

**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, March 7, 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 (via telephone)	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Craig Wrathell	District Manager
Bissi DiCenso	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Barry Kloptosky	Field Operations Manager
Allen Skinner	Genesis Group
Rob Carlton	Resident
Joe Palermo	Resident

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Mr. Wrathell called the workshop to order at 10:02 a.m., and noted, for the record, that Supervisors Davidson, Chiodo and Lawrence were present, in person. Supervisor Smith was attending via telephone. 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

UPDATES: District Engineer

A. Estimate for Wild Oaks Soil Settlement Repairs (*to be provided under separate cover*)

Mr. Skinner recalled that the Board directed Genesis to have Ellis & Associates, Inc., (E&A) install borings and conduct testing around the problem manholes. E&A prepared a report, which provided an analysis of the six (6) manholes currently having issues, as well as three (3) recommendations for resolving the issues. He stated that Genesis was asked to obtain cost estimates for Options 2 and 3.

******Supervisor Gaeta joined the meeting via telephone at approximately 10:04 a.m.******

Mr. Skinner recalled that Option 2 involved cement grout, which is injected around the perimeter of the manhole to stabilize it and stop the settling. Option 3 involves injection of polyurethane, which solidifies the soil and seals cracks in the manhole perimeter and pipes in close proximity to the manhole. He requested estimates from two (2) qualified contractors. The estimate received was very high. The cement grout option was approximately \$74,000 for six (6) manholes, including construction oversight. The polyurethane injection option was double the cost. Mr. Skinner concluded that, as the second estimate has not been received and, due to the high cost of the other estimates, Genesis is not prepared to make a recommendation, at this time. He stated that a more cost-effective solution must be found.

Supervisor Lawrence noted that only six (6) of the 38 manholes have issues and questioned why. Mr. Kloptosky stated that other manholes are showing signs of problems.

Mr. Skinner indicated that there are loose pockets of soil around those manholes, which is probably due to poor compaction. He explained that leaks in pipes could also lead to penetration, creating voids, leading to the soft soil issue. Mr. Skinner recalled that the City of Palm Coast videoed all of the pipes and found no cracks; however, E&A feels that there are some. He clarified that the estimates presented do not contain pricing to seal pipes, other than incidental sealing through the polyurethane method. Mr. Skinner noted Genesis' opinion that sealing pipes would be under the purview of the City. He reiterated that the City found no cracks but E&A feels that there may be some issues.

Supervisor Chiodo summarized that the project is on hold pending additional estimates and development of an alternative approach.

Mr. Kloptosky acknowledged that the options presented are probably the best but also the most expensive and suggested providing E&A's report to other contractors to determine if there are other options for repairing the problem.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

UPDATES: Field/Operations Manager

A. Escalante Pier

******This item, previously Item 4C, was presented out of order.******

Mr. Skinner indicated that Mr. Kloptosky informed him that the CDD is considering assuming ownership and maintenance of the Escalante Pier. Mr. Skinner noted that Mr. Kloptosky requested an engineer's evaluation of the pier; however, that is a very specialized scope and Genesis does not have in-house personnel to complete that type of evaluation. This is a structural marine specialization. Mr. Skinner indicated that all of the experts he spoke with recommended conducting a subsurface analysis of the structural members; this requires a scuba diver. He recommended Logan Diving. Mr. Skinner located another company, SK Engineering, who could be on site guiding the scuba diver, during the inspection, and prepare a structural analysis report of the findings. He stated that Genesis wants to check SK Engineering's bio, prior to recommending them. Mr. Skinner explained that a proposal for the repair costs cannot be obtained until the report is prepared and marine contractors review the scope of work.

Mr. Kloptosky noted that he and Mr. Skinner did not proceed with obtaining the report from SK Engineering because the cost to do so is more than the \$2,500 previously approved by the Board. Mr. Skinner stated that Logan Diving's cost is \$2,400 and SK Engineering's cost is \$1,500; he finds those to be reasonable costs, considering the work to be performed.

Supervisor Chiodo voiced his feeling that the evaluation is necessary. Mr. Wrathell summarized and the Board agreed that there is no rush, as the District is not the owner of the pier.

******Supervisor Smith left the workshop.******

Referring to the Logan Diving proposal, Supervisor Lawrence stated that it appears to contain everything the District needs and questioned why it would be necessary to hire SK Engineering, as well. Mr. Skinner indicated that Logan Diving does not have a professional engineer who can write the report; Logan Diving will provide the data but may lack the ability to make a recommendation. Supervisor Lawrence recommended proceeding sequentially with Logan Diving first and having Mr. Kloptosky review the data. Supervisor Lawrence felt that, since Mr. Kloptosky was involved in repairs on another pier, he may be able to determine if the information is sufficient and the repairs are standard, such that the repairs can proceed without an engineer's input. Supervisor Lawrence acknowledged that, if structural issues are found, an

engineer may be necessary. Mr. Kloptosky asked if the scuba diver's evaluation is recorded so that an engineer could review it later and make a recommendation or if the engineer should be on site. Mr. Skinner stated that the ideal approach is for both to be on site together so the engineer can direct the diver, so that nothing is overlooked.

Supervisor Gaeta favored having both the diver and engineer complete the evaluation together.

Regarding ownership of the pier, Supervisor Davidson recalled that ownership of the pier is with Mr. Cullis. Mr. Kloptosky stated that ownership is still with the bankrupt original developer; Mr. Cullis claims to not own the pier. Supervisor Davidson questioned if the District can do anything related to the pier while it is in bankruptcy.

Mr. Kloptosky pointed out that there are safety problems with the railings and, although the CDD does not own or control it, he has received questions about blocking it off. He questioned whether the District is liable. Mr. Kloptosky advised that, if this waits, someone could fall through loose portions of the railings.

Supervisor Davidson recommended that Mr. Kloptosky continue his due diligence to work with the contractors, short of signing a contract, while District Counsel researches further what the District can do. Mr. Wrathell felt that, even if the District does not acquire or fix the pier, obtaining the in-depth analysis would be useful, as the District could provide it to the owner and notify them of the danger, which shows evidence that the District exercised due diligence.

Supervisor Davidson asked Mr. Kloptosky if the pier should be closed, after giving proper notice to the community. Mr. Kloptosky stated that, at the end of the pier, the bottom rail of an entire section is missing and the railing is loose; he feels that there is potential for problems. Mr. Wrathell voiced his concerns about the District putting itself in a position of more liability if it does anything to the pier, as it does not own it. Mr. Wrathell recommended notifying residents that there is a problem but that the District does not own it, so it cannot really do anything.

Supervisor Gaeta agreed with Mr. Wrathell's recommendation.

Mr. Wrathell suggested delaying this matter until District Counsel can review it, as he is concerned that the District might face some liability, the moment it acknowledges that there is a problem. Given Mr. Wrathell's comments, Supervisor Chiodo noted that the Board already discussed the potential hazard, on the record, at the last meeting and at today's workshop;

therefore, he feels that District Counsel should render an opinion. Supervisor Lawrence questioned whether District contractors could even be on the pier, without endorsement of the owner.

B. Village Center Parking Lot

Regarding The Village Center north parking lot, Mr. Kloptosky recalled that he had concerns and did not allow the contractor to finish and reline the parking lot. He met with P&S Paving (P&S) and S.E. Cline Construction (Cline) regarding those concerns and received an email from P&S stating that they would correct the problems. P&S came twice to make repairs; however, Mr. Kloptosky is still not satisfied. He stated that P&S did not clean the entire parking lot and the parts that were completed are not acceptable. Mr. Kloptosky presented photographs of the problems. He explained that the paving was done in sequences, which resulted in a seam and an uneven surface. Mr. Kloptosky detailed the contractor's paving process and stated that the debate has reached the point of cosmetic versus function; the contractor finds Mr. Kloptosky's complaints to be cosmetic issues. He noted that he relayed his concerns to Cline, informing them that the problems are just as bad, if not worse, than before. Mr. Kloptosky stated that the pavers and concrete aprons look better. He suggested having the District Engineer evaluate the parking lot and issue an opinion letter.

Mr. Skinner recommended showing the photographs to Genesis' experts and stated that an on-site investigation might not be necessary. The Board agreed that the District Engineer should review the photographs and render an opinion.

Mr. Wrathell pointed out that the District gives Cline a lot of business; therefore, it behooves Cline to meet the District's expectations.

Regarding Marlin Drive, Mr. Kloptosky stated that the City of Palm Coast contacted him in response to District Counsel's letter. The City is excited to redo the area. Mr. Kloptosky stated that the curb will be removed and installed correctly. He voiced his opinion that the City was not interested in testing the underlying ground and asked if District Counsel should follow up.

******Mr. Skinner left the workshop.******

C. Status of Landscape/Irrigation for Chinier and Front Streets

******This item, previously Item 4A, was presented out of order.***

Mr. Wrathell indicated that Ms. Leister is preparing a presentation for the next meeting.

Supervisor Davidson stated that he wants to review all Firewise mitigation projects completed from 2009, forward. He noted that many lessons were learned and those lessons will apply to the Chinier situation.

Supervisor Davidson noted the importance of wildfire mitigation and the District's participation in the Firewise program. He explained the mitigation requirements and that failure to comply could result in fines. Supervisor Davidson discussed conditions within the District, prior to participating in the Firewise program and what was accomplished. He noted that certain areas could not be touched or the limitations imposed in certain areas deemed to be environmentally sensitive.

******Supervisor Smith rejoined the workshop.******

Supervisor Davidson pointed out Chinier.

Supervisor Chiodo acknowledged the importance of the Firewise mitigation; however, he does not recall Chinier ever being part of the effort. Furthermore, he stated that, at the time, he never heard the term "Firewise" used in conjunction with the vine removal on Chinier and asked how it relates to the Firewise program.

Supervisor Davidson stated that Firewise originally related to the perimeter of houses, protecting structures. He discussed and reviewed 2009 and present day photographs of various areas. Supervisor Davidson indicated that the Firewise work was completed in two (2) phases at a cost of \$18,160. The project was totally funded by a federal to state grant, costing the District \$0. He noted that the Firewise program came about as a result of receiving violation notices from the City and, upon completion, the City proclaimed Grand Haven a Firewise Community. Supervisor Davidson noted that the District must hold one (1) community Firewise Awareness Day per year.

Supervisor Davidson reviewed the announcement that was sent regarding landscaping work along Front and Chinier Streets. He acknowledged that it sounded benign; however, the aesthetic turned out to be displeasing. Supervisor Davidson presented photographs of the vines prior to removal, noting that they were overgrown and a fire hazard. He also provided photographs taken after the clearing. He stated that eventually, the area will fill in; the question now is what to do in the meantime.

Supervisor Davidson discussed the installation of an emergency exit road in The Crossings.

Supervisor Smith asked what decisions the Board is being asked to make. Supervisor Davidson stated that the question is, what can the District do with the area; is it under the jurisdiction of the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) and stipulated as a particular type of conservation area. It is unknown until SJRWMD renders a decision, as to what the District will be permitted by SJRWMD to do with the area. Supervisor Davidson stated that Mr. Kloptosky was to check into what the District can do.

Supervisor Gaeta voiced her understanding that vine removal was completed as part of the fire mitigation work and, given the fact that the District was cited by the City, the work had to be completed. She asked if Supervisor Davidson is stating that, within several months, there will be growth and the area will be more aesthetically pleasing.

Supervisor Davidson replied no, not entirely.

Supervisor Chiodo conceded that the District was cited a few times regarding the vines on Chinier; however, the notice sent to residents discussed vine removal but never mentioned it being related to Firewise mitigation. He feels that it should have been mentioned because it might have alerted residents and the Board to be more aware of what could happen; he was shocked by the unexpected result.

Supervisor Gaeta summarized that Supervisor Chiodo means there was a lack of communication but vine removal was necessary.

Supervisor Chiodo concurred that the vines needed to be removed; however, he feels that neither the community, nor the Board, understood the magnitude of the problem or that the principal purpose was for Firewise mitigation. He felt that, had the outcome been understood, the Board might have thought out what it would do to restore the area, in advance. Supervisor Chiodo acknowledged that no one wants park-like conditions but they want something. At the Board's request, Ms. Leister is developing alternatives, with and without irrigation.

Supervisor Gaeta analogized that the affected residents were assured that the area would always remain a conservation area; however, she questioned the Board's responsibility, other than an apology for the appearance, because the work was necessary for Firewise mitigation. She discussed the impact of the lack of communication.

Supervisor Chiodo confirmed that the Board asked Ms. Leister to develop a plan but it has not committed to what will be done. Supervisor Gaeta clarified that residents must be

notified of what will happen, so they can understand but not for the purpose of being given a choice about it.

Supervisor Smith questioned if this area is CDD property or belongs to SJRWMD. Supervisor Davidson indicated that this is an open question; it is owned by the CDD but the question of who has administrative control must be clarified.

Mr. Kloptosky contacted SJRWMD and was told that the parcel is listed as a wetlands preserve and an upland buffer, which is directly controlled by SJRWMD, with heavy usage restrictions. In response to Supervisor Smith's question, Mr. Kloptosky reiterated that the area is owned by the CDD but falls under the jurisdictional restrictions of the SJRWMD, which allows for fire mitigation and other things.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that the outer ring is the upland buffer and the inner portion is the wetlands preserve. He read from Article 3, of the SJRWMD wetlands restrictive covenants and summarized that three (3) properties within the CDD tract do not fall within the wetlands classification; however, the remaining tract is within the classification. Mr. Kloptosky discussed the meaning of this with SJRWMD. His impression, based on the restrictive covenants and conversations with SJRWMD is that the District cannot plant anything in the area that disturbs the natural wetland. Furthermore, the District cannot enhance the property, as that would disturb the natural vegetation; the area must be left alone. He recalled the covenants allowing for preservation of the flora and fauna and pointed out that is what Ms. Leister did; the purpose of the vine removal was for Firewise mitigation but it was also to address invasive and exotic vegetation, along with choking vines, which were destroying the natural trees and wetlands. Mr. Kloptosky stated that he asked SJRWMD to provide him with a summary of the information, in layman's terms.

Mr. Kloptosky felt that the District cannot add anything to the area and it certainly cannot add irrigation.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if this information would be provided to District Counsel to interpret. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he is waiting for SJRWMD's version in layman's terms.

Mr. Kloptosky reviewed the wetland tract and upland buffer.

In response to Supervisor Smith's suggestion and given his recent findings, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that he asked Ms. Leister to hold off on developing vegetation renderings for the area, pending today's discussion.

Supervisor Lawrence recalled that the developer hydroseeded the area years ago and asked Mr. Kloptosky if the District did something in violation of SJRWMD; he asked that District Counsel review the matter. He wants District Counsel to determine what the District can legally do, meaning, what can it do to get around the SJRWMD's constraints.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that a regulatory scientist with experience working with the SJRWMD visited Grand Haven regarding previous issues and recommended inviting her to inspect the area and offer an opinion, prior to District Counsel's investigation. Mr. Wrathell agreed with this approach, as an environmental consultant might offer valuable input beyond simply a legal opinion. Supervisor Davidson felt that the consultant's opinion would be helpful to District Counsel and the District.

Discussion ensued regarding similar areas in the District and how SJRWMD determined the designations. Mr. Wrathell explained that designations generally come from negotiations between the developer and the SJRWMD, at the time the community is being developed.

******Supervisor Smith left the workshop.******

A question was raised regarding whether the District receives a credit from SJRWMD for the golf course. Mr. Wrathell explained that golf courses are notorious for having a lot of fertilizers and pesticides, which ends up in the water; basically, the District would not want to be associated with the golf course, as a wetlands area, because of the potential problems.

******The workshop recessed at 11:59 a.m.******

******The workshop reconvened at 12:11 p.m.******

▪ **Cottages at Golf Course [TL]**

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

Supervisor Lawrence recalled that there are issues regarding access to the cottages at the golf course. He contacted Mr. Cullis, who acknowledged his belief that those cottages are covered by the Master CC&Rs and implied that the CC&Rs contained rental restrictions, which is why they were thinking of long-term rentals. Regarding access, since the golf parking lot and all of the roads are public roads, there is no way that the District can impede progress or access.

Mr. Rob Carlton, a resident, recalled that Mr. Cullis previously approached the District to consolidate this area from six (6) units to four (4). He confirmed that there is nothing in the Master CC&Rs related to rentals, which means that no CC&Rs apply to the four (4) units, unless they somehow fall under an existing village. Mr. Carlton indicated that the GHMA plans to

follow up with Mr. Cullis to inquire about whether this will become a part of River Club. Mr. Carlton asked that the CDD not become involved in the GHMA's business, as he feels it is not appropriate and is counterproductive, in terms of what the GHMA is trying to accomplish. He acknowledged that there is minor overlap, with regard to access issues, but feels that they should respect each other. Mr. Carlton stressed that the GHMA is extremely concerned and does not want four (4) units in Grand Haven to be under no authority, whatsoever, as it would set a bad precedent. He noted that this is not an immediate issue but the units will be built. Mr. Carlton noted that amending the Master CC&Rs would be a monumental task.

Supervisor Chiodo indicated that the District will work with the GHMA, as access is a CDD concern. Supervisor Lawrence asked that the GHMA keep the District informed. Supervisor Lawrence noted that Mr. Cullis is looking for a developer for the units.

Mr. Carlton advised that questions were posed to Mr. Cullis; however, he has not responded. Mr. Carlton will meet with Mr. Cullis this afternoon and pose the questions again.

Mr. Joe Palermo, a resident, voiced his feeling that the CDD and GHMA must work together on this issue. Mr. Palermo feels that, while residents of the four (4) units will be able to use the parking lot for access, they should not be allowed to park overnight in the parking lot. Mr. Palermo asked if the Architectural Design Committee (ADC) will oversee the design. Mr. Carlton replied affirmatively but clarified that the ADC will be split, with one (1) ADC for new construction and the other for modifications. The GHMA will control the modification ADC and Mr. Cullis will control the new construction ADC.

Supervisor Lawrence voiced his opinion that Mr. Cullis lost control of the ADC, once a certain percentage of properties were sold. Mr. Carlton stated that Mr. Cullis maintains control of the ADC for three (3) years following the sale of his last property in the community. Mr. Carlton's understanding is that Mr. Cullis still owns property; therefore, it could be a number of years.

Discussion ensued regarding parking for the new units. Supervisor Davidson indicated that the original plans showed parking at each of the individual units; residents would not park overnight in the parking lot.

Supervisor Davidson advised that he attends the Master Association meetings.

- **Continuation of the Field/Operations Manager's Report**

Regarding ADA compliance and pool lifts, Mr. Kloptosky recalled that the Board directed him to proceed. Duda Pools was on site and submitted a proposal in the amount of \$16,910 for two (2) pool lifts, including installation, plans and permitting. In response to Supervisor Gaeta's question, Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the lifts carry a manufacturer's warranty and the contractor warranties the labor. Regarding electrical work, Mr. Kloptosky explained that the proposal includes bonding the units, as long as the existing bonding wires are within close proximity; if pavers must be lifted, etc., additional charges could be incurred. Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the proposal does not include lift covers and extra batteries; he is obtaining separate proposals for those items.

Mr. Kloptosky advised that he has not ordered the lifts. He suggested that District Counsel prepare a standard contract to go with the proposal; Duda Pools is prepared to order the units, once they receive the District's signed contract. Mr. Kloptosky was advised by Duda Pools that the lifts will take 14 days to arrive.

A resident questioned if lifts are needed at the spas. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the Board approved lifts for the pools, based on activities; they are not required at the spas because organized activities are not held at the spas.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled issues with the pergola and his letter to the contractor sent last week. He noted that, to date, the letter has not been picked up from the post office. The letter subsequently sent via Federal Express, was delivered and resulted in a call to Mr. Kloptosky. The contractor is willing to work with the District to resolve the issues; a meeting is scheduled for early next week.

Discussion ensued about the warranty and if problems arise after the warranty expires.

Mr. Kloptosky reported a number of recent issues regarding gate access devices (GADs) and discussions of exceptions. He noted incoming requests for additional GADs. In one (1) instance, residents were very disrespectful to staff and demanded an extra GAD because they previously had two (2) vehicles but now have only one (1); they feel they should still receive two (2) GADs. Mr. Kloptosky advised of another situation where three (3) family members reside in the home but only two (2) have cars; however, due to work schedules and health problems, the woman demands another GAD for herself, as she has friends who take her to doctor appointments. The woman finds it too cumbersome to wait at the guard gate for access. Mr. Kloptosky requested a letter from the woman's doctor explaining how her condition requires

immediate access back into the community but has not received one. He reported on a resident who has requested an additional GAD for a vehicle that is in their possession but is not registered to them. Mr. Kloptosky asked the Board if he has authority to grant exceptions to the GAD Policies, in these types of situations.

In the last situation, it was suggested that the resident submit a letter from the vehicle owner confirming that the resident is the authorized user and that a GAD be issued based on that letter.

Supervisor Gaeta pointed out that the District established GAD Policies and, if exceptions continue to be granted, gradually, more and more residents will make requests for exceptions to the policies, which would defeat the entire purpose of reregistration and access control.

Supervisor Davidson noted that residents in The Crossings are talking and requests are being fueled by the exception that the District already granted, due to a medical issue; word is spreading that all a resident must do is say they have a medical condition and an exception will be granted.

Supervisor Gaeta proposed that the Board maintain their decision.

Supervisor Lawrence felt that the Board gave Mr. Kloptosky authority to make common sense decisions and, if he is unsure, he should consult with the Chair. If a decision cannot be made, only then should the matter come before the Board again.

Supervisor Gaeta agreed that these questions should not keep coming up.

Mr. Kloptosky distributed a handout detailing the progress of reregistration; to date, reregistration of 510 of 1,866 homes is complete. Mr. Kloptosky stated that response is weak, particularly in certain villages. He fears an overwhelming burden on the office staff, once cards are deactivated.

Supervisor Gaeta indicated that she contacted several people and found that there are many people in the community who have no idea of what is going on because they do not receive emails or choose not to read CDD or AMG emails. She suggested posting a copy of the reregistration notice at The Village Center and the CDD office, along with the café and restroom doors and other prominent locations. Supervisor Gaeta recommended including the information in the Oak Tree publication, as well.

Supervisor Davidson stated that he submitted an article for the upcoming Oak Tree, which includes information about reregistration. He proposed sending individual certified letters to those that have not responded by a certain date.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that staff prefers to contact residents via telephone.

Discussion continued regarding getting information to the community.

Supervisor Davidson noted that, for contract purposes, AMG needs an estimate of the security needs, as the new GAD and smart amenity access card (SAAC) system commences.

Supervisor Lawrence suggested that AMG prepare their standard contract and the District will address the extra work as an exception or addition to the contract, which will be paid separately.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled the Board's decision to not issue a second GAD to the home that only has one (1) vehicle. He warned the Board that this is the homeowner who was very rude and to expect more from the resident.

Supervisor Davidson recommended that Management issue a letter to the resident informing her of the policy and noting that the lack of civility towards District Staff is unacceptable behavior, which can result in loss of her privileges.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Road Resurfacing Capital Plan [TL]

Supervisor Lawrence reviewed his calculations and explained that he factored inflation and a 10% contingency into the estimated costs. He discussed an approach of building reserves, in an equal amount, each year, through 2035. Supervisor Lawrence explained that the problem with that approach is that a reserve of \$3.1 million would be built during the first ten (10) years but only \$1.1 million would be spent. This approach amounts to asking today's residents to contribute a large amount of money for which they will never receive the benefit.

In response to a question, Supervisor Lawrence advised that the plan equates to approximately a \$150 assessment.

Supervisor Lawrence reviewed alternative approaches where less is collected in the early years and the amount increases incrementally, in future years. He discussed another approach with an \$85 per unit assessment to build reserve now, with the concept that the bonds will be

paid in 2019; owners will see a reduction in that assessment, which can then offset the necessary assessment for the roadwork.

Supervisor Davidson presented a bond scenario that would commence in 2019, when the other bonds were retired. He noted that this approach would probably more fairly distribute the cost to the residents that would benefit from the resurfaced roads; however, it is a much more expensive approach.

Regarding Sailfish Drive, Supervisor Davidson stated that the main problem was fixed. He voiced his concern about taking repairs out of sequence; however, there is a history with Sailfish Drive.

Supervisor Lawrence felt that, mistake or not, the Board made a commitment to the residents of Sailfish Drive and the work should be completed.

Supervisor Gaeta noted that the other issues were not known at the time the commitment was made. She questioned how many other streets have puddling problems and, from a priority perspective, how can it be prioritized so that reserve funds are not being used for something that is not necessary at this moment. Supervisor Gaeta stated that focus should be on the priority items.

Supervisor Lawrence reiterated his opinion that the Board made. He explained that the repair is \$80,000 and the District has \$130,000 in its reserves. He proposed completing the Sailfish Drive resurfacing, followed by the Wild Oaks manhole work, with whatever funds remain.

Supervisor Gaeta suggested moving the Sailfish Drive project into the 2014 budget, as other emergency issues will likely arise. She noted that, when emergencies arise, one must prioritize. She reiterated that the other issues were not known when the commitment was made.

Supervisor Chiodo felt that other matters will arise during 2014.

Regarding the Wild Oaks manhole issue, Mr. Kloptosky voiced his opinion that it involves a lot of money and he is not sure about the approaches presented. He stated that he has a proposal from Cline to repair three (3) of the manholes, for approximately \$5,000. He acknowledged that there are subsurface issues; however, if Cline cuts it open and recompacts the area, he feels it would last another five (5) years, at which time, they could be fixed again. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the process presented by Genesis does not sit well with him. He feels

that fixing the manhole issues at minimal cost, with Cline compacting as well as possible, would be best, followed by approaching the City to fix the rest.

Supervisor Chiodo voiced his opinion that the puddling problem on Sailfish Drive is a problem that should be fixed and, given Mr. Kloptosky's suggestion of another way to fix the Wild Oaks manhole problems, he feels that Sailfish Drive should be fixed.

Mr. Kloptosky clarified that he is not saying Genesis' recommendations are not the long-term, proper fix; he is suggesting a less expensive "band-aid" approach, with full knowledge that the problem may recur and require future repair.

Supervisor Chiodo gave full support to Mr. Kloptosky's recommendation for repairing the Wild Oaks' manhole issues.

Supervisor Davidson agreed with Mr. Kloptosky's recommendation of how to repair Wild Oaks and using the remaining funds to address Sailfish Drive.

In response to Supervisor Gaeta's question, it was noted that the Sailfish Drive costs are expected to be \$80,000 plus another \$20,000 for engineering.

Supervisor Lawrence recalled discussion of gutter issues at the last meeting and suggested having the District Engineer review a few of them to determine the seriousness and cost. He stressed that the District will never be able to keep all of its roads puddle free forever; there may be puddling after heavy rains. It will cost the District too much money to fix puddle problems.

B. Gate Access [TL]

This item was not addressed.

C. Cottages at Golf Course [TL]

This item was discussed during the Fourth Order of Business.

D. Update: Keeping Grand Haven Grand [SD]

This item was not addressed.

E. Reconsideration of CDD Communication

Supervisor Davidson presented Supervisor Smith's sample communication to residents. He voiced his concerns with an informal, individual opinion of a collegial body's work. Supervisor Davidson stated that this is a five (5)-member Board and if a single person is writing their opinion or perception of the entire Board's actions, it will not reflect the Board's actions or intent; it will be only that person's point of view.

Supervisor Lawrence asked if removing the “My Take” section would satisfy Supervisor Davidson.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that the “My Take” section is a part of the problem. He recalled that the summaries prepared by Supervisor Chiodo, years ago, were objective, summary descriptions; they did not contain personal opinions, etc.

Supervisor Lawrence felt that the problem with Supervisor Chiodo’s summaries was that they were too long; he believes that the advantage of Supervisor Smith’s version is that it is brief.

Supervisor Davidson found the briefness to also be a disadvantage. He indicated that simplifying a complex matter too much can create a public relations nightmare. Supervisor Davidson pointed out a portion of Supervisor Smith’s summary, related to landscaping and irrigation, which was incorrect; it failed to mention that the Board requested two (2), rather than one (1) landscaping plan, with one (1) including irrigation and the other without. He noted that the statement gives the impression that the entire Board is in favor of irrigation, which is incorrect information.

Supervisor Davidson explained that Board Members would be forced to explain comments included in Supervisor Smith’s summary; however, Supervisor Smith protects himself from inaccuracies or not telling the truth by including the statement “I am known to take incomplete and inaccurate notes. Do not rely on them for truth or wisdom.” But the affected Board Members must spend time explaining the statements.

Supervisor Gaeta stated that, if she had never attended a CDD meeting and read this type of information, she would be trying to sell her home. She pointed out that the summary contains several grammatical errors, as well. Supervisor Gaeta referred to the comment “When you remove vines and brush and find there are no live trees it is called “an oops,” which is inflammatory. She found much of this insulting to the Board and inflammatory.

Mr. Wrathell indicated that Management and Mr. Kloptosky reviewed Supervisor Smith’s information and felt that it needed to be rewritten. He feels that Supervisor Smith is well intentioned; however, the District has meetings, a website, sends e-blasts and posts meeting minutes. He advised that communication such as this, coming from a single Board Member and transmitted via the District’s official e-blast, is a mistake. Mr. Wrathell stated that, historically, the Board has done a great job communicating. He feels that this type of communication could create a divisive situation.

The Board agreed to not move forward with this type of communication.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

UPDATES: District Manager

- **UPCOMING MEETING/WORKSHOP**
 - **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING**
 - **March 21, 2013 at 9:30 A.M.**
 - **COMMUNITY WORKSHOP**
 - **April, 2013 at 10:00 A.M.**

The next meeting will be held on March 21, 2013 at 9:30 a.m., and the next workshop will be on April 4, 2013 at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Wrathell recalled discussion at the last meeting regarding the state unemployment tax issue that went back to the former management company, Rizzetta. He explained that the state has been difficult during Management’s efforts to get the charges reversed. Management discovered that Rizzetta made the change about six (6) month’s prior to Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC, becoming District Manager; however, subsequent to termination, Rizzetta changed their address to their Orlando office but the state sent its notices to Rizzetta’s Tampa office, even though Rizzetta was no longer the manager. Mr. Wrathell stated that the state cannot locate authorization for them to have changed the address; therefore, Management is questioning how the state can change the address without proper authorization. Management made a public records request and informed the state that a timeline will be established, along with involving District Counsel, if the state does not rectify the situation.

******Supervisor Smith joined the meeting via telephone.******

Supervisor Lawrence advised Supervisor Smith that the Board discussed his proposed communication and decided that it would create more issues than benefit.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

OPEN ITEMS

This item was not addressed.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

SUPERVISORS’ REQUESTS

Supervisor Gaeta noted that certain residents email individual Board Members with their questions or issues. She indicated that she forwards those communications to Management. Supervisor Gaeta suggested that the Board establish a policy regarding residents contacting individual Board Members, as there have been situations where other Board Members are at a disadvantage because they were not aware or informed of what was happening.

Supervisor Davidson suggested that, when a Board Member receives a request, it should be forwarded to Management, for inclusion in the next agenda. Supervisor Gaeta stated that not all inquiries are included in the agenda. Supervisor Gaeta explained that there were instances where a particular Board Member responded to inquiries without sending the inquiry to the District Manager to disseminate to the other Board Members.

Mr. Wrathell summarized that Supervisor Gaeta believes if a Board Member receives communication from a resident, it should be disseminated to all of the Board Members, so that everyone is aware of the issue and no one is at a disadvantage. Supervisor Gaeta stressed that she does not want things to get back to the point where certain residents feel they can use a particular Board Member as their power base and noted that this is how items end up being discussed ad nauseum.

Mr. Wrathell indicated that, in general, if there is an issue that a Board Member feels is important enough to be placed on the agenda, it is forwarded to Management.

Supervisor Lawrence asked that the District prepare certificates of appreciation to the residents who are assisting with reregistration.

Regarding the Wild Oaks manhole issue, Mr. Kloptosky voiced his understanding that the District Engineer was to obtain a second proposal and asked if the Board still wants him to do so. The Board replied no. Supervisor Davidson indicated that Cline has a proposal of a less expensive repair and suggested that Mr. Kloptosky obtain the District Engineer's opinion of Cline's suggestion. Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that he will provide a copy of E&A's report to Cline so that the information can be utilized to develop repair options.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**ADJOURNMENT**

There being nothing further to discuss, the workshop adjourned.

On MOTION by Supervisor Davidson and seconded by Supervisor Chiodo, with all in favor, the workshop adjourned at 2:03 p.m.

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chair/Vice Chair