

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

A Community Workshop of the Grand Haven Community Development District's Board of Supervisors was held on **Thursday, January 3, 2013, at 10:00 a.m.**, at the **Grand Haven Village Center, Grand Haven Room, 2001 Waterside Parkway, Palm Coast, Florida 32137.**

Present at the meeting were:

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

Also present were:

Craig Wrathell	District Manager
Barry Kloptosky	Field Operations Manager
Howard McGaffney	Amenity Management Group (AMG)
Roy Deary	Amenity Management Group (AMG)
Sean Marston	District Engineer
Allen Skinner	Genesis Group
Vic Natiello	Resident
Chip Howden	Resident
Murray Salkovitz	Resident

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Mr. Wrathell called the workshop to order at 10:05 a.m., and noted, for the record, that Supervisors Davidson, 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

**CONSULTANTS, GUEST REPORTS &
PRESENTATIONS**

There being no consultants, guest reports and presentations, the next item followed.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**UPDATES: District Engineer****• Review of Prior Work**

Mr. Marston distributed a handout regarding the five (5) issues the Board previously directed the District Engineer to review, research and comment on, including the pavement repair reports prepared by ATM and CPH, Sailfish Drive, The Village Center North parking lot, the Pond 7 Mitered End Section and the Wild Oaks manhole settlement problem.

Mr. Marston indicated that Genesis reviewed and compared the ATM and CPH reports regarding pavement replacement. He noted that ATM completed a baseline evaluation; CPH provided a more analytical approach, consistent with the Florida Department of Transportation's (FDOT) Flexible Pavement Design Manual Chapter 6 approach. He reported that Genesis agrees with CPH's approach to evaluating the existing pavement. Several roads are considered poor but Mr. Marston felt that immediate repaving is not necessary but, if the District establishes a repavement program, those roads would be the first priority. From there, the District could build upon a capital improvement plan. Mr. Marston recommended establishing a road resurfacing program because the District's roads show signs of distress.

Regarding Marlin Drive, Mr. Kloptosky stated that the roadway is poor and noted that a recent water line break, caused by Bright House, caused the road to flood, washing out significant amounts of base material, making the cracks worse. Mr. Kloptosky feels that Marlin Drive will be a problem sooner, rather than later. He will provide photographs at the next meeting. In response to a question regarding liability, Mr. Kloptosky stated that Bright House claims it was not their fault because they followed the locate markings, which were wrong. According to Bright House, the locate markings were wrong because they were from the old map, before Marlin Drive was expanded. He could not confirm if the Bright House comments were true. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the City repaired and replaced the water main and a section of curb; however, he finds the City's work to be terrible, stating that the curb looks horrible.

Supervisor Davidson questioned if the City would bill the District for the work performed. Mr. Kloptosky stated that he does not anticipate being billed, as it was not the District's fault.

Supervisor Lawrence voiced his opinion that District Counsel should become involved in this matter and that the District should pursue Bright House to have them repair a large section of the road.

Mr. Marston recommended that the District consider scheduling repairs and resurfacing, beginning with the distressed roads.

Supervisor Lawrence asked Mr. Marston to prioritize the poor roads but pointed out that delaying resurfacing as long as possible will save the District money.

For budgetary purposes, Supervisor Smith asked if the District has a lineal foot or per-mile cost to resurface. Supervisor Lawrence felt that the District Engineer should provide an estimated cost, rather than relying on the estimates of the previous District engineers.

Supervisor Davidson summarized that the only area currently failing is The Village Center parking lot.

Mr. Vic Natiello questioned who produced the documents. Mr. Marston indicated that the particular document was from CPH's report. Mr. Natiello stated that he does not believe a word of it. Mr. Natiello feels that all of East Lake and South Lake are in great condition and asked why some rarely traveled streets were assessed as fair. Mr. Natiello suggested that the District Engineer visit the roads to verify the information. Mr. Marston confirmed that he drove the community. Mr. Natiello stated that his disagreement is with areas labeled green and blue. Supervisor Lawrence indicated that the green and blue areas will eventually be addressed, when they reach the red and yellow designation. Mr. Kloptosky reminded the Board that they did not want Genesis to create a new report, due to the cost. Mr. Wrathell pointed out that this is a situation where the District does not have enough money to deal with all of the problems; the focus should be on those listed as poor.

Mr. Marston summarized his understanding that the Board wants them to prioritize the poor roads, develop a time frame and the average cost per lineal foot.

Mr. Marston indicated that he and Mr. Skinner visited Sailfish Drive, along with Mr. Kloptosky. Genesis reviewed CPH's September report regarding drainage issues, as well as the as-builts provided by Mr. Kloptosky. Mr. Marston stated that the road was not built to the minimum slope, leaving flat areas. He noted that CPH and S.E. Cline recommended reconstructing the typical cross section to provide an inverted crown draining water to the middle of the streets, at a cost of \$136,094.40.

Mr. Marston advised that Genesis does not agree with CPH's recommended solution, as changing the roadway to an inverted crown would be a major roadway project, including revising the drainage patterns and relocating existing utilities. Mr. Marston recommended providing three (3) additional drainage inlets in the identified low areas and running the storm

drainage back to the cross drain that intersects the Sailfish Drive right-of-way. He explained that this allows drainage in the low areas, with limited conflict; several trees would need to be removed but could be replaced and installed with a root barrier to prevent root damage in the future.

Mr. Kloptosky voiced his feeling that residents expect the road to be resurfaced when the drainage is addressed, as they are unhappy with a patch on the road.

Supervisor Chiodo felt that the primary expectation is that residents will no longer have drainage problems.

Mr. Marston indicated that he can obtain a quote from S.E. Cline for this approach.

Supervisor Lawrence suggested that the District prioritize the roads for resurfacing and pointed out that Sailfish Drive is nowhere close to the top of the list; therefore, completing it now, at a cost of approximately \$100,000, would mean that a higher priority road would not be completed. He was in favor of addressing the drainage issue but delaying resurfacing.

Mr. Kloptosky reminded the Board that it promised to address the issue. He feels that if the work is not completed, residents will be unhappy.

Supervisor Chiodo clarified that the Board's suggestion is to repair the drainage, which is still significant. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he will obtain a quote based on the new design. A Board Member asked if the proposal should include resurfacing of a certain portion. Supervisor Chiodo confirmed that resurfacing should be separate. Supervisor Davidson stated that the District will address the drainage problem but the aesthetics will come later.

Discussion ensued regarding specific areas and drainage issues on Sailfish Drive.

Regarding mobilization costs for a resurfacing project, Mr. Wrathell wondered if it made sense for the Sailfish Drive resurfacing to coincide with Marlin Drive. Mr. Marston confirmed that the price would be better, if the projects are coordinated.

Mr. Marston indicated that the conceptual layout was completed and, from that, it can be designed and an engineer's cost opinion can be provided. He suggested obtaining a quote from S.E. Cline.

Supervisor Smith stated that he is not in favor of paying the District Engineer to do what he considers to be an administrative task. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he will obtain the quote.

Regarding resurfacing, Supervisor Smith questioned if it is S.E. Cline's forte. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that they hire a subcontractor to perform the work. Supervisor Smith reiterated his question. Mr. Kloptosky stated that they do a lot of resurfacing but do not actually

perform the work themselves; it is done by a subcontractor. Supervisor Smith asked about using a resurfacing company. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that they could work directly with a paving contractor if it was a simple resurfacing project; however, he feels that there is more involved in this project and S.E. Cline would be better to act as the general contractor to manage it. Supervisor Smith questioned going through a “middle man” and paying markup, when the District can work directly with the paving contractor.

Regarding The Village Center North parking lot, Genesis reviewed the scope for milling and resurfacing. Mr. Marston reported that S.E. Cline’s proposal was approximately 15%, or \$7,000, less than CPH’s estimate.

Supervisor Lawrence pointed out that there is never enough parking at The Village Center and questioned if the Board should consider removal of a dead tree and adding more parking spaces. Mr. Marston advised that the District’s site design was approved, locally, which includes landscape islands; changing it may require revisions and create permitting issues. Supervisor Davidson stated that the back area is a conservation area, so parking cannot be expanded towards the back.

Supervisor Lawrence asked if spaces for motorcycles could be added when the parking lot is resurfaced and relined. Mr. Kloptosky stated that a single parking space could be divided to create two (2) motorcycle spaces.

Mr. Kloptosky relayed that he was told by Jay that the City should not be involved in any of the District’s road repairs because the District is paying for them. Mr. Marston stated that, typically, for road resurfacing, nothing is needed from the local agency. Mr. Marston pointed out that, for the Sailfish Drive project, a permit will be necessary, as there will be land disturbance.

The Board agreed that the District Engineer should not investigate the possibility of adding parking spaces, as it would be cost prohibitive, given the bureaucracy involved.

Mr. Marston recommended approval of S.E. Cline’s proposal.

Supervisor Lawrence asked if this should go out to bid.

Mr. Kloptosky advised that it already went out to bid and S.E. Cline was the lowest, at \$40,977. He stated that bids were obtained from S.E. Cline, P&S and Masco. The problem with P&S and Masco was that they could only perform the paving; therefore, he had to get a separate price from S.E. Cline for the remaining scope of work. Mr. Kloptosky pointed out that the bid is

more than 30 days old, so the price may change. This item will be included as a consent agenda item at the next meeting.

******Supervisor Gaeta joined the workshop via telephone at 10:51 a.m.******

Regarding settlement around the Wild Oaks manholes, Mr. Marston explained that he toured the area and there are areas around six (6) or seven (7) manholes, which are collecting water and are depressed. He noted that a geotechnical investigation was provided on two (2) borings by Ellis and Associates. He indicated that the boring logs indicated a difference in pavement structure but did not reveal significant variations. Mr. Marston stated that he contacted the City of Palm Coast Utilities Department to determine if they had any issues with their manholes; however, they did not recall and do not have a design to repair this problem. He explained that when the City installs new manholes, they use manholes with an extended base out from the cylinder, which gives more bearing capacity on the soil, so the manholes do not settle.

Mr. Marston stated that there is not sufficient information and recommended obtaining a proposal from Ellis and Associates to provide additional borings on four (4) settling areas and provide recommendations. In response to a question, Mr. Marston estimated a cost of approximately \$5,000 to complete the additional borings. He explained that one (1) repair option is to inject cement grout around the manholes, which would stabilize the area. The other option might involve excavation of five (5) to ten (10) feet and rebuilding the manhole.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that S.E. Cline evaluated the area and found three (3) to be in the worst condition. S.E. Cline felt that this problem is occurring because of how the road was constructed. S.E. Cline proposed making a saw cut from curb to curb beyond the cracked sections, removing the manhole, checking and recompacting the base, as well as recompacting around the manhole, itself. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the estimated cost was \$5,767 to repair the three (3) worst manhole areas. He felt that the cost was reasonable. Mr. Kloptosky stated that he wants to feel comfortable that this would solve the problem.

Mr. Marston stated that he would not feel comfortable; he would want the geotechnical engineer to determine whether that is the way it should be done. He explained that the problem could be below the base.

Mr. Kloptosky conceded that cracking is occurring where these types of repairs were made in the back.

It was pointed out that, once the work commenced, the cost to test compaction must be added. Mr. Kloptosky stated that compaction testing was not included in S.E. Cline's proposal.

Supervisor Chiodo questioned the benefit of the geotechnical testing. Supervisor Lawrence voiced his suspicion that there is improper compaction and that the geotechnical testing might be a smart investment, so they can better understand what needs to be done and have a permanent fix, as opposed to proceeding now with S.E. Cline's current suggestion.

Regarding the area that was previously repaired, Supervisor Lawrence indicated that there was a crack in the road, which was cut out, recompact and repaired; however, within a year, it cracked again. Supervisor Davidson suggested completing the geotechnical testing around that crack, as well. Supervisor Gaeta agreed with Supervisor Lawrence, especially since S.E. Cline previously repaired cracking but it has happened again.

Supervisor Smith asked who will obtain the geotechnical bid. Supervisor Chiodo stated that it will be Mr. Kloptosky. Mr. Marston indicated that he can call to request a proposal and have it sent to Mr. Kloptosky. Supervisor Smith expressed that, if the District Engineer would be paid \$125 to make a phone call, he would rather have Mr. Kloptosky contact the contractor, saving the engineering budget for engineering-related matters. Supervisor Davidson noted that Mr. Marston has experience with geotechnical companies and asked if there are any that he would prefer not to work with. Mr. Marston stated that he works with larger geotechnical companies, such as Ellis and Associates. Supervisor Davidson suggested that Mr. Marston provide Mr. Kloptosky with a list of geotechnical companies he is less confident about.

Supervisor Lawrence acknowledged Supervisor Smith's concern but noted that this would be a short conversation between a knowledgeable engineer and a knowledgeable geotechnical firm. He felt that Mr. Marston would likely spend more time compiling the necessary information and transmitting it to Mr. Kloptosky, than it would take for him to make the call himself; therefore, it might be more cost efficient for Mr. Marston to contact Ellis and Associates. Supervisor Lawrence questioned why this should even be bid.

Mr. Marston confirmed that he is not billing in minute increments for making a quick telephone call. Mr. Marston summarized that he is to obtain a proposal from a geotechnical firm to investigate in four (4) or more areas.

Supervisor _____ voiced his opinion that all manholes are settling and his belief that the settling and minor cracking is okay but, if it is not okay, then he wants to know if all of the manholes will need to be addressed. Mr. Marston stated that, anytime there is

cracking, it creates a way for water to enter, which is not a good situation, in his opinion. Mr. Marston indicated that the manholes will be evaluated, during the resurfacing project, and he hopes to design a fix for them and repair them as the project progresses.

Mr. Kloptosky questioned if sealing the cracks is worthwhile. Mr. Marston felt that sealing is not necessary, as the Board has recognized the problem and intends to fix it during resurfacing. He stated that sealing the cracks could extend it a few years but recommended tackling it with the resurfacing.

Supervisor Davidson pointed out that the sealing is not aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Marston noted that resealing could be never ending and stated that the focus should probably be on resurfacing, rather than delaying having to deal with the problem.

Regarding the Pond 7 mitered end structure, Mr. Marston recommended obtaining a proposal, since the District already has a successful repair method. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he obtained a quote from S.E. Cline for \$765 to fill the eroded area around the back edge and install sod. The Board agreed that Mr. Kloptosky should proceed with the repair.

In response to Supervisor Smith's question regarding capital expenditures, Mr. Wrathell stated that an expense of \$5,000 or more would be considered a capital expense; this item is considered a simple repair maintenance item.

*****The workshop recessed at 11:15 a.m.*****

*****The workshop reconvened at 11:24 a.m.*****

▪ **Village Café Improvements**

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

Mr. McGaffney recalled discussion, at the last meeting, regarding concerns in the Café, and stated that 99% of the issues were resolved. He indicated that apologies were extended to staff and concessions made on behalf of certain residents. One (1) issue remains unresolved, as the person is on vacation.

Mr. McGaffney stated that he hopes to have the Café open seven (7) days per week, by the end of January; however, he is still trying to increase staff, for those hours. The goal is to be open for lunch and dinner on Saturday and for lunch on Sunday.

Mr. McGaffney indicated that he ordered comment card boxes and comment cards will be implemented at both facilities.

Supervisor Davidson asked Mr. McGaffney to address each resident concern, regarding the Café, contained on his list, and detail what action was taken or implemented.

Regarding staff's lack of knowledge about how to mix drinks, Mr. McGaffney indicated that this item was a myth.

Regarding comment cards not being prominently displayed, Supervisor Davidson recalled Mr. McGaffney's prior statement regarding the comment card boxes.

Regarding no manager on duty at night, Mr. McGaffney stated that he is the director and is developing another staff member to assume food and beverage operations responsibilities at the Café. He indicated that the person is the Assistant General Manager, solely responsible for food and beverage operations, under Mr. McGaffney's directive. Mr. McGaffney indicated that the evening Manager on Duty (MOD) is Mr. Bill Hilla.

Regarding wait staff and bartenders not asking customers their names and introducing themselves, Mr. McGaffney acknowledged that staff should do this. Supervisor Davidson noted improvement in this area.

Regarding a dress code for employees, Mr. McGaffney indicated that the dress code is a black polo shirt with appropriate shorts; he is trying to eliminate blue jeans.

Regarding having extra staff on days when special events occur, Mr. McGaffney voiced his opinion that events are over staffed, not under staffed.

Regarding physical plant limitations, Supervisor Davidson confirmed that this item refers to the cooking, food service preparation and service areas. Mr. McGaffney indicated that the Café is an amenity and will never be like a chain restaurant. Due to the size of the kitchen, it is difficult to cater events, while also servicing the restaurant; therefore, they are starting to focus on restaurant services and decline catering other Amenity Center activities, during restaurant hours. This allows people to utilize outside food vendors, if the Café cannot do it.

Supervisor Lawrence relayed concerns about the wait time to receive food. Mr. McGaffney stated people need to understand that it takes longer at busy times or for large parties to receive their food because the grill area is small. Mr. McGaffney stated that there is nothing else that can be done to speed service. Supervisor Lawrence asked if people could call in their food orders, prior to arrival. Mr. McGaffney replied no. Supervisor Gaeta suggested giving bread during the wait. Mr. McGaffney stated that meals now come with a soup or salad, along with bread, which should come out prior to the food order.

Mr. Natiello referred to the matter of extra staff for events and noted that the Café is well staffed for major events; the problem is when there is a busy night in the Café, along with an event in the Amenity Center.

Mr. Murray Salkovitz, a resident, asked if the Café has considered a mid-week breakfast. Mr. McGaffney indicated that there is interest in breakfast and he will address and push for it at his annual meeting. Supervisor Davidson explained that, years ago, there was a Wednesday morning breakfast. Mr. McGaffney stated that the Café definitely could not have breakfast every day. Supervisor Davidson clarified that it was a cooked breakfast, once a week, and specified that, when they tried to have a breakfast buffet, it was horrible. Mr. McGaffney felt that breakfast once per week is possible.

Supervisor Davidson asked about a replacement for the successful punch cards.

Mr. McGaffney indicated that the punch cards cost AMG approximately \$39,000 per year. He explained that, last year, 1,000 cards were distributed. Mr. McGaffney calculated that the cost could have been \$60,000, if all were fully utilized, based on 1,000 cards times \$5 per card, per month, times 12 months.

Supervisor Davidson pointed out that the punch cards were well received and increased the Café's business. He noted that he is disappointed to see it go and asked what will replace it.

Mr. McGaffney indicated that his team made a decision to offer a monthly coupon. He explained that the punch card system had a few negatives, such as people using it for the catered dinners at the Wild Oaks socials. Mr. McGaffney is working with Mr. Deary to develop a discount program for residents.

Supervisor Lawrence pointed out that the District loses \$25,000 per year to keep the Café open, meaning, a \$14,000 profit might have been made, without the punch cards. Mr. McGaffney disagreed, noting that AMG put money into maintaining the same level of labor and voiced his feeling that the Café still would have had negative revenue, regardless of the cards. Mr. Deary and Mr. McGaffney explained that the impact to the bottom line was not as great as suggested by Supervisor Lawrence because some residents, that utilized the program, spent additional dollars; however, the increased business required the Café to hire additional staff. Mr. McGaffney stated that whatever program is offered in the future will not be as frequent. Supervisor Gaeta suggested offering a free dessert after purchasing 12 meals.

Supervisor Davidson described the changing dynamic of the Café, with some residents considering it to be a pub or local bar. He presented a plan to eliminate inappropriate behavior in the community entitled "Managerial Concerns/Possible Responses Regarding Chronic Unacceptable Public Behavior". He noted that a group of patrons have repeatedly behaved unacceptably; those patrons were verbally abusive to the Café staff, facilitators around the

community, office staff and amongst themselves. Supervisor Davidson discussed instances of public intoxication and noted a patron who passed out after behaving inappropriately and being abusive towards staff. Supervisor Davidson described a process including incident reports, verbal warnings, suspension of privileges, trespass warnings or orders and Flagler County Sheriff's Office intervention.

Mr. McGaffney clarified that the Café does not knowingly intoxicate patrons; those patrons have usually had something to drink before arriving.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that Page 2, which is missing, included drastic measures, such as cutting off food and beverages to the patron and closing the facility, to gain control of the situation. He stressed that the Board is responsible for how the Café is run and what is provided; it is not within the residents' powers to turn it into a watering hole and complain that their drinks are too weak. The Board must define the function of the Café.

Supervisor Davidson noted that AMG's verbal warnings were effective, in that a particular person has addressed the problem. He feels that many of the problem patrons are being weeded out and the situation has been diffused.

Mr. McGaffney thanked the Board for their support in dealing with this matter. He discussed the staff's training and discussed responsible drinking.

Supervisor Gaeta thanked AMG for their efforts and stressed that it is a Café, not a bar. Regarding a resident threatening an employee, Supervisor Gaeta suggested posting a code of conduct to inform residents and staff.

Supervisor Smith asked if the District has a policy governing inappropriate behavior. Supervisor Davidson replied affirmatively, stating that it is in the amenity rules. Supervisor Davidson confirmed that the procedure he presented is the implemented procedures from the policies.

Mr. Salkovitz noted that the Sheriff's Office is placing cameras on its officers and suggested that the District place cameras at its facilities. Supervisor Davidson advised that cameras are in place at the Amenity Center, including the bar and at the back door.

Supervisor Lawrence commended Mr. McGaffney.

Mr. Natiello noted that the Board and AMG refer to the Café as an amenity and questioned if he must pay the \$10 guest fee if a friend dines with him. Supervisor Davidson indicated that the Café is a separate entity. Mr. Natiello felt that the word amenity should be avoided, as it implies otherwise.

Mr. Wrathell indicated that the Café is an amenity because it provides that people's behavior will be the same as it is at the other amenities. Supervisor Davidson stated that the Café is an amenity that is exempt from the rules governing who can use it. Supervisor Lawrence felt that it is common knowledge that residents can bring guests to the Café without paying a guest fee.

▪ **Gate Access Devices (MG)**

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

Supervisor Gaeta indicated that Mr. Mark Bowlus emailed his employees' schedules but it was only for the past month. She notified him that she needs the schedules for the future and will follow up with him.

Mr. Wrathell indicated that he contacted Mr. Bowlus, who informed him that he has part-time employees, for whom it is difficult to determine their specific schedules. Supervisor Gaeta indicated that if the District has a list of employees, GADs could be provided. Mr. Wrathell asked Supervisor Gaeta to review the email he forwarded, as he believes it contains names.

Regarding whether golf course employees could have GADs, Supervisor Davidson recalled the Board's decision that they would not receive them unless the employee's specific work hours could be determined and the GAD could be activated for only those hours. He pointed out that, based on Mr. Wrathell's information, the golf course employees' hours are ill defined; therefore, they should be placed on a list and be required to check in at the gate; only those with definitive work hours should receive a GAD.

Supervisor Lawrence summarized that the Board's position is that no golf course employees, including Mr. Bowlus, will be issued a GAD.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that Mr. Kloptosky must ensure that the CDD office has a list and loads it onto the system. Mr. Kloptosky stated that they already have a list. Supervisor Davidson asked that a tab for the golf course employees be included in the database and that their current GADs not be deactivated until the list is completed.

Supervisor Smith asked how the District would handle employees attempting to enter when they are not scheduled to work or multiple times per day. Mr. Wrathell pointed out that the District must allow everyone access into the community. Mr. Wrathell advised that the protocol should then be the same as for anyone wishing to enter. Supervisor Gaeta recalled the employee's previous issue was long lines and being late to work, as a result of delays when entering the community.

Regarding nonresident golf course members, Supervisor Davidson indicated that a woman calls because her GAD was deactivated and is demanding that it be reactivated because two (2) other nonresidents have working GADs. Supervisor Davidson suggested that the golfer be informed that her GAD will not be reactivated and she will be required to check in at the gate. The other nonresidents' GADs should also be deactivated. The Board agreed with Supervisor Davidson's suggestions.

Mr. Kloptosky asked if the nonresident golfers should be notified prior to deactivating their GADs. Supervisor Davidson replied affirmatively.

Supervisor Gaeta suggested that the District send a letter to Mr. Bowlus notifying him that all golf course employee GADs, including his, will be deactivated, along with any in the possession of nonresident golfers.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that Grand Haven Realty employees have GADs.

Mr. Wrathell suggested that all GADs issued to nonresidents, such as the golf course and Grand Haven Realty employees, be deactivated, with only realtors who are property owners having a GAD. Mr. Kloptosky pointed out that Grand Haven Realty owns several lots in the District and could obtain GADs for each of their lots. Supervisor Lawrence stated that a person owning lots can only receive one (1) GAD, regardless of the number of lots that they own.

Supervisor Gaeta indicated that some Audubon Society members have GADs and suggested that they be deactivated. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that only Ms. Gretchen Butler has a GAD. Supervisor Davidson voiced his opinion that Ms. Butler should be able to keep her GAD.

Regarding updating information, Mr. Wrathell voiced his opinion that Mr. Bowlus will have incentive to keep the list updated; otherwise, his employees will have difficulty entering.

In response to a question, Mr. Kloptosky stated that only two (2) nonresident golfers have GADs.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that a question was raised regarding how long passes were good for. Mr. Kloptosky stated that some are trying to obtain a pass that is good for one (1) year. Supervisor Davidson spoke of his relatives, who are on his visitor list but want to maintain a pass so they can pass easily through the gates, being waived through by the guards, rather than having to stop. Supervisor Davidson recommended that visitor passes be issued for only one (1) month.

Supervisor Gaeta questioned what to do about people who obtain a pass each month and whether there is a limit to the number of times a pass can be issued to an individual.

Discussion ensued regarding the procedure for issuing a pass.

Mr. Natiello suggested that a pass should only be issued for a day or two (2) or, if possible no longer than two (2) weeks.

Supervisor Smith felt that passes should be issued for a one (1)-month time period. Supervisors Davidson and Gaeta agreed.

▪ **Determination of Annual Fair Market Value Floor for Rental Property (SD)**

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

Supervisor Davidson recalled that the District previously tried to determine an annual fair market value floor for rental properties within the community. The Board decided on a figure of 80%, as the minimum; however, that is not a workable number based on the going rates, as compared to HUD's rates. Supervisor Davidson stated that the District needs a better system for determining what becomes an objectionable low level lease amount. He indicated that Mr. Natiello and the GHMA have worked on this.

Mr. Salkovitz voiced his concerns regarding the matter of leases; he feels that the District's attention to the percentage of fair market value is immaterial. Supervisor Davidson stated that it is material information, with regard to distribution of GADs and Smart Amenity Access Cards (SAAC), because if the leases are unacceptable, GADs will not be issued.

Supervisor Lawrence stated that this is primarily to assist the GHMA, who does not have the means to track this.

Mr. Natiello stated that the problem with placing a percentage on the value is that the rates fluctuate. He noted a 10% difference in a single year. He discussed homes with a higher number of bedrooms and suggested that the District set a standard home type and not apply the same figures to a home with bedrooms in excess of the set number. Mr. Natiello indicated that some properties have no lease, others have need-based leases, others have a zero dollar lease, etc. He presented a graph showing leases by rent amount, without 17 properties, including the previously noted situations. Mr. Natiello pointed out leases falling within the 100%, 80% and 50% values. He stated that, as the numbers were not known, he assumed three (3) bedrooms; however, if there were more bedrooms, the rent would be higher. He confirmed that using a figure of 80% encompasses most of the properties but there is still a problem on the lower end, especially when there are zero dollar leases.

Regarding low or zero dollar leases, Mr. Natiello pointed out that the property owner may have tax or other reasons for keeping the rent low. Mr. Natiello recommended obtaining

accurate data regarding the number of bedrooms and rental amount for each property. He discussed how to utilize HUD's data within the CDD's database and make determinations.

Supervisor Lawrence questioned what the District is trying to accomplish. Supervisor Davidson indicated that the Board is trying to set a point whereby renters with a below market value lease would not be entitled to any GADs.

Supervisor Lawrence voiced his problem with that concept, such as a situation in which he wants to rent his property to his child, non gratis. Supervisor Davidson and Mr. Natiello indicated that the situation relates to renting to a non-relative. Supervisor Lawrence noted wanting to charge lower rent for tax purposes and questioned not allowing GADs to the renters. Mr. Natiello noted difficulty in justifying any tax reason that is not illegal. Supervisor Lawrence felt that the District is treading in an area that it should not and questioned who the District is to tell an owner, who is renting their property, that the rent is too low; therefore, the renters cannot have GADs. Supervisor Davidson noted that a certain element has come into the community. Supervisor Lawrence asked if the Board is assuming that a low lease equals subhuman people.

Mr. Natiello pointed out that District Counsel advised that it is perfectly alright to set a threshold. He noted that GADs are a privilege of the community, not a right. Mr. Natiello voiced his feeling that the Board Members are the ones to determine what a privilege is.

Supervisor Lawrence acknowledged that a GAD is a privilege and that the Board should be able to determine who receives it; however, he thinks that the rent amount is not germane to that decision.

Supervisor Gaeta noted that the decision must be predicated upon something.

Supervisor Davidson stated that there are people gaming the system and the District must prevent it and not encourage it. He noted properties in the 25% level that have a lot of people living in them and asked if the Board should allow that to continue, turning Grand Haven into a tenement. Supervisor Davidson voiced his opinion that the Board should try to control the quality of what happens to the properties when people leave them, etc.

Mr. Natiello explained that the number of bedrooms, lease amount and the HUD market values should be able to be entered into the District's database, which can then calculate the information. The Board could then evaluate the information.

Supervisor Davidson stated that, for the first time, the District will be able to track the information regarding leases.

Regarding whether this task should be turned over to Dolphin Technical Solutions, which would likely cost the District money, Supervisor Smith voiced his understanding that the database has the ability to produce reports and, while a graph is nice, the same knowledge can be gained from a list. Supervisor Smith suggested not doing anything until the data is collected.

Supervisor Smith recalled that the Board previously approved issuance of GADs equal to the number of garage spaces, times two (2). He questioned what the Board is trying to eliminate.

Mr. Natiello pointed out that the task requires minimal programming; a professional should be able to do it quickly.

- **Smart Amenity Access Card Decision Tree (SD) *(to be provided under separate cover)***
******This item, previously Item 6F., was presented out of order.***

Supervisor Davidson recalled that the Smart Amenity Access Card Decision Tree was previously approved by the Board. He recommended eliminating the 80% figure and leaving the statement general.

Supervisor Davidson spoke of a person that is buying foreclosed properties, claiming they are zero dollar leases and allowing six (6) to eight (8) people, with five (5) or six (6) cars, to live in the home. He noted that all of those people want GADs and SAACs. He voiced his feeling that this is a scam, as someone is collecting rent but not reporting it to the IRS and several properties are in arrears on GHMA fees; however, the GHMA cannot do anything because they are listed as zero dollar leases. Supervisor Davidson explained that this matter is a way for the CDD to assist the GHMA by stating that GADs and SAACs will not be given, in these situations. He explained that a house becomes available in Grand Haven nearly every day and is being sold cheap by people who are renting them.

Supervisor Gaeta discussed issues in Grand Haven, as related to low level leases, etc.

Supervisor Davidson indicated there were over 60 volunteers to help with the registration process and distribution of the SAACs. The process was to begin yesterday; however, there were programming difficulties between the Door King data and the master database, which must be resolved.

Supervisor Lawrence recalled that the Board would review the letter to be mailed and another focus group session would be conducted, prior to moving forward. Supervisor Davidson did not recall discussion of another focus group. Supervisor Lawrence stated that the first focus group was comprised of educated people; he would like others to participate, to discover any glitches. Supervisors Davidson, Gaeta and Chiodo did not recall the possibility of a second

focus group. Supervisor Davidson felt that the process is not complicated and the new form is much clearer.

Supervisor Chiodo pointed out that the process will be completed by village; therefore, they can address problems that arise.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that staff will train ten (10) people at a time, which serves as more test groups, as the participants are to download and complete the form.

Supervisor Davidson explained the current SAACs and process. He noted that they contain bar codes, which are deactivated when a resident sells, etc. The current SAACs provide data regarding who is authorized to use the amenities but do not define who has the benefit of inviting others to utilize the amenities. Supervisor Davidson discussed who is authorized to utilize the amenities and questioned if collateral family members, significant others and non-relatives living full time in the home should be allowed to have use of the facilities. He suggested that there be different types of SAACs, such as primary and non primary, serving to define whether the holder is allowed to invite guests to use the amenities. Supervisor Davidson indicated that the District wants to ensure that only immediate, lineal descendants and/or adopted children of lease holders are authorized to use the amenities; this excludes a renter's collateral family, non-relatives and others from receiving SAACs.

Supervisor Davidson stated that the Board must still define the terms for a property owner's guests, etc. He stated that the primary classification of a property owner would allow the primary holder to invite a day or overnight guest; whereas, a non primary card holder could not invite a day or overnight guest. If a non-family member lives in a property owner's house but is the non primary card holder, that person would be barred from having guests at the District's facilities.

Supervisor Davidson stated that the SAAC is issued based on qualifying residency and contains a photo ID of the authorized user. The SAACs are not to be leant out or given to unauthorized individuals while the property owner, full time residing immediate family member or Registered Renter is out of town, on vacation, etc. Any attempt to use a SAAC by an individual who does not match the card's photo ID will result in a refusal to enter the amenity and may result in the suspension of the actual authorized card holder's privileges. He stated that family shall mean no more than two (2) persons over the age of 18 years, occupying a single dwelling unit and using common cooking facilities, together with, but for purposes of these Rules governing use of the amenity facilities, a family shall not exceed two (2) persons for each

bedroom contained in the originally permitted design for the dwelling unit owned or rented by the family. Whenever these Rules refer to use of the amenity facilities by Registered Renters, a family shall consist of only those persons listed on a written lease agreement and their lineal descendants or adopted children, not to exceed two (2) persons for each bedroom contained in the originally permitted design for the dwelling unit. Supervisor Davidson noted that the Rules specifically defined Registered Renters but did not define property owners. He added that, whenever these Rules refer to use of the amenity facilities by a nonresident Amenity Membership, a family shall not exceed five (5) persons, in total. Supervisor Davidson concluded that the Field Operations Manager is authorized to establish interim policies for cases not covered below.

Supervisor Davidson reviewed the classifications and guidelines for issuance of SAACs. For owners of unimproved lots, individuals named on the property deed, only, are eligible for SAACs. He suggested that zero (0) bedrooms equals zero (0) additional SAACs. Supervisor Davidson advised of lot owners bringing family members to use the amenities.

Mr. Wrathell pointed out that a property owner, including a lot owner, who pays assessments, has the right to use the facilities but wondered if the District can limit issuance to one (1) SAAC per lot.

In the case of a lot owner, Supervisor Davidson suggested only allowing those on the deed to receive a SAAC, including the spouse, only if they are listed on the deed, as well, and not allowing owners' parents, children, grandchildren and extended family members. Supervisor Smith questioned limiting the number of GADs. Supervisor Davidson stated that it is to stop overutilization of the facilities; only the property owner pays the assessment so they should be the only ones to use the facilities. Supervisor Smith questioned why an owner's family would be discriminated against, simply because the home is not yet built. Supervisor Chiodo added, especially since the owner pays the same assessment as property owners with a home. Supervisor Davidson indicated that the number of SAACs allowed for lot owners can be discussed.

An audience member suggested that the justification for restricting lot owners is that they do not have a house in the community; therefore, they are a nonresident. He further suggested that a lot owner, as a nonresident, should be required to pay the daily guest rate, in order to use the facilities.

In response to the previous suggestion, Mr. Wrathell indicated that whether the person is a resident or not is immaterial, as long as they are paying the assessment.

Mr. Natiello agreed with Mr. Smith's feeling that direct family members of a lot owner should not be restricted but noted that there should be some restrictions. Regarding use of the term significant others and cohabitation, Mr. Natiello advised that Florida law does not permit any cohabitation of significant others; it is a second degree misdemeanor, punishable by a \$500 fine or 60 days in jail.

For owners of improved lots with immediate family residing on property, such as a parent, son, daughter, adopted children and grandchildren, Supervisor Davidson proposed that, parents, lineal descendants or adopted children of owners named on the property deed are eligible for SAACs, as consistent with "Family" definition contained in Amenity Rules, these family members must reside in Grand Haven property with show of proof, meaning they must show Grand Haven address or drivers license with a Grand Haven address. Issuance of SAACs would be limited up to a maximum of two (2) times the number of bedrooms contained on the original dwelling unit design.

For owners of improved lots, residing on property, with immediate and extended family members, Supervisor Davidson suggested that parents, lineal descendants or adopted children of owners named on deed are eligible for SAACs, must reside in Grand Haven property with show of proof, meaning they must show Grand Haven address or drivers license with a Grand Haven address. Issuance of SAACs would be limited up to a maximum of two (2) times the number of bedrooms contained on the original dwelling unit design. He added that extended family members, meaning all other relatives, residing in property can be considered "Non Primary Cardholders", allowing them to use the amenity facilities but disallowing them to bring house guests. In response to a question, Supervisor Davidson confirmed that this portion relates to extended family members residing on property. He noted that all items are subject to discussion.

******Supervisor Lawrence stepped out.******

Supervisor Davidson defined lineal family as son, daughter, granddaughter, grandson, great grandchildren. Collateral family members include uncle, aunt, niece, nephew, and cousins. Regarding in-laws, Supervisor Davidson felt that they are not collateral.

Mr. Natiello pointed out that, under the terms, a person's child would be lineal but the son or daughter-in-law would be collateral.

Supervisor Chiodo questioned whether an owner's child should be allowed to bring a guest to the facilities. Supervisor Davidson stated that the policy is currently written to allow a child to bring a guest. It was suggested that the Board implement an age limit.

*****Supervisor Lawrence returned.*****

Supervisor Davidson stated that "House Guest" shall mean any guest that is residing in a Property Owner's or Registered Renter's home for one (1) night or longer as a guest. Extended family members with proof of Grand Haven residency may be granted a Non Primary SAAC or placed on pre-approved House Guest Amenity Access List.

Regarding owners of improved lots that do not reside on property, with the property being rented, Supervisor Davidson suggested that the rental property must have a properly executed lease showing date, term, names and contact information, on file with CDD Office. The rental property must be registered with GHMA and with the City of Palm Coast on their approved forms. Supervisor Davidson noted that he and Mr. Rob Carlton, GHMA President, will make a presentation to the Flagler County Association of Realtors (FCAR) on the District's regulations regarding owning and renting properties in Grand Haven.

Supervisor Davidson stated that the property owner must complete a Beneficial User Rights (BUR) Election/Transfer Form, in writing, but questioned how many SAACs should be issued to a property owner who rents the property but elects to retain their BURs and what category they fall into. Supervisor Gaeta felt that the owner should receive as many as they would normally be allowed. Supervisor Chiodo stated that the question relates to family members and asked why this property owner would have any different rules from that of a regular property owner.

For those electing to retain their BURs, Supervisor Davidson proposed that the property owners named on the deed, their lineal descendants and adopted children be eligible to receive SAACs, up to two (2) times the number of bedrooms. He questioned if this should include collateral descendants, significant others and non-relatives.

Supervisor Chiodo felt that an owner who retains their BURs must be provided with the same rights as an owner who does not rent their property and lives on site.

Mr. Wrathell noted that GADs are a privilege and wondered if SAACs are also a privilege. He questioned if the District is obligated to grant SAACs beyond a predetermined number. Mr. Wrathell felt that, legally, the District might not be required to treat all property owners the same, if SAACs are considered a privilege.

Supervisor Smith voiced his feeling that a residing homeowner is different than a person renting in the B Section and that person receiving the same privilege of using the facilities. He feels that if a person must drive to The Village Center, in order to use the facilities, then they should not receive SAACs.

Supervisor Chiodo felt that, if the District adopts rules for property owners living on the property, which limits them to only receiving SAACs for family, etc., that physically live on property, then he is fine, as it maintains the same standard being considered for those nonresident owners who elect to keep their BURs. Supervisor Chiodo stressed that the rules should be the same.

Mr. Natiello suggested making the SAAC distribution rules for a nonresident property owner who retains their BURs the same as for property owners, with an unimproved lot, as the property owner who rents their property but is not residing on property. Supervisors Chiodo and Davidson agreed with Mr. Natiello's suggestion. Supervisor Davidson voiced his opinion that a property owner who rents their property but retains their BURs is essentially the same as an owner of an unimproved lot.

Regarding a property owner who transfers the BUR to the tenant, Supervisor Davidson suggested that the property owner is not eligible for SAACs and any existing SAACs will be deactivated. The tenant becomes the "Registered Renter" and is eligible for SAACs.

For tenants, meaning Registered and Un-registered Renters, Supervisor Davidson stated that the CDD Office must be provided with a properly executed lease, showing date, term, names and contact information. In the event that the lease is a below market lease, as defined herein, the privilege of being issued a SAAC shall be limited. A below market lease is one in which the rental rate set forth in the lease is less than an amount, as established from time to time, by the Board. The CDD Office shall determine the average rental amounts by using the HUD Fair Market Rent Data for the Palm Coast, Florida MSA and data of currently recorded Grand Haven rental property monthly rental rates, as amended from time to time. Below market leases must provide a properly executed lease, showing date, term, names and contact information and are limited to a maximum one (1)-year term.

For below market leases, Supervisor Davidson posed the question of whether immediate family members should be eligible for SAACs and, if so, what type they should receive.

Regarding limiting a lease to a one (1)-year term, Supervisor Smith questioned if the District can dictate the terms of another person's lease.

Supervisor Davidson suggested that below market leases for all others be ineligible for SAACs.

Supervisor Davidson explained that, if a property owner elects to retain their BURs, the tenant becomes an “Un-registered Renter” and is ineligible for SAACs. If a property owner transfers their BUR, the tenant becomes a “Registered Renter” and is eligible for SAACs. For Registered Renters, only those persons listed on a written lease agreement and their lineal family members, meaning lineal descendants or adopted children, residing in the Grand Haven rental property, with show of proof of residency, are eligible for SAACs. All others living in the rental property are to be considered “house guests.” He questioned if house guests should be placed on Pre-approved House Guest Amenity Access List or issued a non-primary SAAC.

Supervisor Davidson suggested that all renters with BURs be classified as non-primary.

Mr. Natiello questioned how the District will verify distribution of SAACs, such as when people request them for a friend that really does not live in the home.

Supervisor Lawrence suggested that anyone living in the rental property must provide proof of residency, by way of a driver’s license with a Grand Haven address. Mr. Natiello pointed out that renters do not usually change their address and questioned another form of proof.

Discussion ensued regarding who should be eligible to receive SAACs.

Supervisor Davidson summarized that, for registered renters, only those listed on the written lease and their lineal family members are eligible for SAACs; all others are not eligible.

Supervisor Davidson noted that the matter of issuance of SAACs is a difficult issue. He noted that the intake form may need to be modified, depending on the classifications developed by the Board. Regarding the SAACs, Supervisor Davidson noted that the old cards specified owner or tenant and questioned what should be included, in print, on the new cards.

Discussion ensued regarding the card scanner system and the information provided to facilitators. Supervisor Davidson noted that the office scanners are linked to the master database; the scanners for use in the field are much simpler. Supervisor Chiodo suggested consulting Mr. Gaeta regarding what information can be shown on the field scanners.

Regarding leases, Mr. Salkovitz pointed out that the issue of zero dollar leases are primarily related to properties not involving realtors.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**UPDATES: Field/Operations Manager****• Wild Oaks Road Settling Issues**

This item was discussed during the Fourth Order of Business.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**DISCUSSION ITEMS****A. Village Café Improvements**

This item was discussed earlier in the workshop.

B. FY 2013 Capital Plan (TL)

Supervisor Lawrence reviewed the list of capital projects and indicated that the approved projects total \$457,826 and, after subtracting that figure from the budgeted funds, approximately \$65,000 remains for the remainder of the fiscal year. He noted that costs are unknown for relocating the Pelican Drive mailbox and repair of the Pond #7 outfall erosion, both of which are unplanned projects being considered by the Board. Supervisor Lawrence pointed out that a cost for the Wild Oaks manhole repair project is pending, a project which the District will probably have to complete. He summarized that the District must be frugal with its capital, for the remainder of the year.

Supervisor Smith asked if the District has established cost reduction/cost improvement objectives for the major consumers of money. He stated that organizations he was involved with developed cost improvement programs every year, which asked vendors, etc., to identify how they could lower the cost structure of their service by a couple of percentages. He felt that doing this would help the District's capital plan. Supervisor Smith noted that the District did this, to some degree, with its landscaping. He finds it reasonable to ask vendors to figure out a way to work smarter or differently and lower their costs by 2% or 3%. Supervisor Smith felt that this will assist the District in preparing the next budget; if you do not ask, you will not get it, he surmised.

Supervisor Davidson noted that the District has attempted to obtain lower pricing from vendors but has not codified the approach as a goal of the District.

Supervisor Lawrence noted that most vendors are under multi-year contracts and asked for suggestions. Supervisor Smith stated that the question must be asked of the vendors. Supervisor Smith suggested that vendors be asked how they can reduce their price and inform them that doing so will give them a positive mark when the contracts come up for bid.

Supervisor Chiodo suggested that the vendor could be asked to do less, in exchange for being paid less. With regard to landscaping costs, Supervisor Gaeta felt that the District has taken steps to reduce expenses. Supervisor Chiodo agreed and stated that the process should continue into other areas.

Supervisor Davidson noted that when items are put out to bid, S.E. Cline is always the low bidder. He acknowledged that this may give the impression that the District favors S.E. Cline and is not meeting its fiduciary responsibility; however, he finds that they are generally the most reliable, best performing and least expensive contractor. Supervisor Davidson questioned how the District could ask S.E. Cline to reduce costs further.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he monitors contracts on a daily basis; in the instance of S.E. Cline, he feels that they always have the best bids and provide more for the money. With regard to AMG, he explained that AMG regularly gives the District free things or services. Likewise, Austin Outdoor does many things for which they do not charge. In response to Supervisor Smith's concept, Mr. Kloptosky stressed that the District seeks to reduce expenses but it is a less formal approach, not a written objective.

Regarding recent expenses, Supervisor Gaeta stated that the District recently encountered unusual circumstances, such as ADA compliance requirements and the lawsuit. She suggested a budget line item for just in case expenses.

Mr. Wrathell stated that the Board has been diligent about convincing contractors to lower their prices. He noted that the District's budget does not contain much excess; the District budgets so tightly that it ends up under budgeting its actual needs.

Supervisor Lawrence suggested approaching AMG next month regarding whether they can cut their costs.

C. Gate Access Devices (MG)

This item was discussed earlier in the workshop.

D. Determination of Annual Fair Market Value Floor for Rental Property (SD)

This item was discussed earlier in the workshop.

E. Update: Keeping Grand Haven Grand (SD)

This item was not addressed.

F. Smart Amenity Access Card Decision Tree (SD) *(to be provided under separate cover)*

This item was discussed earlier in the workshop.

G. City of Palm Coast Public Hearings on Rate Adjustments for Water and Wastewater Service Charges (TL)

- **January 15, 2013 at 6:00 PM, *Community Center***
- **February 5, 2013 at 6:00 PM, *Community Center***

Supervisor Davidson indicated that he hoped Supervisor Lawrence had plans to attend the public hearings.

Supervisor Lawrence stated that he has a conflict with the first public hearing. He felt that the District should ask the City to roll the rates back to when the old ordinance was put in place. Supervisor Lawrence stated that he does not have enough information to know what the City is asking for or whether it is justified.

Supervisor Davidson asked if the rates are for the entire District, beyond just residents. Supervisor Lawrence replied affirmatively and confirmed that this relates to water and wastewater, as opposed to stormwater.

Mr. Wrathell asked if the City completed a rate analysis detailing why they need to adjust their rates, such as to address debt service obligations or upcoming capital needs. Supervisor Lawrence indicated that he will request the rate analysis. Mr. Wrathell pointed out that if they do not have one, the District has the right to ask the justification for the increase.

Supervisor Davidson asked for a Board Member to attend the January 15, 2013 public hearing, on behalf of the District. Supervisor Chiodo will check his schedule but there were no other volunteers.

Regarding contraction of the District, Supervisor Davidson indicated that it is moving forward and the first reading will be at the City's February 5, 2013 meeting, with the second reading on February 19, 2013.

Mr. Wrathell indicated that Ms. Sarah Lockhart contacted him questioning why there is an acreage difference between the DRI and the CDD. He left a message indicating that the CDD's boundaries are not required to match the DRI.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that the District is now a 2013 Firewise Community. He explained the process for receiving the designation and noted that he submitted the required information.

H. Update: ADA Compliance for Pool Lifts

Supervisor Davidson indicated that he has no additional information to report. He recalled that the law was to take effect in mid-January.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**UPDATES: District Manager**

Mr. Wrathell recalled that the District questioned the methodology related to the stormwater utility fee calculations. Management challenged that the previous and current bills were not consistent with the methodology provided to the District. He reported that he received email confirmation today, from Ms. Cynthia Jessup, that the District will receive reimbursements totaling \$16,000, for stormwater fees paid.

- **UPCOMING MEETING/WORKSHOP**
 - **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING**
 - **January 17, 2013 at 9:30 A.M.**
 - **COMMUNITY WORKSHOP**
 - **February 7, 2013 at 10:00 A.M.**

The next meeting will be held on January 17, 2013 at 9:30 a.m., and the next workshop will be on February 7, 2013 at 10:00 a.m.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**OPEN ITEMS**

Regarding the Open Items List, Supervisor Smith asked that items related to switching streetlights to LED/CFL and propane usage at the pools be removed. Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that LED lights are being tested; he wishes to retain this item on the list, pending a final report. Mr. Kloptosky noted that FPL is working on a rebate program for retrofitting with LED lights.

Supervisor Smith recalled that Item I, related to the removal or addition of an amenity, was adopted at the last meeting. The Board agreed that Item I should be removed from the Open Items List.

Regarding keeping Item H, propane usage at the pools, on the list, Supervisor Davidson voiced his opinion that it is a cost-saving strategy; the costs and/or savings remain pending. He stated that the Board could remove it.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that FPL and the propane vendor can place monitors on them; however, they must be on regulators, which are different than what the District has. He noted that there is a cost associated with replacing the District's regulators so that the monitors can be used, which is why he backed away from the matter. The Board agreed to carry Item H for another month.

Mr. Kloptosky pointed out that Item B, related to speeding solutions, could be removed. The Board agreed that Item B should be removed. Supervisor Davidson noted that Item K, related to contraction of the District's boundaries, will be removed, in the near future. Mr. Wrathell stated that Item L, related to the water/irrigation analysis, will be removed, once the checks are received.

Mr. Kloptosky noted that it is great that the District received a stormwater rebate; however, it is still ~~being_~~being stonewalled on the irrigation. The last email from the City concluded that the District is using too much water; he finds this stonewalling and questioned what other action the Board wishes to take. The Board agreed that the water portion of Item L can be removed, once the checks arrive, but the irrigation portion should remain on the list.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

SUPERVISORS' REQUESTS

Supervisor Smith volunteered to take on the task of improving and enhancing communications between the Board and the community. He will look for something to supplement what is already being done. He offered to prepare suggestions for presentation at the next meeting.

Supervisor Davidson asked the status of the Jasmine Drive retaining wall issue. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that Management received the agreement from District Counsel and was to send it to Ms. Smith.

Regarding the SAACs, Supervisor Davidson asked for the Board's input regarding having two (2) classes or categories of cards. It was suggested that each Supervisor provide their responses to Supervisor Davidson's suggestions to Management and that this item be included on the meeting agenda.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

There being nothing further to discuss, the workshop adjourned.

<p>On MOTION by Supervisor Smith and seconded by Supervisor Lawrence, with all in favor, the workshop adjourned at 2:21 p.m.</p>

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chair/Vice Chair