and Mr. Paton replied no, this is separate from the regular CDD minutes.

Supervisor Gaeta suggested that Supervisor Smith’s notes be posted in prominent locations, around the community, for the benefit of residents who do not have email and/or do not read e-blasts.

Regarding the samples provided, Supervisor Davidson asked Supervisor Smith if the disclaimer on the bottom of the notes is really needed. Supervisor Davidson questioned if the statement is true that “the lawyer made me say this”. Supervisor Smith indicated that District Counsel told him he had to say it. Mr. Clark did not comment.

On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Chiodo, with all in favor, authorizing Supervisor Smith to produce and distribute his notes communication, through the AMG e-blast system, for a two (2)-month trial period, was approved.

F. Update: City of Palm Coast Public Hearing Relating to the Adoption of Rate Adjustments for Water and Wastewater Service Charges, February 19, 2013 (TL)

This item was not discussed.

G. Reconsideration of Gate Access Devices for Escalante Golf

This item was deferred to the next workshop.

H. Parade of Homes (Sterling Colee, *Grand Haven Realty*)

Mr. Colee indicated that the Parade of Homes is March 16 through 24, 2013. He recalled that during the first weekend, last year, an average of 110 vehicles entered the community, per day. The first week of weekdays averaged 48 per day, which is an average of six (6) per hour. The second week, the average was four (4) vehicles per hour. The last weekend averaged 79 vehicles per day. Mr. Colee indicated that these figures bring to question whether separate

security is necessary on all days or only on Saturdays and Sundays, those being the heavy traffic days.

In response to Supervisor Smith’s question, Mr. Colee explained that the CDD requires anyone holding an event to provide a guard, which can be a major expense, especially when the traffic volume might not really warrant a separate guard. He pointed out that, previously, data was not available; however, data was collected and it is clear that the traffic volume is heaviest on weekends. Responding to a question, Mr. Colee confirmed that he is asking the District to not require a guard on weekdays.

Mr. Kloptosky pointed out that a guard could be added if there is more traffic during the week.

On MOTION by Supervisor Gaeta and seconded by Supervisor Lawrence, with all in favor, requiring Grand Haven Realty to provide a guard at the Wild Oaks Gate, on March 16, 17, 23 and 24, during the Parade of Homes, and authorizing Mr. Kloptosky to determine if additional coverage is needed, on other days, was approved.

I. Determination and Order of Agenda Items (RS)

This item was deferred to the next workshop.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

OPEN ITEMS

This item was not addressed.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

SUPERVISORS’ REQUESTS

There being no Supervisors’ requests, the next item followed.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

There being nothing further to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 1:46 p.m.

On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Gaeta, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 1:46 p.m.

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chair/Vice Chair