

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

A Regular Meeting of the Grand Haven Community Development District's Board of Supervisors was held on **Thursday, March 20, 2014 at 9:30 a.m.**, in the **Grand Haven Room, Grand Haven Village Center, 2001 Waterside Parkway, Palm Coast, Florida 32137.**

**Present at the meeting were:**

Dr. Stephen Davidson	Chair
Peter Chiodo	Vice Chair
Marie Gaeta	Assistant Secretary
Tom Lawrence	Assistant Secretary
Raymond Smith	Assistant Secretary

**Also present were:**

Rick Woodville	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Howard McGaffney	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Scott Clark	District Counsel
Jim Sullivan	District Engineer
Barry Kloptosky	Field Operations Manager
Ashley Higgins	CDD Office Staff
Robert Ross	Vesta/AMG
Cindy Gartzke	ABM Security Services
Jim Cullis	Grand Haven Realty
J. James Lewis	Resident
Linda Rolla	Resident
George Amandola	Resident
Rob Carlton	Resident
John Gary Noble	Resident
Vic Natiello	Resident
Louise Vince	Resident
Al Lo Monaco	Resident

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Mr. Woodville called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m., and noted, for the record, that all Supervisors were present, in person.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

All present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** *(3-Minute Rule; Non-Agenda Items)*

Ms. Linda Rolla, a resident, spoke about the popularity of pickleball referenced and a recent television news segment on the sport. She noted that a pickleball demonstration was held last week and 14 people expressed interest in joining the Pickleball Group. Ms. Rolla referred to information that the Board was considering setting aside \$5,000 to create a pickleball court at the Wild Oaks basketball courts. She voiced her appreciation for the consideration but advised that the Wild Oaks basketball court location is the least attractive area for pickleball because an eagle's nest is nearby. Ms. Rolla pointed out that the suggested location has limited parking and no place to store pickleball equipment. Additionally, the Wild Oaks basketball court is not large enough to hold a single pickleball court. Ms. Rolla continued describing the drawbacks to locating pickleball at the Wild Oaks courts, including the amount of trees, leaves and the lack of sunlight. She recommended establishing an ad-hoc committee to explore possibilities.

Mr. J. James Lewis, a resident, asked about the status of the unfinished condominiums near the Clubhouse, as he finds them an eyesore. Mr. Kloptosky had no information regarding the status. Mr. Lewis asked that this item be included on a future agenda, as it is important to the community. Supervisor Davidson advised that the GHMA has information related to this topic but the District does not. Mr. Rob Carlton, a resident and President of the GHMA, indicated that the property was sold and the purchaser is trying to obtain permits to commence building. Mr. Lewis asked who the property was sold to. Mr. Carlton did not know the name of the purchaser. Mr. Lewis stated that the residents need specific information. Mr. Lewis voiced his opinion that this item should be on the GHMA and District's agendas. Mr. Jim Cullis, of Grand Haven Realty, offered to invite the developer to attend the GHMA meeting.

Mr. John Gary Noble, a resident, recalled discussion, at the last meeting, regarding the proposed cost of producing the Community Information Guide. He requested more discussion on the matter and questioned the need to purchase 2,000 guides. Mr. Noble suggested charging a fee for the guide, rather than giving them away, with new residents receiving a free guide.

A resident recalled Ms. Rolla's suggestion that an ad-hoc committee be formed for pickleball and asked if the Board plans to proceed because residents are ready to move forward on this subject.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**CONSULTANTS, GUEST REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS**

Mr. Cullis indicated that he is working with someone on the "532" commercial site, which comprises five acres at the entrance to Waterfront Park, and falls within Grand Haven's DRI. The developer is considering building a small community center. Mr. Cullis voiced interest in considering pickleball or other amenities in the area. In response to Supervisor Davidson's question, Mr. Cullis confirmed that this is a private enterprise.

**A. Discovery Village at Grand Living Drainage Easement (*Jim Cullis, Grand Haven Realty*)**

Mr. Cullis recalled that Grand Haven Realty owns 72 acres, named Grand Living, which is adjacent to the north side of Wild Oaks Phase 1. A senior care community is planned for the property and Grand Haven Realty is working with Discovery Senior Living, a premier senior living company. Mr. Cullis noted that the property contains a 100' temporary drainage easement that was installed when Culbert Lane was built. The original easement calls for the property owner to maintain the easement. Regarding drainage, the developer indicated that they are running out of room for the required drainage. Mr. Cullis advised that an acre of land is next to the property, which is located in Parcel K of the Wild Oaks plat; the area is designated as open space drainage. He indicated that the developer requests a drainage easement in order to extend the drainage plan.

Mr. Cullis reviewed the Grand Living building plans and types of units the development will encompass.

In response to Supervisor Chiodo's question, Mr. Cullis confirmed that the drainage easement matter must go through the St. John's River Water Management District (SJRWMD) review and permit process, which is why the developer needs an easement from the District.

Supervisor Lawrence questioned who will be responsible for maintenance of the easements. Mr. Cullis indicated that there will be a perpetual master homeowner's association for all of the property, which would maintain it in perpetuity. Regarding the engineering, Mr.

Cullis stated that he requested that the outfall is on the developer's property so that the District does not have drainage worries.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if Mr. Cullis is seeking the District's approval before moving forward with the SJRWMD permitting process. Mr. Cullis replied affirmatively; the developer wants the easement from the District prior to expending funds for engineering.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if the CDD would be responsible for maintenance of the easement.

Mr. Clark advised that the District must review its permits regarding open space and other matters to ensure that there are no conflicts. He noted that any conflicts can be resolved if SJRWMD approves the developer's permit request. Mr. Clark felt that the "tricky" issue involves disposition of public property; the CDD owns the property and certain items must be considered prior to giving the property away or granting an easement. He indicated that the bond documents require the Board to determine whether the property was acquired with bond proceeds and if it was, there are restrictions regarding how it is given away. Mr. Clark felt that, with notice, the property can be given away for value, provided that those proceeds are deposited with the bond trustee for the purpose of redeeming bonds. He stated that the District should be compensated for the appraised market value of the property. Mr. Clark voiced his opinion that the other matters are practical and political such as whether the property is an amenity. He confirmed that the District has the power to enter into an easement agreement, if the Board chooses.

Supervisor Smith asked if Mr. Clark sees any downside to granting the easement. Mr. Clark found no downside based on current information; the property appears to be isolated from the Wild Oaks subdivision and the trail is already in place, so it does not appear to invite additional activity. Mr. Clark felt there are no downsides, provided the District answers the legal questions and protects itself regarding maintenance issues.

Supervisor Davidson summarized Mr. Clark's recommendation that Mr. Kloptosky, District Counsel and the District Engineer discuss the issues and present their findings to the Board. Supervisor Chiodo asked if the team would try to place a value on the property. Mr. Clark stated that the first question is whether Mr. Cullis is prepared to pay the value based on an appraisal or methodology. Mr. Cullis felt that the developer expects to pay fair compensation. Mr. Cullis offered to have the property appraised and hoped that the District would agree to an

annual payment, in perpetuity. Mr. Clark confirmed that the arrangement could be structured as an annual payment, if the Board agrees.

All Supervisors agreed to the concept of granting the drainage easement provided that the legal and maintenance questions are answered or otherwise addressed.

Supervisor Smith asked if the District can sell the property, outright. Mr. Clark advised that the District can sell if the Board determines that the property is not needed for a particular purpose. Mr. Woodville suggested that Staff review the matter to determine whether the District needs the property and if there are any encumbrances or environmental issues. Mr. Clark confirmed that the Board can conceptually approve Staff's further research of the matter with Mr. Cullis.

**B. 9<sup>th</sup> Green Site Road Access Easement (*Jim Cullis, Grand Haven Realty*)**

Mr. Woodville recalled that this matter involves access to the golf villas, through the District owned parking lot.

Mr. Cullis presented a graphic display of the area. He referred to 1.2 acres of land between the clubhouse and the first phase of condominiums. Mr. Cullis reviewed the site plan and explained that the land was originally designated for a six-unit, multi-family, structure but a few years ago, the District agreed to allow him to pay off the assessment on two units and proceed with building four golf villas. This project is currently in the platting and PUD amendment process to convert the property from multi to single-family. Mr. Cullis discussed the entrance plan and noted that he is requesting an access easement across a small corner of the District's property.

Supervisor Gaeta contended that, after the Board agreed and Mr. Cullis paid off the assessments for two of the six units, Mr. Cullis advertised the property for sale, stating that it could be used for four or six units. Mr. Cullis indicated that the advertisement might not have been changed; however, the agreement with the District was for four units but, if six units were built, Mr. Cullis would pay the back assessments for six units. Supervisor Gaeta asked Mr. Cullis if he is seeking an egress point and where would it be located. Mr. Cullis advised that his easement with the condominiums extends from River Front Drive through the parking lot and ends at the property line. Mr. Cullis explained that the small triangle of property, which was missed, belongs to the CDD. Mr. Cullis is requesting an access easement across the small portion, so that the driveway does not need to pass through the parking lot. In response to

Supervisor Davidson's question, Mr. Cullis indicated that the triangle portion is covered with grass.

Mr. Woodville asked if the single-family units would be sold or rented. Mr. Cullis stated that the villas would fall under standard GHMA guidelines. Supervisor Gaeta asked about the intended height of the units. Mr. Cullis replied 35' and further discussed the driveway plans. Supervisor Davidson asked which of the villages CC&Rs the units would be subject to. Mr. Cullis stated that they would be part of the GHMA and subject to The River Club's CC&Rs.

Mr. Woodville recalled the Board's concerns about rental units, within Grand Haven, and asked Mr. Clark whether the District can place restrictions on the access easement. Mr. Clark believes that the Board has the ability to grant the access agreement with restrictions and noted that it will solve the problem that the Board had with the earlier plan to access the units by way of the parking lot. He noted that the Board was deeply concerned about traffic issues and recalled suggestions, by members of the community, to "cut off access" to the property so that it could remain open space. Mr. Clark cautioned that it was not a good strategy, for various legal reasons, and that it would remove units from the District's assessment roll, if the District did not allow them to be developed. Mr. Clark felt that Mr. Cullis listened to concerns and adjusted his plans, accordingly. The land involved in the new plan involves land that already has an easement across it for golf course parking. Mr. Clark would like to review the current easement to ensure that nothing inhibits the District from granting another easement over the corner of the property.

Regarding restrictions on the easement, Mr. Clark advised that the District can keep the easement from being overused by stating that it is for four units and that the easement is "good" so long as it conforms to the overall plan of the restrictions. Mr. Clark cautioned the Board about trying to impose restrictions because it stretches the boundaries of the Board's authority.

Mr. Cullis pointed out that the parking lot already has a public access easement so he is not sure an easement is necessary, although he is willing to sign one.

Supervisor Chiodo assured the audience that what the Board is being asked to consider has nothing to do with whether they like, condone or approve construction of the four units; the Board is being asked to grant an access easement.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if Mr. Cullis plans to sell the four parcels to a builder and voiced her concerns about separate units, renters and potential parking problems.

Supervisor Lawrence felt that this plan presents a better solution than access being through the parking lot. Additionally, the area will be covered by CC&Rs and should be in compliance with current Grand Haven standards. Supervisor Lawrence favors the proposed plan.

Supervisor Smith found no downside to the proposed plan.

Supervisor Davidson concurred with Supervisors Lawrence and Smith.

Mr. George Amandola, a resident, voiced his opinion that, if traffic passes through the condominium parking lot, the parking lot becomes a street and the proposed plan would also result in the loss of at least two parking spaces.

Mr. Cullis stated that, in the permitted plans, those two spaces were never permitted as parking spaces, although parking spaces were built, as a convenience. He advised that the access easement existed from the beginning.

Mr. Amandola asked about the additional traffic through the parking lot, which the condominium HOA must maintain. He questioned who will pay for the additional wear and tear on the parking lot.

Mr. Cullis was unsure how maintenance was addressed in the documents but offered to review it.

Mr. Amandola contended that the condominium HOA will be required to support maintenance of the parking lot “street” that will be created.

Mr. Clark advised that, if the Board wishes to proceed, it can approve the access easement conceptually, subject to an easement document being drafted and agreed to.

Supervisor Gaeta referred to condominiums that are currently in disrepair and asked Mr. Cullis if he received permission to work in this area. Mr. Cullis indicated that the property is on the other side.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if the plat plan was submitted to the City of Palm Coast. Mr. Cullis replied affirmatively; it is in the initial review process.

**On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Smith, with all in favor, the grant of access easement between the District and Grand Haven Properties, per the diagrams submitted, subject to District Counsel review of the appropriate easement language, and limiting the easement to four single-family residences, subject to the deed restrictions currently in place, was approved.**

**C. Information Recorded on Guest Passes (*Cindy Gartzke, ABM Security Services*)**

Mr. Woodville reviewed the sample guest passes.

Supervisor Davidson recalled the Board's decision, at the last meeting, that guest passes would not be issued to persons who are on a resident's preferred guest list. Ms. Cindy Gartzke, of ABM Security Services (ABM), clarified that the preferred guest would not be issued a 30-day pass but would receive a day pass. Supervisor Davidson explained that his relatives live elsewhere in Palm Coast and are on his preferred guest list and asked how those guests are currently being handled. Ms. Gartzke indicated that preferred guests provide their name, the guard looks them up on the system, a photo ID is requested if the person is not recognized and the person is logged in and given a day pass.

Supervisor Lawrence asked what happens if the preferred guest is staying more than one day. Ms. Gartzke stated that, if a guest is not on the preferred list, the resident can request an extended pass for their guest.

Supervisor Lawrence summarized that a preferred guest must obtain a day pass each day, which seems odd to him. Supervisor Gaeta recalled that the Board agreed that "local" guests who enter the community frequently are issued day passes; however, guests from outside Flagler County must first register at the CDD office and the resident must accompany the guest to The Village Center to obtain a monthly access and amenity pass.

Supervisor Gaeta clarified that the guest pass is issued month-to-month, after the resident approves it at the CDD office, and the CDD office staff conveys the information to the guards.

Ms. Gartzke indicated that the guards do not receive notification from the CDD office but are notified by the residents.

Supervisor Davidson expressed concern over the level of information on the passes. He noted that passes in other communities contain more information than Grand Haven's passes, which only contain the expiration date. Supervisor Davidson voiced his concern that the Grand Haven passes could easily be passed transferred, as there is no identifying information on them. He pointed out that a 30-day pass could be "floating around" to visitors with nothing on the pass to identify who it was issued to; he believes this is a major flaw in the Districts access control system.

Ms. Gartzke indicated that, going forward, all extended passes will contain the names of the visitor and resident, along with the address. Also, the guard will be required to request a



photo ID for verification. Ms. Gartzke was unsure if ID could be required, as it is a public road. She added that the vehicle make and model could be included on the pass so that the guard only needs to verify that the vehicle matches the pass.

Ms. Gartzke suggested the option of allowing residents to purchase a gate access card (GAC), which would be valid for one year. When a resident has a long-term guest, they could request that the GAC be activated for a certain period of time.

Supervisor Davidson felt that the vehicle license plate number, make and model should be included on the guest passes. He questioned if the District is authorized to request the driver's license.

Regarding driver's licenses, Mr. Clark stated that the District should not "collect" images of driver's licenses; however, the District can request identification. He felt that the public access issue does not restrict the District from asking people for identification.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if the guards can view a driver's license or photo ID to verify the identity of the person. Mr. Clark replied affirmatively, if the Board adopts that policy.

Supervisor Davidson reiterated that the pass should include at least the vehicle license plate number, make, model and color. Ms. Gartzke advised that this information is already included on the guard's log; she believes that the only information needed on the pass is the visitor's name. Supervisor Davidson stressed that he wants the passes to include the license plate number for ease of reference. Ms. Gartzke pointed out that some visitors use more than one vehicle. Supervisor Davidson acknowledged that exceptions will exist; however, the District needs to fix the flaw in the system.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if the pass will identify the person as a guest, renter or owner. Supervisor Davidson stated that passes only need to contain the expiration date and the vehicle license plate number, as the other information will be in the database.

Ms. Gartzke asked if this policy only applies to extended passes. Supervisor Davidson stated that it applies to passes issued for more than one day.

Mr. Kloptosky asked about the typical quantity of requests for extended passes. Ms. Gartzke indicated that the number varies, as more are issued during the holiday seasons. Mr. Kloptosky questioned the impact on easy access, if the guard must exit the guardhouse and check the license plate number of each vehicle with an extended pass. Ms. Gartzke agreed that it would take extra time, which is why she suggested including the visitor's first and last name.

Supervisor Gaeta reported that she encountered people fishing in the community; their vehicle moved around the community several times but did not have a visible pass. Supervisor Gaeta questioned how that person gained entry to the community. Supervisor Davidson pointed out that the person might have been a resident. Supervisor Gaeta confirmed that she stopped and asked and the person was not a resident. Ms. Gartzke asked if the person stated that they entered through the Main Gate. Supervisor Gaeta indicated that they said “they got in”. Ms. Gartzke noted that they might have piggybacked through the North Gate, which occurs quite frequently.

In response to a question, Mr. Clark confirmed that this is a procedural matter; approval, by motion, is not necessary.

Supervisor Davidson proposed that Mr. Kloptosky be directed to include the license plate number on all visitor passes with an expiration date greater than one day. Supervisor Lawrence recalled Ms. Gartzke’s comment that it would be more efficient for the passes to include the visitor’s name. Supervisor Davidson felt that including the name would take longer, as the visitor would need to retrieve their ID from their wallet, etc. Supervisor Smith asked Ms. Gartzke which method would be more efficient. Noting that people sometimes switch vehicles, Ms. Gartzke felt that asking visitors for ID is more efficient; the pass is essentially assigned to the person, rather than the vehicle. Supervisor Smith suggested that Mr. Kloptosky be directed to implement the policy to include the visitor’s name. Ms. Gartzke will monitor the process to determine if the procedure causes congestion at the gate.

Supervisor Davidson questioned if the passes should include the name of the resident or location that the person is visiting. Ms. Gartzke felt that this information is not necessary, as it would not be checked, again; the resident would have already notified the guardhouse and, if a complaint is received, the guardhouse records can be checked.

Mr. Vic Natiello, a resident, voiced his opinion that visitor passes should be linked to the vehicle rather than the visitor. Regarding accessing the community for the purpose of fishing or otherwise, Mr. Natiello pointed out that someone can gain access simply by calling a resident from the call box and the resident granting access. Mr. Natiello felt that entry will be slowed if preferred guests must be issued a pass; he believes that the person should be given highest availability of access without being required to have a pass.

Supervisor Davidson recommended that this topic be further discussed at the next workshop. Supervisor Smith asked Staff to include the District's previously approved verbiage or policy regarding access.

Ms. Gartzke asked for clarification of whether the Board is changing any of the current procedures today.

On a temporary basis and until a final decision is made, Supervisor Davidson wants some type of identifying information, such as the vehicle license plate number, included on passes. Supervisor Smith stated that he favors including the visitor's name. Supervisor Lawrence indicated that he is comfortable with including the license plate number for two weeks; however, as the Board might be spending time on a problem that might not exist, he wants information from ABM regarding how often visitor passes are abused and what is occurring. Supervisor Davidson contended that the District will never know if the system is being abused if the passes never contain identifying information; anyone with a pass can drive through without showing identification or any other information being checked and the passes can be transferred to others. In response to Supervisor Lawrence's question, Ms. Gartzke confirmed that she prefers to include the visitor's name rather than the license plate number. Supervisor Davidson directed that, for the next two weeks, visitor passes should include the visitor's name and that this matter should be included for discussion at the next workshop.

Mr. Woodville asked for clarification of the specific information that Supervisor Smith wants to review, at the next workshop.

Supervisor Smith indicated that he wants to review the current verbiage that describes the District's rules and policies related to preapproved lists and visitor's passes, along with the actual procedures that the guards are following.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS**

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

**A. MINUTES**

- i. Approval of February 6, 2014 Continued Meeting Minutes**
- ii. Approval of February 20, 2014 Regular Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Woodville asked if there were any additions, deletions or changes. The Board indicated that their changes are forwarded to Management's office and incorporated into the

minutes. Mr. Woodville expressed that the changes should be reflected, on the record, if the minutes in the agenda differ from the final version. The Board chose not to state the changes, on the record.

**B. UNAUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

**i. Approval of Unaudited Financial Statements as of February 28, 2014**

Mr. Woodville noted that assessment revenue collections were at 88%.

Supervisor Gaeta pointed out that, according to the comment on the bottom of the “Balance Sheet” for the “Governmental Fund”, the accounts were not reconciled, as bank statements were not available prior to preparation of the agenda package. She brought to the Supervisors’ attention that the Board adopted a budget of \$7,000 for “Gate and amenity guest” and revenue collections for this line item were \$6,057. Additionally, \$1,200 was budgeted for “Tennis fees”; revenue collections were \$1,208. Supervisor Gaeta stressed that implementation of the access control and smart amenity access card (SAAC) systems are generating income.

**C. Resolution 2014-1, Revoking A License Agreement Given to Hampton Golf, Inc.**

Mr. Woodville presented Resolution 2014-1 for the Board’s consideration.

Mr. Clark recalled that he recommended this action at the February 20, 2014 meeting; however, the Board declined to take, at that time. Subsequent to recent events, Mr. Clark questioned if the Board might wish to reconsider their prior decision. He explained that the purpose of this resolution is to revoke the right of Hampton Golf, Inc. (Hampton Golf), to enter the pump house for maintenance purposes. Mr. Clark pointed out that Hampton Golf is no longer involved and in his opinion, the license to enter the pump house and to maintain it cannot be transferred to another entity; therefore, Hampton Golf could not have transferred it to Escalante Golf (Escalante).

Mr. Clark reiterated his belief that the Board should take formal action to revoke Hampton Golf’s access on the grounds that Hampton Golf failed to perform their duties under the agreement and as they are no longer involved. Hampton Golf essentially abandoned the agreement.

**D. Ratification of Agreement with PBM Constructors, Inc., for Pump House Repairs**

Mr. Woodville asked Mr. Clark to provide his comments on this matter.

Supervisor Lawrence voiced his opinion that the purpose of the Consent Agenda Items was to speed meetings up and, provided that the Board agrees with the items, there is no need to

further discuss the consent agenda items. Mr. Clark indicated that the question is whether anyone wants to discuss these items. The Board replied no.

**E. Buyer’s Order for Purchase of 2014 Kawasaki Mule™ 4010 4x4**

**On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Gaeta, with all in favor, the Consent Agenda Items, were adopted and/or approved.**

*\*\*\*The meeting recessed at 10:54 a.m.\*\*\**

*\*\*\*The meeting reconvened at 11:02 a.m.\*\*\**

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**STAFF REPORTS**

**A. District Engineer**

**i. Sailfish Drive Drainage Project**

Mr. Sullivan recalled discussion of the Sailfish Drive project, at the last meeting. He noted that several items are pending, including the availability of S.E. Cline (Cline) to perform the work.

Mr. Sullivan reminded the Board that Cline offered deductions for several items. One deduction was approximately \$7,700 if Cline would be allowed to close sections of the road for multi-day periods rather than reopening the road nightly. The Board must make a decision on this option prior to the work commencing.

Supervisor Davidson noted that several cost matters were discussed; he wants a closer estimate. Supervisor Gaeta stated that it appears the cost will be approximately \$130,000 when the original figures from Cline were in the \$70,000 to \$80,000 range; the expense appears to be nearly double. Mr. Sullivan indicated that his figures reflect \$112,000. Mr. Kloptosky noted that \$112,000 does not include permitting fees and any contingency. Supervisor Lawrence believes that his assumption of \$125,000 is about the best estimate. Supervisor Davidson voiced his opinion that, realistically, the cost will be more than \$125,000.

Supervisor Davidson pointed out that the Board had never officially voted to commence the work. He advised that, when the estimate was \$80,000, he was convinced that the project should be completed; however, now that the estimate is nearly double, he is not as convinced.

Supervisor Davidson pointed out that the community is interested in other projects that would benefit more residents. He recommended discussing the Sailfish Drive project at the next workshop and weighing the District's priorities in terms of capital for Fiscal Years 2014 and 2015. Supervisor Davidson stated that he drove Sailfish Drive following the 3.5" of rain and again this morning. During the heavy rain, about five houses had water in the gutters but, this morning, everything was dry. He recommended that the Board consider when Marlin Drive will be resurfaced and whether much of the Sailfish Drive work could be transferred and completed, at that time, which should reduce the cost and free up funds for other projects.

Mr. Kloptosky reviewed the Cline estimate and voiced his opinion that, following a conversation with Cline, the only savings, by combining the Sailfish Drive project with Marlin Drive, are from an asphalt aspect. There would be no savings on the actual work, aside from the resurfacing portion. In response to a question, Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the asphalt portion of the Sailfish Drive project is \$17,000; the District would save a small percentage of that amount. Regarding potential savings for staging expenses, Mr. Kloptosky advised that there would be little savings, as Cline must still stage equipment to perform the drain repairs on Sailfish Drive.

In response to Supervisor Davidson's comment regarding the Cline estimate, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the \$111,000 or \$112,000 figure, after deductions, does not include permitting or contingency costs. Supervisor Davidson pointed out that permitting and contingency costs would bring the estimate back up to \$127,000 to \$130,000.

Supervisor Smith supported Supervisor Davidson's suggestion that the Sailfish Drive project be timed differently.

Supervisor Davidson asked that this matter be included for discussion at the next workshop. Supervisor Lawrence indicated that he will bring the roads capital plan for the Board's review. Supervisor Chiodo agreed with further review but voiced his opinion that the decision should not be based on the prospect of saving a "couple of thousand dollars". Supervisor Gaeta stressed that the current estimate is \$47,000 more than was originally anticipated. Supervisor Lawrence indicated that the greater concern is how quickly the original \$80,000 estimate increased to \$120,000 or more and how much the remainder of the roads capital program will increase from what the Board originally anticipated. Supervisor Lawrence suggested asking the District Engineer to reevaluate the roads program.

Mr. Kloptosky voiced his opinion that Cline's price increase was not only due to escalating prices but Cline's original budget figure was based on a conceptual plan and not on an actual plan designed by the District Engineer. He indicated that Cline reevaluated the project, once the District Engineer's plan was available. Mr. Kloptosky stressed that the final plan contained items that were not discussed during the conceptual stage.

Supervisor Davidson asked Mr. Woodville to ensure that this topic is at the top of the workshop agenda. He wants to discuss timing the Sailfish Drive project with other work and the potential savings, along with comparing the project to the roads capital plan.

**B. Amenity Manager**

**i. Smart Amenity Access Cards Scanning Issues**

- **Paper Copies**

This item was not addressed.

- **Scanning in Bright Sunlight: Red Versus Green – No Indicator Light**

Mr. Ross noted that a tennis player was found to have problems with a SAAC. When scanning, he reported that a "good" scan gives a beep and a green light, while a "bad" card scan gives three beeps and the scanning machine shuts off. Supervisor Lawrence asked about the percentage of people trying to access the amenities with a "bad" card. Mr. Ross stated that the percentage is extremely low.

Mr. Ross indicated that a resident requested that more trips be organized. In response to a question, Mr. Ross confirmed that the person making the suggestion is a travel agent and would coordinate trips and give presentations. Regarding how this suggestion originated, Mr. Ross advised that residents have expressed that they want more bus trips and activities. He recalled that the last trip sparked additional interest.

Supervisor Davidson asked if AMG would be involved in coordinating the trip. Mr. Ross indicated that AMG would simply provide the information through an e-blast, etc., and receive 10% of the fees; the travel agent would register participants and collect the money.

Supervisor Davidson asked about the structure of the trips. Mr. Ross advised that the trips are all-inclusive and do not require a minimum number of participants.

Supervisor Gaeta asked about liability issues.

Mr. Clark advised that he would like the advertisements to include a disclaimer stating that the District is not responsible. He will develop verbiage to be included on the advertisements.

Ms. Louise Vince, a resident, recalled a recent incident at the pickleball court where children were trying to play basketball while adults were playing pickleball. She asked Mr. Ross if he addressed the situation. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he will discuss this matter.

Supervisor Davidson pointed out that the current discussion is related to trips for residents, not pickleball.

Mr. Al Lo Monaco, a resident, questioned how much the District will receive from the travel agent for things such as a bus. He felt that the 10% return from the travel agent to the District should go back to residents.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if the District can include a disclaimer on e-blasts stating that “CDD workshops and meetings take precedence over any and all previously scheduled events”, such as is stated on the GHMA notices. Mr. Ross assured the Board that, going forward, no other activities will be scheduled for the days when CDD meetings or workshops are held.

Supervisor Lawrence recalled Mr. Ross mentioning a 10% discount for trips. Mr. Ross clarified that he mentioned that AMG receives 10% of the activity fee; there is no 10% discount.

Mr. Clark explained that the only way the District is absolved of liability is if it does not profit; in this case, the District is not profiting but AMG is receiving a fee.

The Board agreed to allow AMG to advertise the travel agent trips, provided the previously discussed disclaimer be included. Mr. Clark indicated that he will provide Mr. Ross with the necessary disclaimer wording.

Regarding the fitness equipment discussed at the last meeting, Mr. Ross reported that the new fitness instructor tested all of the equipment and found no issues; all of the equipment is functioning properly, although the appearance might not be “good”. Supervisor Chiodo asked if AMG is keeping a record of down time. Mr. Ross replied affirmatively. Regarding fitness equipment, Supervisor Lawrence stated “This is Grand Haven and, even if it is working, if it looks like hell and we cannot fix it, then we were going to take it out of service and replace it.” Supervisor Chiodo voiced his opinion that the fitness equipment must “look good, too”. Mr. Kloptosky advised that this topic will be covered in his report.



Supervisor Davidson asked about the status of organizing a 4-H group for children. Mr. Ross indicated that there was no response from the community.

**C. Field/Operations Manager**

Regarding activities taking place during CDD meetings or workshops, Mr. Kloptosky advised that a Board Member approached him about this matter. The Board Member asked him to create and post a sign on the doors while meetings or workshops are in progress. The proposed signage states “CDD meeting in progress. Entrance for meeting purposes only. All activities suspended until meeting is adjourned.” The Board agreed to the posting of the proposed signage.

Mr. Kloptosky reviewed photographs of the fitness equipment. Supervisor Lawrence recalled that numerous resident complaints were received regarding the appearance of specific equipment.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that he is accosted nearly every time he passes by the Creekside fitness center and has received a lot of resident input. He acknowledged that the equipment works; however, it is rusty and residents are very unhappy about the appearance. Mr. Kloptosky read an email that he received from the company that performs maintenance on the fitness equipment: “Because of the cosmetic condition of the ellipticals at Creekside, their age and quality, I do not recommend any further repairs to these two Vision machines and advise you to look into replacement options.”

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that, this fiscal year, the Board budgeted \$5,919 to replace one treadmill and one elliptical machine. The cost for two of the recommended replacement elliptical machines is \$6,190, which is only \$217 over budget. Discussion ensued regarding various brands of elliptical machines and costs. Mr. Kloptosky asked if the Board wants to replace the elliptical machines even though the current machines are still functioning. Supervisor Lawrence noted that different machines have different features and asked if the proposed elliptical machines will be suitable for all residents. Mr. Kloptosky stated that it will be impossible to please everyone; he receives compliments and complaints every time new equipment arrives. Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the proposed replacement brand is “good quality”; both of the recommended brands carry five-year parts and one-year labor warranties.

Regarding the new fitness instructor’s evaluation of the fitness equipment, Mr. Kloptosky stated that she found that all of the equipment functions properly. Supervisor Davidson wanted

the fitness instructor to make recommendations for appropriate fitness equipment, thereby having input and taking the decision out of the hands of individual residents with a vested interest in a particular piece of fitness equipment or brand.

Mr. Ross reiterated that the fitness instructor was happy with the current equipment; he did not ask for her opinion about purchasing new equipment nor her recommendations for replacement types and brands.

Discussion ensued regarding obtaining the fitness instructor's opinion and current usage rates of specific equipment. Supervisor Lawrence voiced his opinion that it would be a mistake to replace a certain type or brand of equipment with something different if the current brand and types are highly utilized. Supervisor Davidson asked if Mr. Ross could provide the fitness instructor with the types and brands of fitness equipment that is currently popular with residents. Mr. Ross replied affirmatively.

Regarding replacement of the elliptical machines, Supervisor Davidson suggested that a decision be delayed until feedback and new purchase recommendations are received from the fitness instructor.

Mr. Ross asked the Board how he should respond to residents who complain about the rusty fitness equipment. Supervisor Davidson directed Mr. Ross to respond: "The Board is working with our new fitness instructor to evaluate their replacement."

Supervisor Lawrence asked that the fitness instructor's report be received in time for consideration at the next meeting. Supervisor Davidson preferred to receive the report for discussion at the next workshop. Supervisor Gaeta suggested that the fitness instructor attend the next workshop. Mr. Ross will ask the fitness instructor to attend but noted that she teaches classes.

Regarding a resident's suggestion to remove the rust from the fitness equipment, Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he previously researched that option but it was not practical.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled that, at the last meeting, the Board directed him to research the pickleball matter. He stated that he contacted three pickleball court contractors; two contractors visited, one provided an estimate, a second estimate is pending and the third contractor has not visited. The contractors were provided with the parameters discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Kloptosky reported that the first estimate was over \$12,000, which does not include fence upgrades. He noted the issue and conflict that exists with using the basketball court for

pickleball. Mr. Kloptosky stated that, given the conflict that already exists he believes that it might be best to build a “dedicated” pickleball court.

Supervisor Lawrence stated that he often passes the Wild Oaks courts and does not recall ever seeing anyone playing basketball; therefore, if that court is not utilized for basketball, the hoops could be removed and the court could be dedicated for pickleball.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that he investigated that option but found the same parking and eagle’s nest issues. He voiced his opinion that the best option is to build a dedicated pickleball court near the horseshoe pits. Mr. Kloptosky advised that he must finish investigating the options, cost and locations for a dedicated pickleball court.

Ms. Rolla asked for which configuration did Mr. Kloptosky obtained quotes. She noted that the pickleball players would love a dedicated court but, if that is not possible, the configuration with the court divided to allow for both basketball and pickleball, with a fence in the middle, is the better option.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that his estimates are to resurface the court and paint lines and fencing. He voiced his opinion that pickleball is growing and there will be increased conflict if the court is shared with basketball.

A resident pointed out that building a pickleball court is a one-time expenditure, as the courts require little maintenance.

In response to Ms. Rolla’s question, Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he is investigating locations and the cost to build two courts.

Supervisor Lawrence asked about the level of usage for the horseshoe pits. Mr. Ross stated that horseshoes is never played. Supervisor Lawrence suggested that the horseshoe pits be eliminated and replaced with pickleball courts. Supervisor Gaeta asked if the District must obtain bondholder approval to eliminate an amenity, such as horseshoes, and replace it with something different. Mr. Clark felt that the District can replace, modify or update an amenity; when it wants to eliminate an amenity, the bondholders must be consulted. Supervisor Lawrence pointed out that the horseshoe pits were installed many years after the amenity facilities and tennis courts were built. Based on Supervisor Lawrence’s information, Mr. Clark advised that removing them should not be an issue.

Mr. Kloptosky reminded the Board and audience that the process is lengthy and he might not have all of the estimates and information ready for the next meeting.

Mr. Kloptosky reported that the reinforcement cross bracing, at the wooden foot bridge off of Waterview, was completed at a cost of \$2,750. He indicated that gazebo repairs are underway at Center Park; the wood around the columns was replaced at a cost of approximately \$500 and repainting will cost about \$1,200.

Mr. Kloptosky reviewed photographs of the Chinier and Front Street areas and stated that the landscaping portion was completed and the areas look quite good. A resident expressed appreciation on behalf of the Front Street residents.

Regarding vine removal for the current year, Supervisor Davidson indicated that machinery used for Firewise mitigation was able to shred a lot of the vines. Ms. Leister will review the completed areas to determine if additional vine removal is necessary. Supervisor Davidson indicated that the Firewise workers are doing a great job in the community. A resident noted that the workers were unable to clear an area behind her home because of the extensive rainfall experienced, a few days ago and asked if they could return to the area. Supervisor Davidson advised that the community has areas that are too wet or swampy for the Firewise machinery to be used. Supervisor Davidson stressed to the resident that the primary focus of the Firewise clearing is for wildfire mitigation and not landscaping areas that residents want cleared; the swamp areas should not need wildfire mitigation.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled that, at the last meeting, the Board asked him to continue gathering estimates for pavers for Center Park. He and Ms. Leister tried but had no luck obtaining additional estimates. Mr. Kloptosky advised that numerous small companies install pavers; however, this is a large job and he wants it completed correctly.

Supervisor Smith asked Mr. Kloptosky if the District is paying the retail price for the Kawasaki Mule™. Mr. Kloptosky stated that there are many models and brands at various prices; this model, which will do what the District needs it to do, was located for \$10,650. Supervisor Smith pointed out that the retail price is \$10,149, which does not include the added fees; therefore, it appears that the District is paying full retail price. Mr. Kloptosky stated that none of the companies offered a wholesale or discounted price. Supervisor Smith noted the listed towing capacity of 1,330 pounds and questioned if the capacity is sufficient, given the size and weight of the water tank that must be hauled, which is approximately 2,100 pounds and to use the vehicle for pressure washing, as suggested by Mr. Kloptosky. Mr. Kloptosky stated that his field staff provided the manufacturer with the size and model of the trailer and the equipment

on the trailer; he believes that the manufacturer calculated the information and recommended this vehicle model.

Supervisor Davidson also noticed that the price being paid is \$500 more than the retail price and asked Mr. Kloptosky to verify the cost. Mr. Kloptosky pointed out that the District is being charged a freight setup and other minor fees. Supervisor Lawrence asked about the longevity of the vehicle. Mr. Kloptosky felt that usage determines longevity.

**D. District Counsel**

Mr. Woodville commended Mr. Clark on his masterful handling of the pump house issues with Escalante.

**i. Pump House Agreement/Repairs**

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

Mr. Clark reported that he expressed his disagreement to Escalante regarding their position on the pump house. The current issue is that, since Escalante will pay 75% of the costs to repair and maintain the pump house, they want to have some control over the costs and be able to approve the expenditures, in advance. Mr. Clark wants the District to have full control and, while he is not prepared to give up on the concept of an agreement with Escalante, he believes that the District must show its resolve and that the end result might be no agreement. He suggested that the pump house budget be doubled, during the Fiscal Year 2015 budget discussions, and that the District should be prepared to levy an assessment against Escalante for 75% of the costs to repair and maintain the pump house. Mr. Clark felt that the only way that Escalante should be allowed any input is if they enter into an agreement with the District. He recalled that the Board wants Escalante to assume responsibility of the fertigation; he will review fertigation with Mr. Kloptosky to gain an understanding of what it entails so that he can notify Escalante of what the District wants.

Mr. Clark stated that, if the CDD and Escalante enter into an agreement, he envisions the agreement to stipulate that the District will be in charge, will budget the item and bill Escalante for 75% of all costs and Escalante will have no choice but to pay.

Supervisor Lawrence pointed out that the 75% figure is based on water usage and noted that the percentage should be periodically evaluated. He believes that, as the District becomes more efficient with its water usage, Escalante's usage percentage could increase and the District's could decrease.

Mr. Clark noted that the proposed agreement calls for the establishment of a historical water usage figure that should be over a three-year period. He pointed out that the percentages could shift in favor of Escalante or the District.

Supervisor Davidson stressed that the District does not want to be placed in a position of responsibility or liability for the golf course greens. If Escalante refuses to enter into an agreement and all responsibility falls on the District, the District may need to consider hiring a company to run the fertigation aspect. Supervisor Lawrence felt that the District should refuse to operate the fertigation aspect and deem it 100% the responsibility of Escalante; if Escalante does not assume responsibility, the District should inform them that they must “get their water elsewhere”. Supervisor Lawrence voiced his opinion that Escalante’s access to the water should be contingent upon them assuming the fertigation responsibilities.

Supervisor Gaeta noted that Escalante does not agree with the PBM Constructors, Inc. (PBM) opinion that the fertigation tank should be moved outside of the pump house; therefore, PBM does not want to pay the costs for moving it. She felt that this convolutes the situation more and asked how it should be handled by the District.

Mr. Clark indicated that he wants to visit the pump house to gain a better understanding of how everything works. Under the District’s agreement to provide water, Escalante’s responsibility begins at a certain point. Mr. Clark suggested that, if Escalante does not cooperate with the District, the District could provide water, as required, but “as is”, which would then require Escalante to construct its own fertigation system on its property. The District would only provide water to the property line, without fertigating it. Mr. Clark advised that the District is under no obligation to fertigate the irrigation water or provide it in any fashion, other than the way the District receives it from the City.

Mr. Kloptosky commented on the focus on the fertigation aspect and noted that there is the element of the mechanics of the pumps and motors, which will also affect the greens. He believes that aspect should also be addressed in the agreement. Mr. Kloptosky felt that the agreement should include “encourage them (Escalante) to communicate” so that they must inform the District if a problem is discovered.

Mr. Clark stated that the District must take a stand and “help them to understand” that the District is going to “do it the way they have decided to do it”.

Supervisor Lawrence agreed that the matters extend beyond the fertigation aspect. He noted that Escalante was in the pump house daily controlling the timing and quantities of water.

Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the operation is more complicated than it appears. There is a large panel that dials in the electronics of how the pumps turn on and off. He advised that there are times when the golf course does not want the water to come on because watering is not required at the time; he believes that the District needs to allow Escalante access to other things, within the pump house, so that the District is not put in jeopardy by being in total control. Mr. Kloptosky stated that Escalante should be given access to set certain things, as needed, which only the golf course personnel can determine.

Mr. Woodville summarized that there are three aspects to the pump house matter. First is the repair, which the Board already voted to complete. The second issue is maintenance and entering into an agreement, which must still be determined. The third item is operation of the pump house; the Board already set forth that Mr. Kloptosky and his staff would work in conjunction with the District's landscaper on the irrigation side of the system, with Escalante operating the fertigation aspect. Mr. Woodville stated that communications with Escalante have become confrontational and Management suggests that taking over the maintenance and repairs of the pump house and assessing Escalante would help to avoid this type of confrontation and should encourage Escalante to enter into an operating agreement with the District.

Mr. Clark reiterated that he still needs to understand the operational aspects of the pump house.

**ii. Cullis Easement Requests**

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

This item was discussed during the Fourth Order of Business.

**iii. 42 Jasmine Berm**

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

Mr. Clark indicated that ICI Homes (ICI) submitted a proposed settlement, which probably works; however, ICI wants the agreement to remain confidential. He noted that the District is unable to enter into a confidential agreement; therefore, the proposed agreement could not be included in the agenda for discussion of the terms. He explained that the concept is for ICI to issue a check and "walk away" and as to what happens to the berm being at the District

and the property owner's discretion. Mr. Clark felt that the proposed agreement solves the main issue, of who would pay to repair the berm. Mr. Clark asked the Board for direction.

Mr. Kloptosky voiced his opinion that the money offered is sufficient to complete the work.

Discussion ensued regarding the desired repair scope. Supervisor Gaeta pointed out that there could be washouts or other issues, in the future, and questioned when the District will be absolved of this matter. Supervisor Davidson suggested that the District sign an agreement with the property owner removing any future District responsibility. Supervisor Gaeta felt that the agreement must be on the property; otherwise, future property owners could want something from District.

Mr. Clark stated that it is impossible to have an unknown future property owner absolve the District. He suggested that the District remove the berm and grade it back into the property owner's land so that there are no issues with the berm, in the future.

Regarding the repair, Supervisor Lawrence noted that a portion of the berm is on common property. Mr. Kloptosky recalled that ICI originally planned to complete the work. He confirmed that the Board only discussed removal of the wall on the side but not the back wall; however, when ICI planned to complete the work, they wanted to remove the back wall, as well. Supervisor Davidson recalled that the back slope is dramatic and runs into wetland area controlled by SJRWMD. Therefore, he believes that the District should leave the back wall alone. Supervisor Lawrence felt that the drop off is not as steep on the portion within the District's property. Supervisor Lawrence noted that the District wants this situation to "go away"; therefore, the ideal solution would be to cut the wall in the back, remove everything on common property and grade up to it. Mr. Kloptosky voiced his concern that SJRWMD might have requirements that could prevent the District from removing the berm.

In response to Supervisor Smith's question, Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the property owner has contacted him several times requesting a status on the project and reasons for the delay. He advised that he did not respond to the property owner's emails, as he does not wish to speak for District Counsel. Mr. Kloptosky believes that the property owner is agreeable to removal of the wall and grading the land; however, he has not discussed the back wall with the property owner. Mr. Clark advised that he and Mr. Kloptosky must contact the property owner to discuss the details.



Supervisor Lawrence stated that he is suspicious because ICI was prepared to complete the work but suddenly they want to pay money, which could mean ICI knows something that the District does not know. Mr. Kloptosky speculated that ICI changed direction either due to discovery a of restrictions from possibly, SJRWMD, or the reason relates to the mechanics of completing the work. Supervisor Lawrence asked if the District is liable if it completes the desired work and the property begins to erode, in the future. Mr. Clark stated that the remedy is for all parties to “sign off” on the repair approach; thereby, each party releases the others and any ongoing maintenance becomes the property owner’s responsibility. Supervisor Lawrence asked if that approach protects the District from future property owners. Mr. Clark advised that it is not absolute; eventually, the statute of limitations expires.

Mr. Clark will investigate the matter further.

**iv. Pier Adjacent to Golf Club**

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

Mr. Clark indicated that the contract for pier repairs was drafted.

Mr. Kloptosky advised that the contracts were executed, the contractor is waiting for the deposit check and work will commence after the check is received. In response to Supervisor Davidson’s question, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the contractor plans to commence work on the presumption that a permit is not necessary.

**v. Proposed Digital Media: “DVD Version of Community Information Guide”**

Mr. Clark indicated that this is not his item.

Supervisor Davidson advised that this matter will be discussed during Item 7.A.ii.

**E. District Manager**

**i. Upcoming Regular Meeting/Community Workshop**

- **COMMUNITY WORKSHOP**
  - **April 3, 2014 at 10:00 A.M.**
- **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING**
  - **April 17, 2014 at 9:30 A.M.**

Mr. Woodville introduced himself and advised that he will become more involved with Grand Haven. He thanked Mr. McGaffney, the Board and Mr. Kloptosky for their assistance. Mr. Woodville commended Supervisor Davidson for his work on the Firewise program. He complimented Management’s office Staff for their work and support.

Mr. Woodville indicated that the landscaping request for proposals (RFP) was sent to Ms. Leister for comment. The RFP should be ready for the Board’s review at the next workshop.

Regarding a pump house maintenance contract with PBM, Mr. Woodville advised that a contract might follow the repair project.

The next workshop is scheduled for April 3, 2014 at 10:00 a.m., and the next meeting is scheduled for April 17, 2014 at 9:30 a.m., both at this location.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**BUSINESS ITEMS**

**A. Community Information Guide Issues**

**i. Content Decisions**

Mr. Kloptosky reviewed the questions regarding content. He asked if both the owner and the current renter can be included in the guide. Supervisor Lawrence felt that resident refers to the person living in the community; therefore, only the renter should be included in the directory. Supervisor Davidson asked if it is possible to add a “renter” notation and include both the renter and the property owner’s names in the guide. Ms. Higgins replied affirmatively. All Supervisors favored listing only the renter in the guide. Supervisor Lawrence questioned what property owners should be told when they want their name included. Supervisor Smith stated that the guide is a “resident” directory.

Ms. Higgins noted that some residents only use initials rather than their first name and asked if that is sufficient. Supervisor Davidson preferred to include the full name, with the nickname or initials in parenthesis. Supervisor Smith felt that an initial is sufficient. The Board agreed that the name that is currently in the database should be used.

Ms. Higgins advised that spouses with different or hyphenated last names will be listed separately in the guide. Supervisor Davidson recommended explaining this in an e-blast. The Board reconsidered and agreed that initials could be included, in parenthesis, following the resident’s first name.

**ii. DVD Versus Paper**

Supervisor Lawrence felt that the guide should be offered on DVD and paper so that residents who want an electronic version can have one.

Mr. Clark recalled discussion about whether the guide could be placed on the District's website and be password protected. He noted that the District's website is public record; therefore, there could be a problem with limiting access.

Supervisor Davidson pointed out that once the guide is digitized, it can instantly be used and manipulated easily, for other purposes, and asked if the District is liable if it produces an electronic version of the guide. Mr. Clark suggested enhancing the disclosure and having residents sign off on their agreement to having their information included in an electronic format.

The Board agreed to continue producing a hard version of the guide.

### **iii. Punched Versus Bound**

Ms. Higgins stated that the 5.5" x 8.5" bound option is the most economical guide to purchase, costing \$19,560 for 2,000 guides or \$20,685 for 3,000 guides. She advised that residents constantly ask for guides and recommended ordering at least 3,000. In response to Supervisor Gaeta's question, Ms. Higgins confirmed that distribution will be tracked.

Regarding the costs to produce, Supervisor Davidson questioned if the costs should be covered within the assessments. Supervisors Davidson and Gaeta believe that the guide should be included as part of the assessments. Supervisor Davidson pointed out that this is an unbudgeted expense for Fiscal Year 2014 and asked about the source of funds.

### **iv. Advertising**

Supervisor Davidson proposed selling advertising space to supplement the cost to produce the guides.

Ms. Higgins reported that the Oak Tree currently sells one-half page ads for \$150, one-quarter page for \$75 and a business card size for \$50.

Mr. Woodville indicated that most Districts include the resident guide on the website or it is handled through the community's HOA; if the HOA posts the guide on their website, they can "protect it" or limit access but the District cannot.

Supervisor Gaeta pointed out that selling ads could increase the number of pages in the guide; thereby, increasing the cost. Ms. Higgins stated that We Do Signs recommends two pages of ads in the front and two in the back of the guide, plus the inside of each cover, for a total of six full pages for advertisements. Regarding setting a price for ads, Ms. Higgins offered to ask the printer, as he has produced other guides.

### **v. Selection of Printer Company**

- **Class A Printing**
- **We Do Signs**

In response to Supervisor Davidson’s question, Ms. Higgins recommended selecting We Do Signs, as the District has used that company several times. They are always available and the costs are much less than other printers.

Discussion ensued regarding whether these are “apples-to-apples” quotes. Ms. Higgins indicated that she has encountered difficulty reaching Class A Printing and their price is much higher.

**On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Davidson, with all in favor, authorizing Staff to negotiate with We Do Signs for a perfect bound community information guide, provide data to the printer and obtain a cost estimate, was approved.**

**vi. Funding**

This item was discussed during Items 6.A. ii., and 6.A.iii.

**B. Updated FY 2014 Capital Plan**

Supervisor Lawrence presented the Updated FY 2014 Capital Plan. He recommended discussing this during the workshop.

Supervisor Smith referred to the \$85,000 “landscape renovation” line item, with \$50,000 earmarked for vine removal, and asked if \$35,000 is sufficient to pay for all of the items that Ms. Leister plans to complete. Supervisor Lawrence felt that Ms. Leister must answer that question. Supervisor Lawrence explained that he shifted the Chinier Street landscaping project and listed it separately, so that funds for that project will not be drawn from the \$35,000.

Regarding the Creekside pool marcing project, Supervisor Smith asked Mr. Kloptosky for an estimate of when the work will be necessary. Mr. Kloptosky advised that marcing Creekside pool was moved from Fiscal Year 2014 to 2015; therefore, those funds are available. Supervisor Lawrence confirmed that he will make this correction.

The Board agreed that Ms. Leister should attend the next workshop, as the landscaping RFP will be discussed.

Supervisor Davidson summarized that this item and the long-term roads plan should be included for discussion at the next workshop.

**C. Curb Ownership/Maintenance (TL)**

Supervisor Lawrence indicated that curb ownership, for all curbs in Grand Haven, with the exception of Wild Oaks, is where the front of the curb meets the asphalt. Mr. Kloptosky presented photographs of the curbs.

Supervisor Davidson recalled that this issue arose regarding pressure cleaning of the gutters. He noted the beauty upon entering the community followed by dirty gutters, curbs and sidewalks. Supervisor Davidson stated that he wanted the Board to consider pressure cleaning the common areas at the entrance to the community but not extending to any side streets. He suggested a scope of work for pressure cleaning the common areas to maintain the continuity of the entrance and that the CDD should not include individual residential curbs.

Regarding responsibility for curbs, Supervisor Davidson summarized that the CDD is responsible for maintaining and repairing the stormwater functionality of the curbs and it is the individual homeowner's responsibility to maintain the aesthetic appearance of the curb.

Mr. Kloptosky felt that this would be an unbudgeted expense. Supervisor Davidson recalled that the Board authorized Mr. Kloptosky to hire a part-time employee, which is budgeted and indicated that the part-time employee could pressure clean the gutters. Supervisors Davidson and Lawrence questioned why Mr. Kloptosky is not seeking a part-time employee. Mr. Kloptosky acknowledged that the Board approved hiring a part-time person but requested clarification of whether he should be seeking a part-time person for three days per week or a full-time employee. The Board explained that a full-time employee was budgeted; however, approval was given to hire a part-time employee, to begin with, which could be extended to full-time. Mr. Kloptosky stated that it is obvious to him that a full-time employee should be hired, as there are plenty of projects that could be completed.

Supervisor Smith stated that pressure cleaning can be an ongoing project; therefore, he opposes adding a person to the payroll until the Board agrees to apply a chemical to prevent the need for annual pressure cleaning. Supervisor Lawrence recalled previously discussing the chemical that Supervisor Smith is alluding to and noted that his past experience found that the product was far too expensive to utilize. Supervisor Lawrence requested that Supervisor Smith research the cost and report back to the Board.

**D. Keeping Grand Haven Grand: Phase 2**

This item was not discussed.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**OPEN ITEMS**

This item was not discussed.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**SUPERVISORS' REQUESTS**

Supervisor Davidson presented an email and information regarding croquet. He stated that the previously scheduled croquet invitational tournament was cancelled, due to the poor condition of the croquet court. He stated that there are issues with using the terms “invitational” and “tournament”.

Supervisor Davidson recalled his previous suggestion that Fiscal Year 2015 be designated “The Year of the Courts”, with the District focusing on creating two pickleball courts near The Village Center, resurfacing the croquet court, repairing the bocce ball court and evaluating the basketball courts, all of which would cost less than what the District spent on the tennis courts.

Supervisor Lawrence noted that \$27,000 is budgeted in the capital plan, under “projects not approved”, to repair the croquet court and contains another \$5,000 to repair the bocce ball court. He supports exploring these improvements and proceeding with those items; if the tennis courts are being maintained, the other sports courts should be maintained, as well.

It was noted that “The Year of the Courts” could begin during the current fiscal year.

Supervisor Gaeta asked that a disclaimer be included on Management and AMG’s emails stating “Please note, CDD workshops and meetings take precedence over any other previously scheduled event.”

Supervisor Lawrence felt that the disclaimer wording makes it seem that the Board does not care about anyone else and it will “come in and take over whatever time it wants”. He suggested that it be clear that the Board’s workshops and meetings are planned well in advance.

Supervisor Gaeta indicated that the meeting dates were changed three times last year, which created a conflict with other scheduled events. She wants to alert residents that, in those

situations, the rescheduled Board workshops and meetings take precedence over what might have been scheduled.

In response to a question, the Board confirmed that Mr. Kloptosky should invite the croquet court contractor to review the court and give a presentation, feedback and estimated cost.

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**


**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned.

**On MOTION by Supervisor Smith and seconded by Supervisor Gaeta, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 1:39 p.m.**



Secretary/Assistant Secretary



Chair/Vice Chair