

**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, June 6, 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 (<i>via telephone</i>)	Vice Chair
Marie Gaeta	Assistant Secretary
Tom Lawrence	Assistant Secretary
Ray Smith	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Doug Paton	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Howard McGaffney	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Allen Skinner	District Engineer
Liam O'Reilly	Genesis Group
Barry Kloptosky	Field Operations Manager
Roy Deary	Amenity Management Group (AMG)
Robert Ross	Amenity Management Group (AMG)
Joe Montagna	Amenity Management Group (AMG)
Tony Gaeta	Dolphin Technical Solutions
Vic Natiello	Resident

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

UPDATES: District Engineer

A. Sailfish Drive Drainage Repair Project

Mr. Skinner recalled that the drawings are approximately 90% completed and nearly ready for permitting, followed by construction. At the last meeting, Board Members voiced their opinions that the puddling issue is not too severe and asked Genesis to research less expensive options for addressing the problem. The Board wondered if it is necessary to complete a full repair of the street.

Mr. O'Reilly discussed the conditions and noted that the issues seem to be the worst near 27 Sailfish Drive. He reviewed three (3) proposed inlets, including a large, 60" elliptical concrete pipe, known as an equalization pipe, which connects two (2) lakes. He noted that the inlets are extremely shallow, which is why they must tie into the equalization pipe. Mr. O'Reilly detailed the flow line of the curb and gutter; it is a crowned road but has a few flat spots that inhibit flow. Genesis is proposing installation of a few inlets in the flat spots, including an inlet to intercept the water before it reaches the driveway at 27 Sailfish Drive. The plan also calls for rebuilding the curb line, along the area.

Noting the Board's desire to save money, Mr. O'Reilly recommended eliminating a certain piece. He voiced his opinion that remilling and resurfacing a portion of the roadway would solve ponding issues.

Supervisor Davidson asked how long the roadway would be closed, during repairs. Mr. Skinner estimated two (2) to four (4) weeks. Mr. O'Reilly indicated that the time depends on S.E. Cline but suggested that the work could possibly be completed in two (2) phases. Mr. O'Reilly discussed the scope of the repairs.

Supervisor Smith noted that the issue is near 27 Sailfish Drive and asked if the repairs will resolve the issue. Mr. O'Reilly indicated that the problem should be resolved; the plans call for increasing the slope, to allow water to drain from that area.

Supervisor Lawrence recalled that the area in front of 27 Sailfish Drive is a flat spot and asked if it will still be flat, after the area is repaved. Mr. O'Reilly stated that the area will still be visually flat; however, technically, it will have a slight slope. Mr. O'Reilly pointed out that, in situations such as this, repairing one (1) low spot tends to create the same problem, in another

area. Mr. O'Reilly stated that the water needs to be given a place to go and the slope should be increased.

Supervisor Smith voiced his opinion that the area is sunken, in front of the driveway, at 27 Sailfish Drive. Mr. O'Reilly indicated that, based on the survey, the area is flat, not sunken. Supervisor Smith stated that the area fills up with water. Mr. O'Reilly asked if it fills up in the gutter line or the actual asphalt roadway area. Supervisor Smith indicated that it fills in both. Mr. O'Reilly advised that, if the curb area is depressed, rebuilding the curb will help resolve the problem. Also, repaving the roadway will help alleviate other areas with depressions.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if Genesis determined if the way the driveway is graded is contributing to the problem. Mr. O'Reilly stated that the driveway was likely designed to drain into the street; however, if water has nowhere to go, it will remain at the end of the driveway. Mr. O'Reilly voiced his belief that the proposed plan would help alleviate the problem.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if Austin cleaned the drains and, if so, did it make a difference. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that drain cleaning is completed by in-house staff; Austin cleaned the road, curbs and gutters of leaves and debris. Mr. O'Reilly stated that Genesis also suggests cleaning the leaves from low slope areas.

Supervisor Lawrence summarized that, once the area is remilled and repaved, it will have a slight slope, rather than being flat. Mr. O'Reilly replied affirmatively but stressed that the slope cannot be increased very much because it would impact the driveway's ability to drain, if the curb becomes higher than the driveway. Mr. O'Reilly reiterated Genesis' belief that the proposed plan can help the problem.

Supervisor Lawrence asked the cost savings if the drain on the left side is eliminated from the plan. Mr. O'Reilly stated that, in the scheme of the entire project, the cost savings would be fairly minor; perhaps a few thousand dollars, amounting to 5% to 8% of the total construction costs.

Supervisor Davidson acknowledged that certain areas were addressed and the problem now, during the dry season, involves a few bothersome puddles. He stated that, now that the rainy season started, he observed continuous puddles along both sides of the road, on the entire south section of Sailfish Drive. Supervisor Davidson felt that the District has tried various methods to manage the situation, without spending a lot of money; however, the Board should consider discussing it further, at the next meeting. He noted the dilemma that the Board

previously planned to borrow money to complete the repairs; however, it is now only a few months from the new fiscal year. Supervisor Davidson prefers that this be the first item completed, as part of the Fiscal Year 2014 budget, rather than borrowing to do it.

Supervisor Gaeta agreed that it is best to wait and budget the work for Fiscal Year 2014. She recalled that the Board did not decide against completing the work; it chose to try preemptive steps first. Supervisor Gaeta asked the final cost for repairs.

Mr. O'Reilly stated that the oak trees are part of the problem; therefore, if oaks are in place, they will continue to grow and the roots will cause problems again, in the future. Mr. O'Reilly explained that any flat roadway design has a construction tolerance regarding puddling; however, he is confident that the large, worst-case scenarios will be solved. He indicated that, from a construction standpoint, there is almost no way to guarantee no puddling on a flat road design. Mr. O'Reilly stressed that, although the bad problems will be solved, there is potential for continued minor ponding in certain areas.

Discussion ensued regarding alternatives to oak trees or methods of changing root growth. Supervisor Davidson advised that the Architectural Design Committee (ADC) is adamant that live oak trees must be reinstalled.

Supervisor Smith recalled that Mr. Kloptosky was able to solve minor puddling problems, in the past, and asked how he did it. Mr. Kloptosky stated that he approached it the same way; the principal is the same as suggested by Genesis. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that depressed sections of curb, apron and roadway were removed and rebuilt to conform to the existing slope, which solved most of the problem.

Supervisor Lawrence recalled that the sections repaired by Mr. Kloptosky were not zero degree grade; they had an appropriate grade, such that when the depressions were removed, water flowed.

Supervisor Smith asked how many roads have zero grades. Mr. Kloptosky did not know, without researching the surveys; he knows about them when homeowners bring them to his attention. Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the area he spoke about had a grade and the problem was the result of depressions from root lifting of the curbs and aprons; once those problems were repaired, the problem was solved. Mr. Kloptosky acknowledged that the Sailfish Drive issues are different because there is a minimal grade, along the entire street.

Supervisor Smith voiced his understanding and sympathy regarding the problem. He reported that, last weekend, he traveled the roads around the community and, although it had not rained in a few days, sprinklers ran on Friday night, on one (1) side of the street. Supervisor Smith indicated that he observed ponding or standing water in a few areas. Most areas were not as significant as Sailfish Drive; however, he observed one (1) that was as large, or larger, than Sailfish Drive and provided the address to Mr. Kloptosky. Supervisor Smith advised that, with only sprinklers running, he observed 75 occurrences of standing water, at 9:00 a.m., Saturday. He noted that all of the streets with standing water have live oak trees and curbs are rising. Supervisor Smith voiced his concern that the District is not looking at a one (1)-time fix on a single street; eventually, other streets will need to be repaired. He is waiting for a paradigm that will address the problem, without spending \$60,000 to \$70,000 per street, which could bankrupt the District.

Mr. Skinner asked how many of the 75 occurrences were in front of driveways. Supervisor Smith stated that he did not track it that way; however, a number of them were. Others were where curbs were raised because of roots. Supervisor Smith stressed the need to find a solution.

Supervisor Davidson acknowledged that live oaks planted in a “street tree” situation is impractical. He encouraged everyone to review the flow of water, under force, from heavy rain, because he feels that most of the 75 areas observed by Supervisor Smith will drain into gutters and perform correctly, with only a small amount of puddling. Supervisor Davidson voiced his opinion that Sailfish Drive is different, due to the area being flat, which is not conducive to allowing water to flow. He feels that the District should be most concerned about the flow, under heavy rain conditions.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled an area at the end of Creekside Drive, with an overflow of water over the curb because a drain is missing or the grade is not appropriate. He advised that, during heavy rains, water not only accumulates along the curb, it washes over the curb, onto the resident’s property. Cline evaluated the area and found that it is not as bad as Sailfish Drive but it is not as simple as some other areas. Mr. Kloptosky stated that a drain must be installed in the area and tied into an existing drain. Cline estimated the cost to be approximately \$12,000. In response to Supervisor Davidson’s question, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the grade is the cause; there are no large live oak trees in the vicinity.

Supervisor Davidson asked if the drawings are completed and ready for permitting. Mr. Skinner advised that the drawings are nearly complete; a few internal items remain, prior to permitting. Noting the arduous permitting process, Supervisor Davidson asked how long the permits are active, once issued. Mr. Skinner was unsure. Mr. Kloptosky felt that the permittee has a year from the date of issuance to commence work.

Supervisor Davidson suggested that, assuming the work can begin in the new fiscal year, the Board should authorize commencement of the permitting process, at the next meeting.

In response to Mr. Skinner's question regarding elimination of the far drain, Supervisor Davidson confirmed his belief that, if the project is completed, it should be thorough, including that drain. Regarding a final cost estimate, Mr. Skinner asked when a budget amount is needed. Supervisor Davidson indicated that budget discussions are beginning and the public hearing is in September; therefore, the estimate should be provided no later than July.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled that Cline already provided an estimate and he gave them the drawings for review. It was noted that the plans will change a bit; therefore, it is worthwhile to obtain an accurate estimate. Supervisor Lawrence noted that money is budgeted for road repairs and, while an updated estimate would be nice, he does not feel it entirely necessary. Supervisor Davidson asked that permitting and engineering oversight costs be provided. Mr. Skinner stated that a number for construction administration was built into the original design fee. Mr. Kloptosky read the various fees included in the original design plans, which total \$17,500, and suggested verifying that all permitting fees are included. Supervisor Davidson advised that the goal is to develop a more accurate estimate of the overall project costs.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that Cline's original estimate was \$50,280, which did not include the alternative cost of \$19,600, for the northern section of Sailfish Drive. He summarized that \$50,280 would be the construction costs, \$17,500 are the design, permitting fees and construction oversight fees; the only thing not included was addressing the street trees.

Supervisor Davidson was comfortable with proceeding with permitting. Mr. Skinner stated that he will clarify the permitting matters and, at the next meeting, the Board can authorize him to proceed.

Regarding puddles, Supervisor Lawrence suggested that Mr. Kloptosky have his staff drive the community, following rains, to locate areas of puddling. Mr. Kloptosky stated that

staff already observes the community and reports these situations; there is puddling but, for the most part, the water dissipates.

Supervisor Gaeta asked how long it takes to dissipate. Mr. Kloptosky felt that 24 hours is the standard drainage time frame. Mr. O'Reilly stated that, with an actual storm drain system connecting into a retention pond, the time frame is 72 hours; however, that time frame does not address ponding issues. Mr. O'Reilly stated that there is no set time frame regarding ponding, as there are too many factors, such as evaporation and irrigation. It was noted that ponding should not be an issue, if the slopes are adequate. Mr. O'Reilly agreed but pointed out that, with construction tolerance, there is no way to completely fix the minor issues.

******Mr. Skinner and Mr. O'Reilly left the workshop.******

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

UPDATES: Amenity Manager

Mr. Ross reported that the Memorial Day event was a success, with many in attendance.

Mr. Deary indicated that Mr. Joe Montagna, who joined the AMG's Grand Haven team, is present today.

Mr. Montagna expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to work again in the Grand Haven community.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

UPDATES: Field/Operations Manager

A. Sailfish Drive Resident Concerns

These items were included for the Board's information.

Supervisor Davidson noted that the Board must exercise its fiduciary responsibility to spend money when it is absolutely necessary, after first evaluating the problem, under all conditions, to ensure 100% certainty. Supervisor Lawrence pointed out that, whatever action the Board takes on Sailfish Drive will set precedence for the remainder of the community, which is why it is important to be sure the right thing is done.

Regarding the permit issue related to relocating the mailbox on Pelican Court, Mr. Kloptosky stated that he obtained quotes to include the engineering, architecture and permitting costs, as required by the City. He indicated that the cost is nearly double; it was originally \$3,500 but will now be \$6,985. Another contractor bid the project at \$8,000. Mr. Kloptosky

reported that he found a third contractor who is willing to complete the project for the originally quoted price of \$3,500, including the engineering, architecture and permitting costs. In response to a question, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the District has not used the contractor but he checked his references. The contractor initiated the permitting process and Mr. Kloptosky remains in communication with the post office.

Mr. Kloptosky noted that the budget contains a line item for repainting the Creekside building. He advised that the roof at Creekside was very dirty; therefore, he obtained quotes, ranging from \$1,000 to \$1,900, to pressure clean the roof. He eventually located a contractor who bid \$750 and the job was completed.

Regarding the pool lifts, Mr. Kloptosky reported that The Village Center lift was installed. Installation of the lift at Creekside will be completed as soon as the weather permits. Mr. Kloptosky voiced his displeasure regarding the color of the lift covers; he is researching other covers. He indicated that he received negative feedback from residents regarding the lift location and explained that the location was selected based on the best available options, given the code requirements governing location.

Mr. Kloptosky advised the Board of another underground wiring issue, causing the loss of cameras at the tennis courts. He recalled problems at another location that required rerunning the conduit and installing new wiring; it appears that the same repair will be necessary at the tennis courts. Mr. Kloptosky will obtain quotes but estimated the cost to be \$6,000 to \$7,000. In response to a question, Mr. Kloptosky indicated that buried conduit is found throughout the community and detailed other areas that required new conduit and wiring.

Regarding The Village Center pergola project, Mr. Kloptosky reported that the repairs, repainting and restaining are scheduled to begin on Monday.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled a request for motorcycle parking and indicated that a parking spot was divided and two (2) "Motorcycle Parking Only" signs were installed. It was brought to his attention that certain residents are ignoring the signs and parking their vehicles in the spots. Those residents were asked to stop parking there but continue to park there anyway. Mr. Kloptosky feels that the only solution is to install concrete bollards between the motorcycle parking spaces. In response to Supervisor Davidson's question, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that cones were used; however, people either ran over them or moved them. Supervisor Lawrence suggested sticking large, difficult to remove "Warning" stickers to vehicles that park in those

spaces. Supervisor Davidson voiced his opinion that the signs are difficult to see and read; they are indistinct. Mr. Kloptosky stated that the signs can be changed. Supervisor Gaeta recommended signage stating that vehicles will be towed. Mr. Montagna advised that moveable bollards are an option. Mr. Vic Natiello, a resident, advised against installation of something hard, as it could result in a lawsuit. He recommended installing flexible rubber poles. Supervisor Smith recommended not spending a large amount of money on the issue.

Mr. Kloptosky announced that audio/video cameras were installed at both The Village Center and Creekside fitness centers.

Regarding the issues on Chinier and what the District can do in that area, Mr. Kloptosky advised that St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) conducted another inspection. SJRWMD was pleased with the regrowth and wants to wait to reevaluate the growth, after the rainy season. He stated that SJRWMD will not allow installation of irrigation; additionally, no planting will be allowed in the restricted areas. Mr. Kloptosky recalled a question about planting around the perimeter of the entire area, around Chinier and Front Street. SJRWMD advised that certain areas, from the curb back, do not fall within the restricted areas; however, the developer never surveyed the area and had those widths put on file with SJRWMD. Prior to allowing anything to be planted in those areas, SJRWMD will require a survey, with it being amended and filed with SJRWMD. Mr. Kloptosky was unsure of the cost. Supervisor Davidson explained that the land parcel is one (1)-half acre larger than the established conservation area. SJRWMD suggested that the District carve out the equivalent of one (1)-half acre from the perimeter of the parcel, on which the District could plant. Supervisor Davidson noted that a survey would be required and suggested including \$5,000 in the proposed budget.

Supervisor Gaeta asked about maintenance costs for the area. Supervisor Davidson pointed out that no maintenance would be allowed within the conservation area, except for Firewise and removal of invasive species.

Regarding reregistration, Mr. Kloptosky reported that 1,238 households, or 66%, reregistered.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled discussion, several months ago, regarding a request from residents and the Audubon Society to install an "eagle camera" in Wild Oaks. The original request indicated that there would be no cost to the District; however, Mr. Kloptosky believes the group is having difficulty obtaining alternate funding or grants. Mr. Kloptosky detailed the

scope of work and costs necessary to install cameras in the desired location, along with the subsequent electric bills, and asked the Board whether it is interested in pursuing the project.

Supervisor Davidson voiced his discomfort with bringing attention to a tree in Wild Oaks; the District was told that it would be anonymous. Additionally, it was supposed to be an Audubon Society project, not funded through a collection from residents. Supervisor Davidson was not in favor of the project, unless it was completed and funded through the Audubon Society, or a similar, nationally recognized organization.

Supervisor Smith felt that there is no problem with the group accepting donations from residents for the camera; it is not for the CDD. From the CDDs perspective, Supervisor Smith suggested that it be a minimally invasive camera system.

Supervisor Lawrence agreed with Supervisor Smith, provided the project be completed and funded by an organization such as the Audubon Society.

Supervisor Davidson pointed out the District's potential liability if the eagles are disturbed; the District could face hundreds of thousands of dollars in fines, which is why it would be essential to have experts handling the project.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that, to date, it does not appear that the work would not be under the umbrella of experts, as he is receiving proposals from private contractors.

Regarding the clubhouse pier, Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he spoke to five (5) or six (6) contractors and provided them all with the Logan Diving and E&A Reports. He reported that only two (2) of the contractors provided adequate proposals. The proposals range from \$45,200 to \$56,940 for the repairs, as listed in the reports. Those proposals do not include electrical work, permitting, engineering and drawings and ADA compliant handrails, if necessary. Mr. Kloptosky discussed alternatives to the proposed work, including covering the existing posts and rails with powder-coated aluminum. With regard to Logan Diving's report, Mr. Kloptosky stated that one (1) contractor feels that four (4) more pilings should be added.

B. Tennis Court Lighting

Mr. Kloptosky recalled discussion at the last meeting. He explained that the wind code requires that the light poles be upgraded to 5" galvanized steel. Mr. Kloptosky noted that the current light fixtures cannot be installed on the new poles because they cannot be adapted; therefore, new fixtures must be purchased. He indicated that two (2) contractors are willing to buy the old fixtures, which significantly reduces the costs. Mr. Kloptosky advised that the

proposals range from \$34,000 to \$44,000 to replace 12 light poles and fixtures. He noted that the District has used the higher priced contractor many times but has never used the lower priced contractor, although they have received positive reviews. Mr. Kloptosky discussed the installation and attachment processes proposed by the contractors.

Regarding permits, Mr. Kloptosky stated that both contractors agree that permits are not necessary, as the District is replacing something that already existed; however, a permit for electrical would be necessary. Mr. Paton felt that if the current lights do not meet code, permits would be needed for the new lights. Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the proposals do not include permitting costs.

Discussion ensued regarding the wind code distance.

Mr. Kloptosky reminded the Board that they approved this project and authorized him to proceed, at the last meeting.

In response to Supervisor Gaeta's question regarding closure of the courts, Mr. Kloptosky stated that he is unsure of the time frame; he must ask the contractor. Supervisor Gaeta stressed the need to communicate with residents.

Supervisor Smith pointed out that the safety issue only exists while the current light poles are standing. He suggested that they could be taken down now and a portion of the project could be moved to the Fiscal Year 2014 budget.

Supervisor Davidson asked Mr. Kloptosky to monitor the frequency of light usage, at the tennis courts, and report his findings.

At the request of Mr. Charles Trautwein, a resident, Supervisor Lawrence read the following email, from Mr. Trautwein, regarding midge flies, into the record:

"Tom,

- Update:*
- * They are midges.*
 - * They are infesting the large lakes.*
 - * The Mosquito Commission has sprayed 4 times in a row.*
 - * I have swarms of them depending on the wind direction all over my front door, porch and pool and lanai. If you walk on the grass they swarm you.*
 - * Every 2 days they die and a new batch appears out of the lake.*

My neighbors on the lake are living with conditions that should be addressed ASAP. As I am typing this message, a new batch riding on the western breeze are all over the back of my house. We keep trying to clean them of the windows etc.

Please have the CDD board address this issue. Find out the ways to fight the infestation, and the extent of its presence in Grand Haven. Also, please, read this email into the record. Thanks!

Charles J. Trautwein”

Mr. Kloptosky recalled that the Board discussed this problem last year, when a number of complaints were received. To date, the only complaint this year is from Mr. Trautwein, by way of his email. Last year, the only remedy offered by Aquatic Systems was to stock the pond with fish that eat the larva; however, it is not a complete solution. The cost of the fish was a factor. Mr. Kloptosky noted that the fly problem only lasts a short time. Supervisor Davidson directed Mr. Kloptosky to contact Aquatic Systems to inquire about new solutions or what can be done.

Supervisor Gaeta agreed that the problem is bad. Although the problem is with midges, Supervisor Davidson suggested contacting mosquito control. Mr. Kloptosky advised that mosquito control will not spray ponds. Supervisor Davidson also recommended contacting the county health department to find out what can be done.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**RECESS COMMUNITY WORKSHOP:
Tour of Creekside Croquet Court (11:00
P.M.)**

This item did not occur, due to inclement weather.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**RECONVENE COMMUNITY
WORKSHOP (12:00 P.M.)**

This item did not occur, due to inclement weather.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**DEBRIEF: Creekside Croquet Court
Tour**

This item did not occur, due to inclement weather.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**DISCUSSION ITEMS****A. Game Plan for Implementation of SAACs and Deactivation of GADs [BOS]**

Mr. Ross reported stated that the response to the “soft” rollout scanning of Smart Amenity Access Cards (SAAC) has been good. He indicated that, this week, people were sent home because they did not have a card and were not recognized by staff.

Supervisor Davidson asked if those people did not have a card or the SAAC. Mr. Ross clarified that the people did not have any card. Supervisor Davidson stressed that, during this time, people should only be turned away if they have no card with them; if they have the old card, they can still use the facilities, for now.

Supervisor Davidson noted a misunderstanding regarding use of photocopies of cards. He discussed the forgery potential. Supervisor Davidson stated that, if a person wants a duplicate card, for convenience, they should purchase a second card; photocopies should not be used.

Various residents voiced their comments and experiences during the new process.

Supervisor Davidson advised of an issue regarding where SAACs should be scanned, as related to the café and playing cards. He explained that people are using the common areas at Creekside and at the café to play cards. Supervisor Davidson voiced his understanding that some card players are not residents and do not have SAACs. He noted that the café is exempt from scanning; the public can use it.

Supervisor Gaeta questioned if the people are there to eat or just play cards; if they are playing cards, they take the space of a potential paying customer.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that, although there is no scan exempt area at Creekside, people who are not Grand Haven residents are still coming there to play cards. He questioned if those people should continue to be allowed to play cards at Creekside or be treated as day guests and pay a fee.

Supervisor Lawrence pointed out that the rules already state that, if they are not a resident, they are a day guest.

Supervisor Davidson questioned what type of system could be put in place.

Supervisor Gaeta suggested offering a different type of pass for those that only come to play cards once, or a few times per week.

Mr. Montagna discussed a hole punch guest card that is being successfully used in another community; it is not complicated and it is easy to use, assuming staffing is adequate.

Discussion ensued regarding how to implement a punch card type system and the scope of activities it would encompass. It was noted that the consequence of implementing such a system could be that the café, which is exempt, becomes overrun with card players and other groups. It was suggested that a minimum food/beverage purchase could be required when using the café to play games, etc.

Supervisor Davidson asked AMG to develop suggestions to address this situation.

Regarding card checking, Mr. Natiello indicated that he was carded when attending an ADC meeting; he informed the staff that he would let them scan his card but he believes it is not appropriate to ask for a card from anyone attending a public meeting within the CDD. Supervisor Davidson questioned how to monitor and ensure that someone who says they are at the facility for a public meeting is truly there for that purpose. Discussion ensued regarding how to manage admittance of nonresidents to meetings held within the community.

******The workshop recessed at approximately 12:05 p.m.******

******The workshop reconvened at 12:17 p.m.******

Supervisor Davidson asked AMG to confirm that, beginning August 5, 2013, two (2) full-time, extra facilitators will be in place. He indicated that he discussed backup needs with the sheriff for incidences and traffic matters. Supervisor Davidson envisions significant problems at the main gate, once large numbers of gate access devices (GADs) are deactivated. He stressed the need to develop a plan, in anticipation of the problem and to avoid road rage at the entrance.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he spoke to the security supervisor, who is willing to supply extra gate personnel. Mr. Kloptosky scheduled a meeting for next Thursday but the representative is willing to attend the next meeting, as well.

Further discussion ensued regarding the logistics of entrance, directing people to the CDD office, stopping those that speed off once the gate is opened, etc.

i. Re-registration Advertising

Mr. Kloptosky presented sample cartoon advertisements for the purpose of reminding residents to re-register. He discussed posting the signs, in poster form, at various locations

throughout the community. Discussion ensued regarding notifying residents who do not utilize the amenity facilities. It was felt that the posters should be placed at the entrance gates, as well.

ii. SAAC Forgery Potential

This item was previously discussed.

B. Fiscal Year 2013/2014 Proposed Budget [BOS]

Mr. Paton reminded the Board that this is a proposed budget; items can be changed, until it is adopted at the public hearing.

Supervisor Lawrence discussed the roads plan.

Regarding a “bucket list”, Supervisor Davidson stressed that the list contains items that are not confirmed projects; they are items under consideration for Fiscal Year 2014. He reviewed the items on the list and the corresponding estimated costs.

Mr. Kloptosky added wooden bridge rail posts in Wild Oaks, the amount is unknown.

Supervisor Davidson reviewed the list, including Sailfish Drive at \$70,000, clubhouse gazebo at \$60,000, croquet courts at \$30,000, pump house pipes/repairs, underground tennis court wiring at \$7,000, surveying and legal fees for Chinier easements at \$5,000 and wood bridge rail posts. Supervisor Davidson asked that other major projects that might be necessary be brought to the Board’s attention. Mr. Kloptosky added marciting the pool at Creekside to the list.

Supervisor Davidson requested that this document be created and entitled “Estimates – Not Committed Funds”.

C. Status of CIP [TL]

This item was discussed later in the meeting.

D. Service Contracts/Agreements [BOS]

i. Existing/Current

a. Maintenance Landscape Services: *Austin Outdoor, LLC*

Supervisor Davidson felt that all major contracts should go out for RFQ or RFP. Supervisor Lawrence favored only bidding those that must be bid, when it might favor the District, as well as extending contracts, when possible, if the Board wants to maintain the contract. Supervisor Davidson asked Supervisor Lawrence to develop a list of questions for District Counsel to address, with regard to contracts and the bidding requirements.

Regarding the large scope of the landscape maintenance contract, Supervisor Smith asked if the District considered splitting it into pieces and seeking bids. Supervisor Davidson confirmed that the District tried that approach; however, there were horrendous instances of inconsistency, poor results, lack of coordination and blame amongst the contractors. Regarding rebidding, Supervisor Davidson suggested keeping the landscaping together but seeking other large companies that could handle the job.

Supervisor Davidson discussed the contributions of Ms. Louise Leister, the District Horticulturalist, in developing the RFP/RFQ for landscape maintenance. He noted that this contract expires in six (6) months.

b. Security Services: *ABM Services, Inc.*

This item was discussed along with the next item.

c. Amenity Manager: *Amenity Management Group, Inc.*

Supervisor Davidson noted that the security services and amenity manager contracts expire at the end of the current fiscal year. Discussion of whether to rebid these contracts was deferred, pending District Counsel's opinion.

Supervisor Smith noted that AMG provided suggestions for changes that would enable them to maintain or lower the current rate.

ii. Proposals/Solicitations Received

a. Security Services

- ✓ *NFC Amenity Management*
- ✓ *Vesta Property Services, Inc.*

Supervisor Davidson presented unsolicited proposals that were received.

Supervisor Davidson reported that he met once with a representative of NFC Amenity Management but informed him that further communication should be through Mr. Kloptosky. To date, no information specific to Grand Haven has been received.

Mr. Deary noted that he, on behalf of Vesta, provided a proposal for security services, which is included in the agenda. He introduced Mr. Scott Dunlap, Head of Security, for Vesta.

Supervisor Lawrence indicated that the current security company provides a person to consistently meet with the guards to discuss performance, etc., and asked if Vesta offers a similar approach. Mr. Deary indicated that, in the short run, Vesta's model would be slightly different; utilizing Mr. Dunlap's expertise, along with on-site personnel, such as Mr. Ross and Kevin. In

response to Supervisor Gaeta's question, Mr. Deary confirmed that Vesta does not currently have a security staff in the area; however, they have security staff in Tampa and South Florida.

Regarding the proposed budget, Supervisor Davidson referred to the "Property taxes" line item, on Page 2, noting that the budgeted amount was reduced from \$54,000, in the current fiscal year, to \$5,000 for Fiscal Year 2014. The change was believed to be primarily related to the elimination of the Colbert Lane assessment; Mr. Paton will verify.

Supervisor Gaeta referred to the \$12,120 "Miscellaneous contingency" item, on Page 13, and asked what it is for. Mr. Paton will research and provide verification of the item. Supervisor Lawrence voiced his opinion that a \$12,000 contingency is low, in relation to a budget of this size.

▪ **Status of CIP [TL]**

******Discussion of the CIP resumed.******

Regarding the CIP spreadsheet, Supervisor Smith asked about the "Action Year" column. Supervisor Lawrence indicated that the column contains the year that work is or was anticipated to be completed. In response to a question about "priority", Supervisor Lawrence clarified that "Project Type" might be a better title and stated that 'A' designates safety and health, must do items; 'B' designates must do items to preserve capital, 'C' is for cost savings and 'E' relates to requested items; there was no 'D' category.

Supervisor Lawrence indicated that he met with Mr. Kloptosky and Mr. Ross for their input. He explained how he arrived at the projected amounts.

Supervisor Lawrence reviewed the "general" CIP items. Regarding the brick paver section, Supervisor Lawrence stated that it is really a maintenance issue and suggested removing it from the CIP and maintaining. Nothing was budgeted for bubblers, as the District's future use of bubblers remains pending. For cameras, Supervisor Lawrence projected replacement of three (3) cameras per year, over the next ten (10) years, at a cost of \$4,500 per year.

Regarding the curbing section, Supervisor Lawrence anticipated repairing curbs when roads are repaved; he projected \$10,000 per year. Supervisor Smith disagreed with this assumption and voiced his opinion that Mr. Kloptosky will be faced with a few puddling issues each year, which will result in necessary repairs. Supervisor Lawrence projected sidewalk repairs of \$10,000 per year.

Regarding fences, Supervisor Lawrence recommended repair and replacement costs be included as a maintenance item, rather than being on the CIP. Mr. Kloptosky stated that, for the most part, fences have been repaired, as needed, through the community line item in the budget. Mr. Kloptosky felt that the only time fence related costs would need to be budgeted on the CIP is when the bridge rails or an entire fence must be replaced.

For gate related items, Supervisor Lawrence projected total replacement costs of \$107,156, over the next ten (10) years, escalated by 4%. Discussion ensued regarding recently replaced gate related items and recent equipment and service upgrades at the gates.

Regarding the gazebo items, Supervisor Lawrence indicated that projected costs should be increased from \$15,000 to \$60,000, due to the anticipated pier repairs. Supervisor Smith asked if there will be capital costs related to any other gazebos. Mr. Kloptosky advised that the Center Park gazebo will need to be repaired but those repairs can be paid for from the community line item, as they should not be too costly. The Front Street pier was redone not long ago; therefore, it only requires maintenance.

Regarding the guardhouse buildings, Supervisor Lawrence projected no major work in the next few years. Mr. Kloptosky noted that repainting the main guardhouse will occur this year and is included in the painting proposal; other work is routine maintenance. The CIP anticipates replacement of the guardhouse DVRs in 2020, the air conditioner in 2021, the defibrillator in 2027, and flat screen monitor in 2022.

Regarding mailboxes, Supervisor Lawrence felt that these were maintenance items and not needed in the CIP. Supervisor Smith recommended increasing the life expectancy to 35 years for the vinyl and 30 years for the wood.

Supervisor Lawrence reviewed the list of “miscellaneous” items anticipated to be completed over the next ten (10) years. Regarding pump house repairs, Mr. Kloptosky stated that the budget typically contains a “pump house repair” line item that covers replacement of at least (1) pump and one (1) motor, each year.

Mr. Kloptosky discussed the miscellaneous line item related to purchasing a gas powered cart. He indicated that staff uses a golf cart for certain maintenance activities, as it makes better sense than employees using larger, personal vehicles. It was noted that the CIP spreadsheet is not escalating the numbers correctly, for all line items. Supervisor Lawrence will review the formulas.

Supervisor Lawrence stated that the monument signs will not need to be rebuilt and suggested including the costs in maintenance. Supervisor Smith noted that, while the monument signs might not need to be replaced during the CIP's lifespan, they will eventually need to be rebuilt. Supervisor Smith suggested lengthening the monument lifespans to 30 or 35 years.

Regarding road repaving, Supervisor Lawrence recalled that the Board agreed to spend \$195,000 each year, from 2014 through 2019 and, from 2020 through 2023, the amount increases to \$341,000. He noted that, each year, unspent money will drop into the District's reserves.

Under "stop bars/arrows/etc" Supervisor Lawrence budgeted for replacement of half in Fiscal Year 2014 and the other half during the following fiscal year. He noted that the lifespan will be adjusted from eight (8) years to five (5) years.

Supervisor Lawrence reviewed, and discussion ensued regarding the projected CIP costs, replacement/repair schedules and life expectancies for stop sign replacement, street light repainting, address street signs and other traffic signs.

Supervisor Lawrence indicated that the CIP list includes "wall encasing lake" and "wooden walkway – wetlands"; however, those items will not be needed until 2028 and 2024, respectively.

Mr. Kloptosky noted that the railings on the walkway, behind the clubhouse, need to be repaired; he wants to replace the upper rails as soon as possible. The estimated cost to replace the upper rails and install a support rail below is \$8,000. Wood treatments and composite decking, as an alternative, were discussed. Supervisor will update the CIP to include \$8,000 in Fiscal Year 2014, for the railing.

Supervisor Lawrence presented, and discussion ensued regarding the Creekside CIP items, including the bathroom, gym equipment, pool repairs and equipment.

Supervisor Lawrence highlighted the remaining CIP items, slated for expenditures in Fiscal Year 2014, including a new set of croquet balls, croquet court repairs and croquet storage boxes. Discussion ensued regarding the Creekside repainting all buildings item.

Supervisor Lawrence presented, and discussion ensued regarding The Village Center CIP items, including the bathroom tile work and gym bikes.

Discussion ensued regarding the café and kitchen, pool repairs and equipment. In the Grand Haven Room, ceiling fans were included and a new television was eliminated. Tennis court resurfacing of Courts 1 through 4 was removed, as all of the courts were recently

completed. A tennis court roller, for \$4,000, was added. Under sports, bocce court and sports equipment costs were included for 2014. In response to a question, Supervisor Lawrence confirmed that the 2015 croquet courts projected \$27,000 expense is related to the court at The Village Center; it differs from the anticipated expense related to the Creekside court. Under office items, one (1) office computer was projected for purchase in 2014. The CIP contained no anticipated miscellaneous expenses for 2014; \$2,000 for exterior lights was shifted to 2014.

Supervisor Lawrence recapped the CIP, after changes, noting that the final total remains approximately the same, not including the unknowns previously discussed. Overall, Supervisor Lawrence anticipates about \$635,000 in CIP expenditures in Fiscal Year 2014; for the remaining years, the projected annual CIP expenditures are approximately \$500,000 per year.

In response to a question, Mr. Paton confirmed that the proposed budget will be included, for discussion, at every meeting and workshop, until the public hearing.

E. CDD & MHOA Fees [TL]

This item was included for informational purposes. Supervisor Lawrence advised that the average, annual change from 2002 through 2013 was a 4.9% per year.

F. Cable Taxes and Exemption Requirements [DP]

This item was not discussed.

G. Colbert Lane Assessment [HM]

This item was not discussed.

H. Keeping Grand Haven Grand [SD]

This item was previously discussed.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

UPDATES: District Manager

- **UPCOMING MEETING/WORKSHOP DATES:**
 - **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING**
 - **June 20, 2013 at 9:30 A.M.**
 - **COMMUNITY WORKSHOP**
 - **July 3, 2013 at 10:00 A.M.**

The next meeting will be held on June 20, 2013 at 9:30 a.m., and the next workshop will be on July 3, 2013 at 10:00 a.m.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

UPDATE: GHMA Meeting Report [SD]

This item was not discussed.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

OPEN ITEMS

This item was not addressed.

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

SUPERVISORS' REQUESTS

Supervisor Gaeta stated that the former printer of the Community Information Directory has 20 additional binders, with four (4) directories completed. She asked about the interest in obtaining the remaining 20 directories, as new residents would like to have them. She will obtain a quote from the printer.

Supervisor Gaeta noted that the next workshop will be held on July 3, 2013, rather than July 4, and asked if a notice of the change must be sent. Supervisor Davidson replied affirmatively.

Regarding the Community Information Directory, Supervisor Lawrence asked if the Board decided to give them to renters. Supervisor Davidson stated that renters did not receive the directory. Supervisor Gaeta recalled that the Board did agree to give a directory for each property owned, meaning, if a person owned ten (10) properties, they could receive ten (10) directories. Supervisor Gaeta confirmed that she reviewed the minutes and the Board approved this.

Supervisor Davidson asked if binder price includes printing the pages. Supervisor Gaeta stated that the binder price does not include the pages or the divider tabs.

If the goal is to provide something to new residents, Supervisor Smith recommended printing 200 copies of the rules and regulations portion of the directory, to be distributed, as the remaining information is obsolete.

FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

There being nothing further to discuss, the workshop adjourned at approximately 2:32 p.m.

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chair/Vice Chair