

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

A Continued Meeting of the Grand Haven Community Development District's Board of Supervisors was held on **Thursday, February 6, 2014 at 10:00 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 (<i>via telephone</i>)	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Craig Wrathell	District Manager
Howard McGaffney	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Rick Woodville	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Scott Clark (<i>via telephone</i>)	District Counsel
Barry Kloptosky	Field Operations Manager
Patrick Leahy	General Manager, Escalante Golf
Jay Snellinging	Golf Course Superintendant, Escalante Golf
Roy Deary	Vesta/AMG
Daniel Fagan	Vesta/AMG
Robert Ross	Vesta/AMG
Sean Foley	Vesta/AMG
David Surface	Vesta/AMG
Michael Hyman	Vesta/AMG
Joe Montagna	Vesta/AMG
Gino Montagna	Vesta/AMG
Liesel Mocke	Vesta/AMG
Angela Palmieri	Elite Amenities, Inc.
Sal Palmieri	Elite Amenities, Inc.
Larry Sass, Sr.	La Piazza Café
Larry Sass, Jr.	La Piazza Café
Ron Chambers	ABM Security Services
Brenda Nichols	ABM Security Services
Cindy Gartzke	ABM Security Services
Jack Dove	U.S. Security Services
Scott Clement	U.S. Security Services
Irma Parone	Weiser Security Services, Inc.

Jenny Pollard
Toby Tobin
Rob Carlton
Al Lo Monaco
Ron Merlo
Bob Hopkins
Charles Greer
David Alfin
Gary Noble
Vic Natiello

Weiser Security Services, Inc.
Weiser Security Services, Inc.
Resident
Resident
Resident
Resident
Resident
Resident
Resident
Resident

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

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)

This item was deferred.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

BUSINESS ITEMS

A. Discussion: Authorization to begin Pump Station Work

Mr. Kloptosky presented proposals, from Citrus 7 Pump Station Services (Citrus), for the interior and exterior pump house repairs, provided by Escalante Golf (Escalante). He recalled that he previously provided the Board with proposals, from PBM Constructors, Inc. (PBM).

Mr. Jay Snelling, of Escalante, stated that Escalante reviewed the proposals from both contractors and found several differences that stand out. He indicated that PBM proposed a block wall surrounding the building and the Citrus bid does not. Mr. Snelling noted that Citrus' bid is about \$1,000 less for the exterior repair; the total difference for the entire project is approximately \$6,000, with Citrus' costs being less.

Supervisor Lawrence stated that Citrus' quote does not include permits, while PBM's does. Mr. Kloptosky replied affirmatively but wished to discuss this point later.

Mr. Snelling confirmed that a permit will be required if a block wall is installed, as proposed by PBM but permits are not necessary to repair the existing structure and pumps, as proposed by Citrus. He advised that, should permits be necessary, Citrus can obtain them; however, their scope of work should not require any permits.

Mr. Snelling advised that the Citrus proposal is to restore the building to its original condition, with a slightly larger fan, for better circulation.

Regarding the block wall in PBM's proposal, Mr. Snelling stated that it was considered for the purpose of keeping water out of the building. Escalante felt that the wall is not necessary, as the rust situation is occurring from inside the building, from the pumps and lack of maintenance; the reclaimed water is what caused the problems. Escalante believes that, if the pump station is repaired and properly maintained, this should not be a problem.

Mr. Patrick Leahy, of Escalante, reviewed the pump station issues. He stated that Escalante is proposing to restore the building to its original condition; they are not making other "improvements" beyond that and do not recommend moving the fertigation tanks out of the structure. Mr. Leahy advised that many of Escalante's systems do not have fertigation tanks outside the pump station; the only times it was outside was in "add on" situations. He advised that there is no contamination where the fertigation tanks are located; the outside walls and everything to the ground are intact. Mr. Leahy reiterated Escalante's opinion that the rust and deterioration is on the inside of the building, not the outside; therefore, the only water getting in is from the pumps inside the building, not from a source outside the building.

Mr. Leahy pointed out that, if the sidewalls are restored and a block wall is not installed, the project can commence immediately, as permits would not be necessary. He stated that Escalante is prepared to have Citrus, a well-known contractor in the golf community and the pump station maintenance contractor, commence immediately. Mr. Leahy stressed that, if a permit is necessary, as would be in the work proposed by PBM, the project could be delayed several more months; Escalante prefers to proceed immediately.

Mr. Leahy noted that a contingency for unknown issues was built into the bids. He concluded that, overall, Citrus's proposal is approximately \$6,000 less than PBM, for the same scope of work.

Mr. Snelling noted that Citrus' contract would call for four (4) inspections and one (1) full service, annually. He concluded that Citrus will be motivated to maintain the work they completed, as opposed to trying to maintain someone else's work.

Regarding the maintenance contract, Mr. Kloptosky voiced his understanding that Escalante was to present a proposed maintenance schedule and cost analysis to the Board. He questioned why Escalante already contracted with Citrus for maintenance of the pump station, without first presenting it to the Board. Mr. Snelling advised that Escalante contracted with Citrus in August and asked how the maintenance costs were to be billed but never heard back. Mr. Kloptosky contended that, at his meeting with Escalante, they did not inform him that they already contracted for maintenance. Mr. Snelling noted that he arrived in July and was informed that maintenance was necessary; therefore, he contracted with a company to have the maintenance work performed.

Mr. Wrathell pointed out that there is not sufficient time to resolve this matter now and asked Mr. Leahy and Mr. Snelling to return at 1:30 p.m., following the RFP presentations.

B. ORAL PRESENTATIONS: Amenity Management Services [20-Minute Presentation; 15-Minute Q & A Session]

Mr. Wrathell acknowledged that this is a public meeting so the Board cannot tell people that they cannot sit in; however, as a matter of courtesy, the Board requests that any competitors step out of the meeting, during the other presentations.

i. 10:15 AM - 10:50 AM: *Amenity Management Group, Inc.*

Mr. Roy Deary, of Amenity Management Group, Inc. (AMG), introduced himself and thanked the Board for the opportunity to present. He stated that he hopes to persuade the Board to continue with AMG, as the District's amenity manager.

Mr. Deary introduced Mr. Daniel Fagan, Mr. Robert Ross, Mr. Sean Foley, Mr. David Surface, Mr. Michael Hyman, Mr. Joe Montagna, Mr. Gino Montagna and Ms. Liezel Mocke, of Vesta/AMG. He noted that numerous other Vesta/AMG employees were also present.

Mr. Deary played a five (5)-minute video providing an overview of Vesta. He discussed the value that Vesta/AMG provides to Grand Haven by providing "peace-of-mind", enabling one to enjoy Grand Haven's lifestyle to the fullest and providing the "right balance". He noted Vesta/AMG's management approach, long-term relationships and quality of service.

Mr. Deary explained the cost for quality management services.

Mr. Deary indicated that Vesta/AMG is moving forward with “High Touch” and “High Tech” innovations.

Mr. Foley explained Vesta/AMG’s high tech goals for CDD management. He discussed “Vesta Vantage”, which is a communication app formulated to provide better communication to residents.

Mr. Deary recapped what Vesta/AMG can bring to Grand Haven, along with their vast experience, as Grand Haven’s amenity manager, for the past seven (7) years.

Supervisor Lawrence noted that Waterside Café has lost approximately \$25,000 per year and asked if it is on the same trajectory.

Mr. Deary recalled the Board’s decision, a few years ago, that Waterside Café is an amenity; not a business. He noted that, each year, Vesta/AMG pulls approximately \$30,000 from its management contract to subsidize the café. Mr. Deary advised that progress is being made towards the breakeven point.

Discussion ensued regarding the café operation, promotional programs and progress.

Noting improvement in the goal to break even, Supervisor Lawrence asked Mr. Deary if that factor was taken into account in Vesta/AMG’s bid. Mr. Deary replied no, there were significant losses, over the years, and he never asked the District for help or raised their prices; he is optimistic about the progress and is willing to share the wealth with the District, if the café became profitable. Mr. Deary offered to return to sharing profits and losses with the District.

Mr. Smith voiced his preference to have the restaurant operation remain with the amenity manager.

Supervisor Chiodo recalled marked improvement in the amenities, over the past five (5) years.

Supervisor Gaeta agreed with Supervisor Chiodo.

Supervisor Lawrence voiced his appreciation that Vesta/AMG would agree to share the profits, if the café becomes profitable.

Supervisor Davidson agreed with the previous comments and offered thanks to Mr. Deary and Vesta/AMG for their efforts and service.

Supervisor Gaeta commended Mr. Ross.

*****The meeting recessed at 10:50 a.m.*****

*****The meeting reconvened at 11:00 a.m.*****

ii. **11:00 AM - 11:35 AM: *Elite Amenities, Inc.***

Mr. Wrathell welcomed Elite Amenities, Inc. (Elite).

Ms. Angela Palmieri, of Elite, introduced Mr. Sal Pamieri, also of Elite. She discussed Elite's experience, background, clients and desire to provide personalized service. Ms. Palmieri explained the standards of the Elite team. She noted that the proposal includes the offer to interview existing staff members for continued employment, when possible. Ms. Palmieri pointed out Elite's commitment and enthusiasm to provide Grand Haven with a fresh perspective, from a new café, future cost sharing, exciting special events and taking advantage of the District's underutilized space; the level of energy and excitement infused into Grand Haven will resonate with residents and guests, helping to increase property values.

Mr. Palmieri discussed Elite's "Value Equation", including value innovation, sense of community, along with appraisals and transparency. Elite looks to save money through efficiency and increase revenue streams through staff and partnerships. He noted that Elite places a high premium on cross-training employees to increase efficiency and flexibility. Mr. Palmieri discussed Elite's partnerships. Regarding creating a sense of community, Mr. Palmieri indicated that Elite "thinks outside of the box" and surveys the community to determine what is desired. Mr. Palmieri stated that appraisals are an important part of Elite's process, as they provide consistent feedback to determine if expectations are being met. He explained transparency and Elite's pledge to provide quality, easily understandable financial reports, enabling effective and informative analysis.

Ms. Palmieri detailed the transition process. She indicated that Phase 1 would include fact finding and noted that Elite already met with Mr. Kloptosky and has visited the café and other amenity facilities, several times. Elite would also interview current staff, the CDD Board, and GHMA, along with surveying residents, reviewing the kitchen and café and meeting or forming committees. Phase 2 relates to operations review, including office management, communication strategies, computer and software analysis, SAAC system, accounting reports and product inventory and meeting with vendors. Phase 3 is Elite's "Prepare to Launch", which includes having staff in place, implementing amenity safety preparedness, new documentation and reporting in place and a café reveal party.

Ms. Palmieri acknowledged that Elite has not managed a restaurant but explained that the café would be outsourced to an experienced restaurateur. She indicated that Mr. Larry Lass, Sr.,

and Mr. Larry Lass, Jr., of La Piazza Café, are present to answer questions. Ms. Palmieri discussed the Lass' qualifications and La Piazza Café. Ms. Palmieri indicated that Elite is willing to assume 50% of the staff costs, in years two (2) and three (3) of the contract, which equates to a savings of over \$100,000 to the District. She voiced her confidence in the Lass' and café.

Regarding tennis at Grand Haven, Ms. Palmieri discussed Mr. Palmieri's experience caring for and maintaining clay tennis courts. She indicated that Elite's pool expert already visited the Grand Haven pools and submitted recommendations for cost-free services and improvements. Ms. Palmieri noted Elite's passion regarding fitness facilities. She explained that offering new and unique special events is a popular part of what Elite offers. Ms. Palmieri discussed Elite's partnering with charities year round.

Noting Elite's plan to outsource the café, Supervisor Lawrence asked what would happen, given that the current café typically loses money. Ms. Palmieri pointed out that the RFP states that any losses would be Elite's responsibility.

Supervisor Lawrence asked for clarification, as he does not fully understand the "outsourcing" concept. He questioned who pays electricity, propane and the other expenses, if the café is outsourced and how it saves the District money. Additionally, Supervisor Lawrence wants more information on what happens if, at the end of the year, café revenues are less than the expenses.

Ms. Palmieri voiced her understanding that, according to the information she was provided, the CDD pays the café overhead expenses and pointed out that the CDD already pays the expenses, such as utilities, and including the café staff. The Board advised Ms. Palmieri that the CDD does not pay the café staff. Ms. Palmieri noted that this fact was not made clear to her; however, Elite feels that, based on the Lass' restaurant experience, the café can boost its sales. She stated that Elite is committed to publicizing the café and making it a success.

Supervisor Gaeta asked how many CDDs Elite manages. Ms. Palmieri replied six (6). Supervisor Gaeta questioned the size of the largest community that Elite manages. Ms. Palmieri stated that the largest is 1,400 homes. Supervisor Gaeta asked which community has 1,400 homes. Ms. Palmieri replied Queen's Harbour and noted that St. John's Golf and Country Club is similar. Supervisor Gaeta asked for Elite's average "hours of operation". Ms. Palmieri indicated that the hours of operation vary, depending on the management scope of each community and

discussed the various programs that Elite runs. Supervisor Gaeta voiced her opinion that, according to Elite's RFP, their primary focus is on aquatics and fitness and questioned whether they provide other services, such as tennis court maintenance, or outsource those services, as well. Ms. Palmieri stated that an Elite team member would oversee the tennis courts; it would not be outsourced. Supervisor Gaeta asked how many people Elite employs. Ms. Palmieri noted that staffing is seasonal; they currently have about 25 employees but more than 100, during the summer. Supervisor Gaeta asked how many facilitators Elite would provide at Grand Haven. Ms. Palmieri indicated that the RFP clearly identified what the District wants; her submitted RFP followed the guidelines but Ms. Palmieri would like to assess the District's amenity staffing to determine how staff's time is being managed.

Ms. Palmieri referred to Supervisor Lawrence's questions about outsourcing the café, Ms. Palmieri pointed out that her RFP submittal indicates that an Elite employee would manage the café. Supervisor Gaeta questioned how many years of restaurant experience that particular employee has. Ms. Palmieri indicated that it depends upon whether Elite would be allowed to keep any of the current café staff, as she believes it would work best to have someone transition; however, if not, she will assure the Board that Elite would have an experienced manager. Ms. Palmieri noted that she has food and beverage operation experience.

Supervisor Smith asked if Elite has partnered with La Piazza Café on other ventures. Ms. Palmieri indicated that Elite has not worked with La Piazza Café but looks forward to the opportunity. In response to Supervisor Smith's additional question, Ms. Palmieri advised that Elite outsources with several food and beverage companies, as well as caterers; they are quite familiar with the partnership aspect.

Supervisor Smith asked about Elite's experience in outsourcing a restaurant operation compared to a snack bar operation. Mr. Palmieri advised that Elite does not have experience in managing a restaurant of this size but noted that Elite reviewed the current café's financials and sees room for improvement and noted that, if possible, Elite envisions keeping much of the current café staff.

Supervisor Gaeta voiced doubt that retaining any of the current café staff would be possible because of employment agreements. She recalled that, at the last meeting, she asked if Elite sought other restaurants and was told that they did but did not receive responses. Supervisor Gaeta indicated that Grand Haven has unique residents and wondered what happens

if they are not satisfied with La Piazza Café; while the food is good, she feels that their price point, lack of diversity and a nearby competitor are grounds for concern. Supervisor Gaeta asked how Elite would deal with that. She recalled that Elite's RFP calls for a three (3)-year contract and she did not notice flexibility on that point or a termination clause and asked if Elite is amenable to something like that. Supervisor Gaeta reiterated her question of what will happen if La Piazza Café does not work out for Grand Haven.

Regarding the café staffing question, Mr. Palmieri indicated that it will be fine if they cannot retain the current staff and expressed his confidence that a qualified, experienced restaurant manager and staff can be found in the local area. In response to the question of the "competition" from the golf club, Mr. Palmieri noted "chatter" on the website about residents dropping their memberships and patronizing the café. Regarding the uniqueness of Grand Haven residents, Mr. Palmieri recalled Elite's experience in Queen's Harbour CDD and the perfectionism and strictness of that community; Elite has successfully managed Queen's Harbour for ten (10) years and, if Grand Haven is similar, they should work together perfectly. In response to the question of menu diversity, Mr. Palmieri voiced his opinion that La Piazza Café can cook everything on the Waterside Café's existing menu and then some.

Mr. Lass stated that the current café menu is fine, although he would "tweak it" a bit. He believes that the prices could be reduced by \$1 or \$2 and the dinner options would need to be "perked up". Mr. Lass indicated that he has eaten at Waterside Café a few times and found room for improvement. He is comfortable with the concept of working with Elite. Mr. Lass noted that La Piazza Café has breakfast, lunch and dinner experience.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that Mr. Lass lives in Grand Haven and asked if he is familiar with the community dynamics, as he appeared "surprised" about the close proximity of the golf club. Mr. Lass stated that he is familiar with the situation and voiced his opinion that they should not try to compete with each other.

Supervisor Davidson stated that he has grave concerns about an independent restaurant operating in a "captured" market, as the restaurant would not be allowed to advertise to bring in a lot of outsiders. He noted that the café has a consistent clientele, with little variance. Supervisor Davidson indicated that, in the current operation, everything, including staffing, runs through the amenity manager; he believes that outsourcing creates another level of necessitating profit or they cannot continue to operate. He believes that this scenario would drive costs up,

rather than controlling them. Supervisor Davidson voiced his concern that this arrangement would be based on a three (3)-year contract.

Supervisor Lawrence clarified that the café has not reached a “break-even-point” each year; the reason that it might appear that way, on the profit and loss financial statements, is because Vesta/AMG has covered the loss by moving funds from their management contract to the café financials. Supervisor Lawrence asked about a liquor license.

Supervisor Gaeta contended that Elite’s RFP did not factor in employees and asked how much that will increase their price.

Ms. Palmieri stated that it will not add anything; she was working from the District’s budget, overall. She indicated that the savings will still be there and might be even more. Ms. Palmieri recalled that she and La Piazza Café offered to consider years two (2) and three (3). She clarified that she did not have access to an actual profit and loss statement for the café; she worked from the information provided to her, which reflected a break-even status. Ms. Palmieri discussed her attempts to obtain information regarding operations and pointed out that Elite has questions, as they were not afforded much information from the District, when preparing the proposal. She stood by the proposed \$50,000 savings in the second and third contract years.

Regarding the request for a three (3)-year contract, Mr. Palmieri noted that Elite’s upfront transition costs would be approximately \$20,000; however, all of Elite’s contracts contain a 30-day written notice termination provision.

Regarding the profit aspect, Mr. Palmieri stated that there is room for improvement with the café. He noted that, in speaking with several other restaurant operators, they were “blown away” by the café’s numbers. He reiterated that Elite is speculating on the café figures because they were not afforded the opportunity to see the café’s true numbers. In response to Supervisor Lawrence’s question, Mr. Palmieri clarified that others were “blown away” by the café’s low numbers and stated, for example, that Queen’s Harbour can do \$3 million in liquor sales, alone; he cannot understand the Waterside Café’s figures. Mr. Palmieri indicated that he was bothered by the fact that the liquor, in the café, was locked up, which could reflect shrinkage and is a “red flag” that there is room for improvement.

Recalling the relationship between the café and the golf club, Ms. Palmieri stated that Elite is familiar with these types of relationships, based on their experience in other districts.

Her strategy is to discuss and coordinate with the other party so that they do not “step on each other’s toes”.

Supervisor Chiodo asked if Elite would obtain a liquor license or rely on La Piazza Café’s license. Ms. Palmieri indicated that Elite will obtain a license.

Supervisor Gaeta asked what Elite’s proposed food costs are. Mr. Lass felt that the food costs would be 30% or below; he stated that he is not trying to compete with the golf club and he can adapt to whatever the residents want. Mr. Lass is confident that he can execute the type of menu that is desired, while keeping it at a reasonable price point.

Supervisor Gaeta asked Mr. Lass which food vendors he uses. Mr. Lass indicated that he uses all of the major food vendors, readily available in the area, with the exception of Sysco.

Supervisor Lawrence asked Mr. Lass if he visited and inspected the kitchen. Mr. Lass replied no, indicating that he was not offered the opportunity to view the kitchen facility. Ms. Palmieri noted that Elite asked to view the kitchen but the request was denied.

Mr. Smith noted that several companies requested access to the District’s facilities, in order to prepare their RFPs, and asked Mr. Wrathell why those requests were denied. Mr. Wrathell stated that Management’s office is several hours away; therefore, Management would not be conducting tours. Mr. Wrathell deferred the question to Mr. Kloptosky. Mr. Kloptosky stated that several requests were made to tour the community and he granted those requests; however, he did not allow access to the café kitchen because, in his opinion, health codes prevent outsiders from entering the kitchen. Mr. Kloptosky contended that he allowed access to everything else that the various companies wished to see.

C. Discussion/Consideration: Ranking

Supervisor Smith felt that Vesta/AMG is doing a fine job and he is concerned about Elite’s concept of outsourcing the café. He ranked Vesta/AMG #1.

Supervisor Lawrence agreed with Supervisor Smith and voiced his opinion that Elite does not understand café management and there are too many unanswered questions about Elite. He felt that Elite could likely realize they are in over their head and suddenly give the District 30 days notice; Supervisor Lawrence finds Elite to be “too big of a risk”, because he does not believe they can deliver the savings that they propose, especially since they plan to outsource the restaurant. He ranked Vesta/AMG #1.

Supervisor Chiodo agreed with Supervisors Smith and Lawrence. He was concerned about La Piazza Café’s abilities to perform, given that they did not see the café’s kitchen.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if Mr. Kloptosky could provide the Board with his opinion.

Supervisor Davidson pointed out that time is limited.

Supervisor Gaeta concurred with the previous Supervisors. She voiced her concerns about outsourcing the café and stated that Elite did not seem to understand the needs of the District. She questioned what else Elite and La Piazza Café could bring, that Vesta/AMG does not already provide.

Mr. Wrathell directed the Board to complete their Evaluation Criteria forms.

Supervisor Davidson voiced his opinion that the potential savings proposed by Elite is an unknown. He stressed the need to continue the good level of service that Vesta/AMG is providing and noted that the community is very resistant to change, even if it is a good change. Supervisor Davidson ranked Vesta/AMG #1 and Elite #2.

All Supervisors ranked Vesta/AMG #1 and Elite #2.

On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Chiodo, with all in favor, accepting Amenity Management Services, as the #1 ranked amenity management firm, and Elite Amenities, Inc., as #2, was approved.

D. Authorization to Enter Into Agreement With Number-One Ranked Amenity Management Firm

On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Gaeta, with all in favor, authorizing Management to enter into an agreement with the #1 ranked amenity management firm, was approved.

Supervisor Lawrence stated that the most telling comment, which influenced his decision, was Elite’s belief that they could increase the café revenue; which he believes is not possible.

The Board invited the Vesta/AMG and Elite representatives into the room and Mr. Wrathell announced that the Board ranked AMG #1 and Elite #2; the District will retain AMG as its amenity management firm.

A side discussion of the presentations continued. It was noted, by Supervisor Lawrence, that Elite was not provided with as much information as the District could, or should, have provided, as they did not know that the only reason the café appeared to break even, on the financials, was because AMG subsidized it. He suggested that this be considered for future RFPs.

E. ORAL PRESENTATIONS: Security Services [15-Minute Presentation; 15-Minute Q & A Session]

It was noted that, although the presentations are running behind schedule, each firm will be given their full time.

i. 11:50 AM – 12:20 PM: ABM Security Services

Mr. Rob Chambers, of ABM Security Services (ABM), noted computer difficulties with his PowerPoint presentation and thanked the Board for “bailing him out”. He gave a brief history of his background. Mr. Chambers introduced Ms. Brenda Nichols and Ms. Cindy Gartzke, both of ABM. He provided a brief history of ABM, the services that it provides, the industries it services and where ABM works. Mr. Chambers indicated that ABM recently “rebranded” itself to bring all of its services and branches under a single branch.

Mr. Chambers discussed ABM’s “hands-on” management approach, recruitment, hiring and turnover, along with their training program. He indicated that ABM offers employees a 401k program and stock purchase options, which enables them to retain employees. Mr. Chambers detailed ABM’s new-hire, safety and recurrent training programs.

Mr. Chambers stated that ABM builds value for its clients by reducing operating expenses through its people and technology, Custom Facility Services program, highly trained employees and sustainability.

Ms. Nichols discussed her history with Grand Haven.

Ms. Gartzke explained the training that is provided to security officers, her on-site management and coordination with CDD staff.

Regarding ABM’s scope of services, Supervisor Davidson noted that the District’s general landscaping contract is currently on a month-to-month basis and asked if ABM has a landscape maintenance branch of service. Mr. Chambers replied affirmatively and added that ABM provides landscape services in communities the size of Grand Haven and larger. Supervisor Davidson asked Mr. Chambers to provide the Board with information about landscape maintenance services, including nearby communities and where ABM finds its

landscape employees. Mr. Chambers advised that ABM brought OneSource into the company several years ago.

Supervisor Lawrence referred to ABM's database abilities and asked if there is opportunity for ABM to assist or integrate more with the District. Mr. Chambers stated that he is not familiar with the District's database system; however, ABM has systems that can do many things. Ms. Nichols indicated that the TEM system is used in several other communities. Ms. Nichols discussed the various security systems available. Mr. Chambers pointed out that a multitude of systems are available.

Supervisor Gaeta pointed out that, in Grand Haven, security is a function of the CDD, not the GHMA. She explained the CDD's database system, the work to develop the new system and asked why the District did not hear from ABM sooner, regarding how they could assist.

Ms. Nichols indicated that no one has ever asked for her input. Supervisor Gaeta contended that the District was never aware that ABM offered this component. Ms. Nichols pointed out that this was discussed, as part of the initial contract; however, at the time, the District felt they did not need it, as they had their own system.

Mr. Chambers voiced his understanding that the District has not experienced a system-wide "issue" with its current system. The Board concurred. Mr. Chambers voiced his opinion that Ms. Nichols would have presented options, had the District been experiencing problems with its system. Supervisor Gaeta stated that the District was experiencing problems, which is why it developed a new system. Ms. Nichols reiterated that no one from the Board or CDD ever brought these issues to her attention.

Supervisor Smith referred to a statement, in the proposal, indicating that ABM will be on site, four (4) times per week and asked if that is correct. Ms. Nichols replied affirmatively. Mr. Chambers clarified that, while ABM is on site, they do not necessarily meet with management each time, unless the District wants to require check in.

Supervisor Davidson asked if ABM offers virtual guard services. Mr. Chambers replied affirmatively. Supervisor Davidson asked Mr. Chambers to expound upon what is offered. Mr. Chambers explained that virtual or remote officers can be integrated, depending on the system capabilities. Mr. Chambers noted that ABM has an expert that can visit and provide a property evaluation.

Supervisor Gaeta asked about the cost for other services. Mr. Chambers indicated that certain things cost nothing extra; however, if the District should want a remote guard system, it would be a direct cost between the District and the vendor that provides the service. In response to a question, Mr. Chambers confirmed that the QMS report is available at no extra charge.

Supervisor Gaeta noted that ABM's price has decreased, significantly, and asked how that is possible. Mr. Chambers indicated that rebranding and other cost-saving measures and business partnerships have resulted in savings, which are passed to the customer.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if ABM provides their officers with uniforms. Mr. Chambers replied affirmatively. Ms. Nichols indicated that the uniforms are leased.

Supervisor Lawrence asked how the guards are paid, compared to the rate paid to other guards, in the area. Mr. Chambers indicated that the wage might be different, based on experience.

Ms. Nichols indicated that the average hourly rate, in the area, is \$9 to \$9.50. She explained that, when certain tax matters impacted ABM, the guard wages were reduced to ensure that the added costs were not passed to clients; however, wages have increased, in the past few years. Ms. Nichols reported that the day shift guards are generally paid slightly more than the afternoon and evening guards because the daytime is the heart of the day. She confirmed that the day shift guard is paid \$9.25 per hour, compared to other communities that pay \$9 per hour. In response to the turnover rate for Grand Haven, Ms. Nichols stated that ABM was asked to remove one (1) person during their seven (7) years in the community; approximately five (5) other employees left for better jobs in the military, police academy and corrections.

Mr. Chambers noted the distinction and the difficulty in retaining those working as guards as a path to their "career" field, such as police or corrections work; ABM focuses on retaining other types of employees. He indicated that ABM will willingly provide the District with their payroll information.

ii. 12:25 PM – 12:55 PM: US Security Associates

Mr. Jack Dove, of U.S. Security Associates (U.S. Security), discussed his experience with the firm and introduced Mr. Scott Clement, also of U.S. Security. He advised that U.S. Security is expanding into the area and noted several clients in the Palm Coast area. Mr. Dove explained that U.S. Security was acquired by Goldman, about two (2) years ago, which, overall, has approximately 57,000 employees.

Mr. Dove indicated that U.S. Security has focused on managing its officers with technology. He discussed their "Guest Verification System" (GVS), which is offered to all clients, at no charge; this system allows for management of residents and enables residents to update their visitor lists and manage their visitors. Mr. Dove noted that the system is fully customizable, to the point that it could check all visitors on the state sex offender registry by scanning their driver's license.

Mr. Dove discussed the technology used to manage their guards and continuous training used by U.S. Security.

Mr. Dove noted that Palm Coast and the Grand Haven community are slightly different than other communities, which is why they proposed a higher pay rate. He explained the importance of hiring quality guards and servicing the community in the desired manner. Mr. Dove discussed the "Responsive Management System" and how it is used as a problem resolution process. He noted that all employees must go through the entire background system, including a national check; the system is audited every week.

Mr. Clement discussed GVS and its use in nearby communities. He found that residents appreciate the convenience of being able to manage the system themselves.

Mr. Dove advised that the system is also capable of transcribing and emailing voice mail messages to the guards. Guards are provided with an emergency response guide so that they can quickly deal with any matters that arise.

Supervisor Gaeta asked how many CDDs does U.S. Security service. Mr. Dove asked for a moment to research the answer.

Supervisor Lawrence asked how many sites U.S. Security services in Flagler County. Mr. Clement indicated that, currently, they do not manage any, in Flagler County. In response to Supervisor Lawrence's question, he advised that U.S. Security manages about seven (7) or eight (8), in the local area.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if U.S. Security visited the site. Mr. Dove indicated that he is familiar and has extensive knowledge of the community.

Supervisor Gaeta asked Mr. Dove if he was aware that the CDD undertook a project to identify potential areas of intrusion and that the District recently upgraded its database system and equipment. She recalled a recent Saturday when an alligator entered the pool but the information was not conveyed, in a timely manner, and a children's birthday party took place the

next day, although the alligator had left and no one knew its whereabouts. Supervisor Gaeta asked how U.S. Security would have handled this situation.

In response to Supervisor Gaeta, Mr. Dove indicated that U.S. Security serves 1,648 CDDs, company-wide. He noted that U.S. Security is aware of the types of issues that arise in communities and tailors themselves to the community's needs. Mr. Dove stated that all incidents are entered into the computer and the information is immediately emailed to whomever the client identifies. Technology allows everyone to be notified promptly. He discussed how their data system and online incident reporting enables U.S. Security to easily determine what is happening and link recurrent activities. Mr. Dove stressed that U.S. Security is focused on solving problems using the technology available.

Supervisor Lawrence asked how GVS works. Mr. Dove explained that residents can call the guard, leave a voicemail or update their visitor on their individual list, via their phone or computer. Supervisor Lawrence asked the salary range for guards. Mr. Dove replied that it is \$9 to \$10 per hour.

Mr. Clement indicated that he is from the Palm Coast area and fully understands the needs of the community. Supervisor Lawrence asked how often the manager would visit the guardhouse, each week. Mr. Clement advised that he meets with the representative once per month; however, the field managers are on site once or twice per week and their site inspection is automatically emailed to whomever the Board designates.

Supervisor Davidson asked if U.S. Security utilizes virtual guard services. Mr. Dove indicated that U. S. Security has a 24-hour command center, in Miami, which operates the remote guard technology. He discussed technology developed to address these types of needs.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if virtual guard services were factored into U.S. Security's proposal. Mr. Dove replied no and indicated that U.S. Security's proposal is based on the specifications and man-hours identified in the RFP package. Mr. Dove explained that the managers can visit the site more frequently, especially during the transition.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if U.S. Security provides incident or general overview reports. Mr. Dove indicated that the preference is discussed with the client; however, the client has access to a database containing the information and is able to generate their desired reports.

iii. 1:00 PM – 1:30 PM: Weiser Security Services

Ms. Irma Parone, of Weiser Security Services, Inc. (Weiser), introduced herself, along with Ms. Jenny Pollard and Mr. Toby Tobin, also of Weiser.

Ms. Parone detailed Weiser's background. She stated that residential security is Weiser's largest market, servicing over 130 high-end communities. Ms. Parone discussed Weiser's hiring criteria and noted that only 107 of 763 applicants were hired in 2013 and explained the steps taken and interview process utilized to ensure that employees are placed in the area that best suits their skill set. She noted the satisfaction and engagement rate of employees.

Ms. Parone reviewed the virtual guard option and the benefit it can provide to a CDD. She discussed the high client retention rate of the Jacksonville branch office. Ms. Parone continued detailing Weiser's employee training program and retention rates, along with the company structure, including the branch offices and onsite supervisors. Clients are surveyed monthly and action plans are developed to address any concerns or issues.

In summary, Ms. Parone indicated that Weiser has a very selective hiring process, virtual guard capabilities and technology, including a web-portal system, is experienced in residential security and provides a money-back guarantee.

Supervisor Lawrence asked how many clients Weiser has in Flagler County. Ms. Parone replied none. Regarding who would make on-site visits, Ms. Parone indicated that numerous employees live nearby; the District would receive the same attention as if it were in Jacksonville.

Supervisor Lawrence asked what employee salaries are based upon. Ms. Parone advised that salaries are a percentage of the bill rate and factor in the rate in the local area.

In response to Supervisor Lawrence's question, Ms Parone provided more details of the virtual guard option. She noted that some communities use a mix of physical and virtual guards. Supervisor Lawrence asked the estimated savings with partial use of a virtual guard. Ms. Parone estimated savings of 40%, while Mr. Tobin's community realized 50% savings, with a full-time virtual guard system.

Supervisor Davidson discussed the virtual guard system and noted that Grand Haven will likely always want a human at the front gate but might utilize a virtual guard at ancillary gates or other locations. Mr. Tobin discussed the benefits and capabilities of the virtual guard system, throughout the community.

F. Discussion/Consideration: Ranking

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he checked the references of U.S. Security and Weiser. He reported that the references for both companies were very favorable. Mr. Kloptosky voiced his opinion that all three (3) companies are capable of servicing the community; however, he favors nurturing existing relationships and is hesitant to make a change. He recommended retaining ABM.

Supervisor Chiodo noted that Weiser's proposal is significantly higher than the other companies but he found nothing in their presentation to believe that they are worth any more.

Supervisor Davidson asked for a ranking.

Supervisor Chiodo indicated that he is not "upset" with ABM and has no guarantee that another company would be better; therefore, he is inclined to rank ABM #1, U.S. Security #2 and Weiser #3.

Supervisor Smith stated that he is satisfied with ABM; therefore, he ranked ABM #1, U.S. Security #2 and Weiser #3.

******Supervisor Smith left the meeting.******

Supervisor Gaeta pointed out that ABM has been in the community for a long time and was aware of the database issues that the District was going through; however, they never offered any of the services that were available to their clients. She felt that ABM's service has been "ho hum" and there has been a lot of turnover with the guards. Supervisor Gaeta stated that some ABM guards do not possess the level required by Grand Haven. She voiced her opinion that Weiser might not fully understand the dynamics of Grand Haven. Supervisor Gaeta indicated that she was impressed with U.S. Security and believes that they are on the "cutting edge", with strong technology knowledge.

Supervisor Gaeta ranked U.S. Security #1, Weiser #2 and ABM #3.

Supervisor Lawrence felt that nothing presented would justify Weiser's proposed price. He stated that he is torn between U.S. Security and ABM. He believed that U.S. Security could do a good job; however, they lack a presence in Flagler County. It was clarified that U.S. Security has no clients in Flagler County. Supervisor Lawrence felt that the price difference between U.S. Security and ABM is minimal.

Supervisor Davidson noted the higher cost of Weiser. He indicated that ABM's performance has been inconsistent; however, he is intrigued by the knowledge that they can also offer landscape services, in addition to security. Supervisor Davidson voiced his hope that Mr.

Kloptosky could work with Ms. Nichols and Ms. Gartzke regarding the inconsistencies in the service provided. He felt that U.S. Security is “unknown”, in the local area.

Supervisor Davidson ranked ABM #1, U.S. Security #2 and Weiser #3.

Supervisor Lawrence asked Mr. Kloptosky to comment on the level of resident satisfaction with ABM’s guard service.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he received no specific complaints regarding the service; occasional complaints are received when a resident or a guest is not allowed to enter, as a result of the guard following the required procedures. He pointed out that Ms. Gartzke and Ms. Nichols are responsive to issues. Mr. Kloptosky felt that ABM would be receptive to changes. He is concerned that the District would still have issues with a new security provider.

Supervisor Lawrence ranked ABM #1, U.S. Security #2 and Weiser #3.

Discussion ensued regarding the contract’s cancellation clause, should the District be dissatisfied with ABM’s performance.

The Board invited the ABM, U.S. Security and Weiser representatives into the room and Mr. Wrathell announced that the Board ranked ABM #1, U.S. Security #2 and Weiser #3; the District will retain AMB as its security services firm.

On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Chiodo, with Supervisors Lawrence, Chiodo and Davidson, in favor, and Supervisor Gaeta dissenting, accepting Amenity Management Services, as the #1 ranked amenity management firm, and Elite Amenities, Inc., as #2, was approved. (Motion passed 3-1)

Mr. Wrathell noted that Supervisor Smith provided his ranking, via telephone, prior to leaving the meeting; therefore, his rankings count in the tally but he is not able to vote on the matter, as he is no longer in attendance.

Noting the ranking results, Supervisor Lawrence recommended that the District conduct a formal review of ABM, after the first year of service, and direct Mr. Kloptosky to work with ABM to determine additional services that can be provided to the District, free of charge.

G. Authorization to Enter Into Agreement With Number-One Ranked Security Firm

On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Chiodo, with Supervisors Lawrence, Chiodo and Davidson, in favor, and Supervisor Gaeta dissenting, authorizing Management to enter into an agreement with the #1 ranked security services firm, was approved. (Motion passed 3-1)

▪ **Discussion: Authorization to Begin Pump Station Work**

****Discussion of this item resumed.****

Mr. Kloptosky recapped the proposals for the interior pump house repairs. PBM proposed \$40,000 and Citrus proposed \$36,192. He indicated that Citrus proposed an additional \$6,829 to change all of the piping and manifolds to “schedule 40” steel pipe, for a total project cost of \$43,023. PBM proposed an additional 7,000 to fabricate new piping and manifolds out of “schedule 40” steel, for a total project cost of \$47,000. Mr. Kloptosky questioned the contractors’ presumptions that building permits might not be necessary if the project only includes repairs.

Mr. Kloptosky detailed the proposed costs for building improvements and noted that Citrus proposed \$5,074 and PBM proposed \$15,000, which is \$10,000 more. He discussed the differences in the work proposed by each contractor and presented slides of the current building conditions. Mr. Kloptosky voiced his strong disagreement with Escalante’s belief that the building deterioration is originating from conditions inside the structure and spoke in favor of the more expensive scope of work proposed by PBM. He reiterated his opinion that Escalante and Citrus are misguided in their belief that the necessary work can be completed without obtaining building permits from the City of Palm Coast. Mr. Kloptosky supports selecting a single contractor to complete the interior and exterior repairs.

Mr. Kloptosky summarized that his opinion regarding the scope of work necessary for the building is very different but the scope of work for the interior is similar.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled that Escalante wants to use Citrus to complete the project because they contracted with them for maintenance. He voiced his surprise, as he believed that the Board was to be consulted prior to Escalante selecting a maintenance provider.

Regarding qualifications, Mr. Kloptosky voiced his opinion that PBM has “impressive” credentials and identified several of their clients. He stated that both contractors are capable but the question is what the Board wants for the pump house.

Supervisor Gaeta stated that she is not comfortable with a different company maintaining the District's pump house; therefore, she supports hiring PBM to complete the repair project, in spite of the higher cost.

Mr. Leahy asked if he will be afforded the opportunity to comment further. The Board replied affirmatively.

Supervisor Lawrence indicated that Mr. Kloptosky's presentation and discussion convinced him that PBM's proposed scope of work is what should be completed. He felt that PBM is "better versed" in this type of construction than Citrus because PBM works for cities, including the City of Palm Coast. Supervisor Lawrence favored selecting PBM to complete the work, as proposed.

Supervisor Chiodo agreed with proceeding with the scope of work proposed by PBM. He pointed out that the Board does not have a proposal from Citrus for the concrete block wall option because they were not asked to provide one; he would like to know Citrus' cost for that option so that the Board can make an "apples to apples" comparison of the proposals. Supervisor Chiodo noted that the District owns the pump house and, although the costs are shared with Escalante, the District should be "in charge" of maintenance.

Supervisor Davidson recalled that a goal of the Board has been to repair and replace the developer's inferior construction, landscaping, etc.; the Board does not want to cut corners. He stressed that the Board listens to Mr. Kloptosky's input regarding these types of matters. Supervisor Davidson stated that Citrus has not interacted with the City of Palm Coast Building Department; therefore, Citrus' belief that a building permit is not necessary might not be correct. Supervisor Davidson supported the selection of PBM.

Supervisor Davidson voiced his concern that Escalante selected Citrus as the pump house maintenance contractor and asked the terms of the contract and what Escalante has prepaid for maintenance. He wanted to know the actual work completed by Citrus.

Supervisor Gaeta acknowledged Supervisor Chiodo's suggestion that a proposal for the same scope of work should be obtained from Citrus; however, she believes that the Board should make a decision immediately.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that, while it is possible to hire different contractors for the two (2) phases of work, he has reservations about that approach, as he believes the work can be better

accomplished with a single contractor completing the work. Mr. Kloptosky felt that there would be too many challenges with different contractors trying to coordinate their work.

Mr. Leahy referred to slides presented by Mr. Kloptosky and explained that the rust shown is not related to water entering the building; it originates from within the structure. He indicated that Escalante believes that the structure was constructed in a way that led to the current conditions; Escalante is willing to regrade the land surrounding the edges of the building, to alleviate those issues. Mr. Leahy discussed other areas that have been impacted by water spraying out of the pumps, which are located inside the building. He stated that the pumps must always be maintained, including checking the seals.

Mr. Leahy clarified Mr. Kloptosky's misunderstanding that Escalante entered into a maintenance contract with Citrus, stating that Escalante hired Citrus to conduct maintenance on the building, because it was not previously completed; Escalante does not have a contract with Citrus.

Supervisor Gaeta referred to the rust issue and noted that humidity in the pump house can be causing rust, as well.

Mr. Snelling advised that Citrus performed an annual service on October 4, 2013 and provided a copy of the services provided. Citrus visits quarterly to inspect, change packings, etc. He noted that the skid plate has never been covered by water.

Mr. Kloptosky debated Escalante's belief that moisture is not entering from outside the building.

Mr. Snelling explained that the process involves reclaimed water, which has a high salt content and, when the pumps run, water comes out of them, inside the building.

Supervisor Davidson interjected his opinion that Mr. Snelling's statement justifies the need for a concrete wall.

Mr. Snelling advised that using concrete will act to "contain" the water against the pumps; the high-salt water will then have nowhere to go. There must be somewhere for the water that is inside to go.

Supervisor Lawrence asked Mr. Snelling if he is so sure of himself that, if the work is completed without a concrete block wall, Escalante will pay for 100% of the repairs, if the area "rusts out" again. Mr. Snelling replied affirmatively.

Mr. Snelling recalled that the original allegation was that the fertigation tanks were the cause of the problems; however, nothing was found to be wrong with the tanks. He has always maintained that the issue arose from the reclaimed water spraying from the pumps within the pump house.

Supervisor Lawrence asked if the water sprays as far as the fertigation tanks. Mr. Snelling indicated that it has. Supervisor Lawrence questioned why the fertigation tanks are not rusted. Mr. Snelling referred to a slide showing the wall that separates the pumps from the fertigation tank side; the water remains on the pump side of the structure; however, there was a previous instance where an exposed pipe caused flooding on the other side, as well.

Supervisor Gaeta stated that the Board must make its decision now. She recalled Mr. Kloptosky's indication that PBM worked with the City of Palm Coast. Supervisor Gaeta thanked Mr. Leahy and Mr. Snelling for their time and efforts; however, she believes that the Board is the party to make the decision and, although the repair and maintenance costs are shared with Escalante, the District should determine who is awarded the maintenance contract.

Mr. Leahy pointed out that Citrus completes pump house work throughout the U.S.; it is their business. He stated that Citrus is not a contractor; they build their own items, have their own pipes and resources. Mr. Leahy reiterated that Citrus' business is building pump houses, which is the subject of this debate.

Mr. Leahy stressed that Escalante is invested in the golf course and addressing things that were not addressed in the past. He noted that, unfortunately, the pump house was constructed a certain way; Escalante wants to restore it to the way it was when it was first contracted. Mr. Leahy pointed out that, if the Board wishes to recreate and reconstruct the building, as Supervisor Davidson previously suggested, then the investment becomes different and it might be an additional discussion where the District presents what it wants to Escalante. He reiterated that Escalante is trying to return the pump house to its original design. Mr. Leahy conceded that the Board will vote to do what it wants to do; however, Escalante chose Citrus because of their experience and past work. He emphasized that Citrus is highly experienced in this work.

Mr. Kloptosky acknowledged Mr. Leahy's past comment that Escalante has pump houses that do not have concrete and have metal extending to the floor; however, this pump house has a grade issue, which he believes causes the outside water to run towards the building. He contended that the grade cannot be changed.

Supervisor Davidson suggested that Mr. Leahy obtain an estimate from Citrus to install permanent concrete block and install new parts on the roof louver. Mr. Leahy agreed. Supervisor Davidson asked if a Citrus representative could give a presentation, at the next meeting. Mr. Leahy agreed.

Mr. Kloptosky asked for clarity regarding whether the Board officially decided against moving the tanks outside. Supervisor Davidson noted the types of tanks involved and voiced his misunderstanding of them; he no longer believes that moving the tanks is an essential part of the project.

Supervisor Chiodo stated that, while the Board understands that PBM's proposal is not the way the pump house was originally designed, it understands the issues with everything that the developer designed. Supervisor Lawrence indicated that the Board is trying to reach a viable solution.

The Board agreed to Supervisor Davidson's suggestion.

Supervisor Lawrence asked Mr. Leahy if he is comfortable with the District's current stance. Mr. Leahy advised that he is the middleman; he will obtain the estimate requested by Supervisor Davidson. Supervisor Lawrence suggested that an Escalante representative be available for the next meeting. Mr. Leahy indicated that Escalante can be available via telephone.

Mr. Kloptosky stated, for the record, that it does not matter to him who performs the work; it is great if Escalante wants to complete and maintain it. His goal is to ensure that the needed repairs are completed and the pump house is maintained so that the same issues do not arise in the future.

Supervisor Lawrence stressed that the Board must know the status of the maintenance contract and what rights the District has to enforce things, even if it is unilateral enforcement.

Mr. Clark noted that, if the Board truly wants to entertain assigning Escalante with maintenance responsibility, the District must get Escalante to respond to the contract that was sent to them several months ago. Mr. Leahy stated that he was not aware of a contract.

Mr. Kloptosky asked if PBM should also be invited to the next meeting to provide their opinion. Supervisor Davidson indicated that they can be invited but questioned the necessity, since the Board would be essentially asking them to complete the work that was proposed. Mr. Kloptosky felt that PBM should be invited to discuss the issues, in depth, and provide more

insight than he can. Supervisor Davidson stressed that he does not want to create a “dueling contractors” situation. Mr. Kloptosky voiced his opinion that the Board does so with all of the other bids. Supervisor Chiodo asked if the Board will have an “apples to apples” comparison.

Mr. Wrathell commended Mr. Kloptosky for clearly laying out the issues and for his recommendation. He stated that the Board can make its decision, after hearing from Citrus.

Supervisor Davidson provided Mr. Leahy with a copy of the agreement that District Counsel sent to Escalante.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

SUPERVISORS’ REQUESTS

Supervisor Davidson advised that the Firewise Mitigation project is commencing much quicker than anticipated; he will meet with the chief ranger and crew next week and asked for the Board’s authorization to serve as the District’s liaison and to execute documents on the District’s behalf, allowing the work on District property.

On MOTION by Supervisor Chiodo and seconded by Supervisor Lawrence, with all in favor, authorizing Supervisor Davidson to serve as the District’s liaison on Firewise matters and to execute documents, on the District’s behalf, including granting Firewise workers access to work on District property, was approved.


SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

There being nothing further to discuss, the meeting adjourned.

On MOTION by Supervisor Gaeta and seconded by Supervisor Chiodo, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 2:32 p.m.


Secretary/Assistant Secretary


Chair/Vice Chair