

**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, October 16, 2014** in the **Grand Haven Room, Grand Haven Village Center, 2001 Waterside Parkway, Palm Coast, Florida 32137** at **10:00 a.m.**

Present at the meeting were:

Dr. Stephen Davidson	Chair
Peter Chiodo	Vice Chair
Marie Gaeta (<i>via telephone</i>)	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
Mike Munson	District Engineer
Barry Kloptosky	Field Operations Manager
Robert Ross	Vesta/AMG
Roy Deary	Vesta/AMG
Ashley Higgins	Grand Haven CDD Office
Joanne Smith	Resident
Jim Gallo	Resident
Kevin Quinn	Resident
Vic Natiello	Resident
Bob Hopkins	Resident
Tom Byrne	Resident
Frank Benham	Resident
Ron Merlo	Resident
Charlie Greer	Resident
Amy Daigle	Resident
David Alfin	Resident
Rudy Lerro	Resident

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Mr. Woodville called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m., and noted, for the record, that Supervisors Davidson, Chiodo, Lawrence and Smith were present, in person. Supervisor Gaeta was 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)*

Mr. Jim Gallo, a resident, indicated that Supervisor Davidson provided him with an update on lavaya.

Mr. Gallo thanked the Board for their efforts with the ‘Meet the Candidates Night’, held last night. He expressed his opinion that the Palm Coast City Council needs “new blood”; the candidates were open to the District’s requests regarding the fence and permitting. Mr. Gallo noted disappointment with Councilman Lewis’ comments that were read to the audience, which proves that there are issues that need “mind changing” on the City Council. He supported Supervisor Chiodo’s position that Grand Haven must make its presence known at City Council meetings.

Mr. Gallo thanked Mr. Kloptosky for having the lights at Montague repaired.

Mr. Kevin Quinn, a resident, voiced his opinion that Bright House currently has a monopoly over the District’s services. He discussed AT&T’s capabilities. Mr. Quinn stated that an AT&T representative advised him that the fiber optic lines are in the streets and outside the boxes of everyone’s homes; the lines were laid but the service is not “on”. He asked who is responsible for this type of thing, if the CDD is not. Mr. Quinn stressed that competition of providers would benefit residents.

Mr. Quinn commended Mr. Ross and the amenity staff on the amenity aspect of their work. He questioned who decides the Café hours of operation and noted that residents want consistent operating hours, as they cannot figure out when the Café opens and when it closes.

Mr. Ross advised that the hours of operation are posted on the door; the Café is open Monday through Thursday from 11:00 a.m., to 9:00 p.m.; 11:00 a.m., to 11:00 p.m., on Friday

and 11:00 a.m., to 8:00 p.m., on Saturday. He acknowledged that the Café might close early, if there are no customers.

In response to a question, Supervisor Davidson explained that the Café operation is subcontracted and the CDD subcontracts operation of the amenities, including the Café. He stated that the Amenity Director recommends hours of operation, policies, etc., for the Board's consideration. Supervisor Davidson pointed out that, if the Café is open but there are no customers, it would not make sense to remain open.

▪ **37 Jasmine**

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

Mr. Clark recalled that the Board directed him to rework the proposal from Intervest Construction, Inc., (ICI), to add protections for the District. He presented the draft and explained that it was provided to Mr. Kloptosky and Mrs. Joanne Smith, the resident. Mr. Clark requested comments.

Supervisor Davidson expressed confusion because the heading in the draft letter appears to be the same as the ICI letter addressed to the District. Mr. Clark confirmed that he modified ICI's letter, including Items 8., 9., and 10., indemnifying the CDD from loss, damage or injury to persons, making ICI responsible for obtaining permits and indemnify the CDD from loss or damage to the property adjacent to Tract "E" at 37 Jasmine Drive. Mr. Clark also added a paragraph placing a time frame on the work.

Mr. Kloptosky expressed concern about Item 7, "CDD shall remove existing irrigation lines on CDD property and cap off at front connection location." and questioned if clearer language would be necessary, as the CDD has irrigation lines parallel to the street to water the common area property, which will not be removed or disconnected. Supervisor Davidson asked Mr. Kloptosky to provide verbiage. Mr. Kloptosky stated that he was unsure if the District has irrigation lines in the area of the repair work and did not know if it must be defined; however, he did not want confusion because the "front" lines would not be disconnected. Mr. Clark asked if the agreement should require ICI to repair the irrigation lines parallel to the street once the project is completed. Mr. Kloptosky replied "only if they damage them". Supervisor Davidson directed Mr. Kloptosky to provide his preferred verbiage to Mr. Clark.

Mr. Kloptosky referred to the last line of the last paragraph "CDD shall assume responsibility of all future maintenance of Tract "E". He questioned whether that statement

should remain in the agreement and asked if the statement includes work completed by ICI that might begin to erode because it was not stabilized properly. Mr. Kloptosky felt that the statement would make the District responsible, in the future, as opposed to ICI.

Mr. Clark indicated that this was the condition presented in ICI's agreement; ICI wants to be "done with it". He clarified that this provision was why he added that the District must sign-off on acceptance of the work.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that he would only be comfortable with the provision if ICI completes the work properly. Mr. Clark asked about compaction standards that could be included in the agreement. Mr. Kloptosky advised that there are many industry standards and he hoped ICI would follow them; however, the District would not be performing the work so he could only oversee it. Mr. Kloptosky wanted the Board to understand that, if the District agrees to the provision and erosion occurs, the District would be responsible for repair and/or maintenance. Discussion ensued regarding whether the District could require ICI to warranty the work for five years. Mr. Kloptosky reviewed photographs of stabilization work that he completed in Grand Haven.

Mr. Kloptosky referred to Item 5, "Stabilize with Erosion Cloth and install Bahia sod." He expressed his opinion that Bahia sod will not appear the same as other sod; it will grow tall and require maintenance. Mr. Kloptosky felt that, for aesthetics and better maintenance, St. Augustine should be installed extending to the former location of the retaining wall so that it will be watered by the overspray from the Smith's irrigation and be mowed by their landscaper. In response to a question, Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the District previously had irrigation in the area but it was disconnected. Mr. Clark asked Mrs. Smith if she agreed to accept responsibility for irrigating that area. Ms. Smith replied affirmatively. Mr. Clark confirmed that the Bahia sod could be changed to St. Augustine.

Mr. Clark indicated that he will enhance the verbiage regarding stabilization and require a one-year warranty.

On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Smith, with all in favor, the letter agreement between the District, Mrs. Smith and Intervest Construction, Inc., as modified, pursuant to the Board's discussion, was approved.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS****A. MINUTES**

- i. **Approval of September 4, 2014 Regular Meeting and Public Hearings Minutes**
- ii. **Approval of September 18, 2014 Community Workshop Minutes**

B. UNAUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

- i. **Approval of Unaudited Financial Statements as of September 30, 2014**

Mr. Woodville reported that assessment revenue collections were at 101%.

C. ANNUAL ENGINEER'S REPORT

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

On MOTION by Supervisor Davidson and seconded by Supervisor Gaeta, with all in favor, the Consent Agenda Items, as presented, were approved.

Supervisor Davison referred to the year-end report presented at the September 4, 2014 meeting, by Mr. Kloptosky, and asked that the capsule summary from those minutes, listing the CDD's accomplishments, be posted on the CDD website. Mr. Vic Natiello, a resident, recommended posting the summary on the bulletin boards, as well. Supervisor Lawrence suggested making copies available at the amenity facilities. Mr. Bob Hopkins, a resident, stated that he would prefer a list that included whether each accomplishment was completed over or under budget. Supervisor Davidson stressed that the important part is what was accomplished all around the community; residents allege that the District only completes work on Front Street, which is not true. Supervisor Davidson agreed that the summary list could include a statement at the end indicating that the projects were completed under budget.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**STAFF REPORTS****A. District Engineer**

Mr. Munson distributed revised concepts for The Village Center parking lot. He indicated that, after meeting with the City of Palm Coast, regarding landscaping and buffer requirements, it was determined that the District must install a 20' buffer off of any roadway, which pushed the

parking area to the west. Mr. Munson stated that the revised plan includes 24 parking spaces, with two being handicapped spaces. He noted that the shift west would probably result in not enough room for a bocce ball court, in the location previously discussed. Regarding the number of “lost” spaces, Mr. Munson indicated that one plan had 27 spaces and another had 30.

Supervisor Davidson asked who attended the meeting on behalf of the City. Mr. Munson advised that about ten people from the City were in attendance but Mr. Ray Tyner was not one of them. Mr. Munson and Mr. Sullivan met with Mr. Tyner briefly in the hall, after the meeting.

In response to Supervisor Chiodo’s question, Mr. Munson confirmed that the District’s landscaping is consistent with the City’s requirements.

Mr. Munson advised that he spoke with the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) a few weeks ago. The SJRWMD is reviewing their files to determine the capacity for the expansion. Supervisor Lawrence asked for an explanation of capacity. Mr. Munson explained that the stormwater capacity into the pond west or southwest of the parking lot must be determined.

Mr. Munson reviewed a slide depicting the wetland and buffer areas and explained that those are conservation areas.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that this discussion segues into the pickleball court discussion because the City tried to combine the parking lot and pickleball court matters and not issue a permit for the pickleball court until everything is completed for the parking lot. He felt that the City was willing to consider the matters separately.

Mr. Munson concurred and explained that past plans showed a tennis court in that area but it was never built; therefore, it can be justified that this proposed impervious area could be used for the pickleball court.

Regarding the wetland buffer and the drain line, Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the area was previously marked out; the original sketch had the line too far east; however, it can be shifted closer to the sidewalk, which would clear the drain and buffer and should not be an issue. Once this is completed, the District can apply for a building permit, which would be a much simpler process than a zoning process.

Mr. Munson advised that the City wants the District to include tree removal, landscaping and irrigation for the pickleball court in the parking lot expansion plans. Mr. Kloptosky felt that information was in conflict with the direction he received from Mr. Bill Hoover and asked if the

City changed its mind. Mr. Kloptosky stated that he was told that the District must submit a landscape plan, along with the fencing diagram, for the pickleball court because the City would require landscaping, due to the fence.

Mr. Munson indicated that the City seems to mean if landscaping will occur, then the landscaping and irrigation plans should be reflected on the parking lot plans. He recommended not worrying about it now.

Mr. Kloptosky offered to provide a conceptual landscaping plan for the pickleball court, from Austin Outdoor (Austin), as it will be similar to the landscaping around the tennis courts. He noted that the irrigation system would be in the way so it must be disconnected and relocated, for which the City typically requires a drawing. Mr. Kloptosky felt that, if the District provides a drawing, the pickleball court landscaping could be added to that drawing, to keep it separate from the parking lot plans. He noted that two trees might need to be removed.

Mr. Munson pointed out that the City is only agreeing to issue a building permit for the parking lot if the District officially agrees to include the pickleball court information on the future site plan for the parking lot. Supervisor Davidson asked Mr. Munson to obtain written confirmation of the City's position.

Mr. Kloptosky detailed his past difficulties with the City on various projects.

Supervisor Davidson felt that the best plan of action was for Mr. Kloptosky to continue working with Mr. Tyner on this project. Mr. Kloptosky noted that Mr. Tyner handed the project off to Mr. Hoover. Supervisor Davidson indicated that he and Mr. Kloptosky must speak to Mr. Tyner to determine if he can streamline the process to avoid doing other things or at least make the commitment that one project would not be tied to the other. Mr. Kloptosky advised that these matters transpired over the past few days and he did not have the opportunity to update Mr. Munson.

The Board concurred with Supervisor Davidson's recommendation that the projects be separated and that Mr. Kloptosky work directly with Mr. Tyner.

Mr. Munson indicated that, per City code, two islands would be added to the Creekside parking lot. The SJRWMD advised that the stormwater capacity was sufficient; he will submit an "e-permit" and the plans.

Supervisor Lawrence asked if there were stormwater capacity concerns regarding the pickleball court. Mr. Munson replied no, provided the SJRWMD buys into the concept of the tennis court that was not built.

B. Amenity Manager

Regarding croquet, Mr. Ross advised that everyone seems to be playing fair; no one has reserved the open time slots. He concluded that it is “business as usual”. In response to Supervisor Davidson’s question, Mr. Ross confirmed that the Croquet Club members are signing in when they play.

Mr. Ross reported that the ‘Meet the Candidates Night’, last night, was successful and the parking lot was extremely busy. It was noted that 90 people attended the event, not including the candidates and their entourages. Mr. Ross pointed out that the speaker system only works inside the room; therefore, if there are more than 120 attendees, the excess would not be able to hear.

Supervisor Chiodo pointed out that he did not realize that option would be given up with the new speaker and microphone system. Supervisor Lawrence asked what would be necessary for the new system to broadcast outside of the room. Mr. Ross was unsure and recommended having the contractor review the system. Mr. Kloptosky indicated an issue with an amplifier. Supervisor Davidson directed Mr. Kloptosky to ask the contractor if the system could be wired to have sound outside the room.

Supervisor Gaeta asked Mr. Ross if the Café tested having breakfast or brunch on Sunday or during the week.

Mr. Ross advised that breakfast and brunch were tried various times but were unsuccessful. He noted that the Café recently reopened on Saturdays, which is working well; however, Sunday has never been successful.

Supervisor Gaeta suggested another trial run, in the future, and sending an e-blast to the community. Supervisor Lawrence confirmed that the Café tried serving breakfast many times but there was never enough participation.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled the Board’s request for Mr. Ross to monitor the parking lot. He presented photographs of the parking issues on Wednesday, when vehicles were illegally parked. Mr. Kloptosky noted that water aerobics did not meet that day and the tennis courts were closed, due to rain; however, the parking lot remained very busy.

In response to a question, Mr. Ross indicated that Move to Music was held on Wednesday; the parking issues would have been worse if water aerobics and tennis would have been held, as well.

Supervisor Lawrence asked Mr. Clark whether the District is liable if people are illegally parked and an accident occurs. Mr. Clark indicated that a lawsuit can be filed for \$400. Supervisor Davidson asked if the District has culpability if it has “No Illegal Parking” signage and fails to tow illegally parked vehicles. Mr. Clark preferred that the District refrain from installing signage if there is no intention of enforcement. Supervisor Davidson conceded that the District could not enforce it because of the number of vehicles that park illegally and the resident reaction.

Mr. Natiello asked if Mr. Kloptosky photographed the other parking lot on the same day. Mr. Kloptosky replied no. Mr. Natiello asked why illegally parked people are not asked to park in the other lot, as there is usually plenty of space. Mr. Ross indicated that people do not want to walk from the other parking lot. Supervisor Lawrence recommended that the parking status update include both parking lots. Mr. Ross confirmed that both parking lots are full to capacity on Wednesday and Friday. Supervisor Davidson directed Mr. Ross and Mr. Kloptosky to include photographs of both parking lots in future updates.

Regarding the hours of operation for the Café, Mr. Ross indicated that the current hours seem to satisfy the community. He acknowledged that the Café might close early, on occasion, if business is slow. Mr. Ross advised that Fridays are the busiest day of the week. He felt that there was no need to change the hours.

Supervisor Smith felt that the Café is being run efficiently. Supervisor Lawrence noted that the Amenity Manager is trying to serve the community and could expand the hours, if demand merits it.

Mr. Quinn felt that, for the convenience of residents, it would be nice if the Café was open on Sunday but he understood the fiduciary decision.

Supervisor Lawrence recommended advertising the Café hours frequently and including them in an e-blast.

C. Field/Operations Manager

Mr. Kloptosky reported a misconception around the community that his office is blocking AT&T U-Verse® (AT&T) from servicing Grand Haven. He stated that the District has no control over utility easements; the utility companies come and go at will.

Ms. Higgins indicated that she spoke to an AT&T representative who advised her that the fiber optic cables are in the community but they are not turned on; it is the decision of AT&T regarding whether it would be profitable enough to activate the lines to offer U-Verse® service. She noted that she was unable to speak to anyone higher up at AT&T.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled that Mr. Quinn was advised by the local AT&T store that Grand Haven is blocking the U-Verse® service so he had Ms. Kane contact the store. Ms. Kane informed the store manager that Grand Haven has no control over the lines and the manager agreed to instruct his technicians to stop reporting inaccurate information.

Supervisor Smith reported that, as a resident, he visited the AT&T store and requested U-Verse® service. The store accepted his application, entered it into their computer, called the technical department and was told that service to the area was not turned on. He asked the store who he could speak to and provide with a petition but the store personnel did not know. Supervisor Smith surmised that it is a retail store and its scope of service is to sell products. He suggested that a resident volunteer pursue this matter and locate a contact person within AT&T to whom the District can present a resident petition requesting service.

Supervisor Lawrence reiterated that it is AT&T's decision whether to activate the lines and not the District or the City.

Supervisor Davidson expressed his doubt that the AT&T trunk line fiber optic cables are actually installed along Colbert Lane. So, even if the individual houses and streets contain fiber optic lines, there would be nothing to connect them to. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the person Ms. Higgins spoke to confirmed that the cables were installed at the houses. Supervisor Davidson reiterated that he is not convinced that main trunk lines are installed on Colbert Lane, which would be necessary to bring services into the District.

Mr. Quinn advised that he saw the fiber optic cables and explained that the telephone boxes near the electrical boxes contain the cables. He explained how cable systems operate. Mr. Quinn noted that Bright House offers faster internet service for an additional fee; Bright House actually restricts internet access through its cable box. Other options, such as U-Verse®, do not work the same way; customers do not pay more for faster service. He felt that Grand Haven

would be the perfect candidate for the wireless internet, at no additional cost to residents, other than the initial set up charges. Mr. Quinn noted periodic cell phone service issues and recalled that AT&T wanted to install a cell tower, which could generate revenue for the District. He surmised that the fiber optic cable is installed throughout Grand Haven; only a small item that turns on the service is missing. He believed that competition within the community would benefit residents. Mr. Quinn discussed other local communities that have U-Verse[®] service.

Supervisor Davidson discussed the previous cable system in Grand Haven and noted that, historically, AT&T had DSL lines and voiced his opinion that Colbert Lane does not have a fiber optic cable trunk line that would feed into Grand Haven; therefore, it would not matter whether fiber optic lines run to homes. He stressed that the District needs to speak to someone at AT&T who is familiar with the fiber optic trunk lines in the area to answer the question of whether fiber optic capabilities exist on Colbert Land to feed into Grand Haven. Supervisor Davidson indicated that, if the District can confirm that this is simply a financial decision of AT&T, residents could petition AT&T to encourage them to provide the service.

Supervisor Davidson suggested that Mr. Quinn and Mr. Bob Hopkins, a resident, coordinate to find someone to speak with at AT&T. Supervisor Chiodo believed that retired AT&T executives reside in Grand Haven and recommended identifying them and seeking assistance. Supervisor Davidson stressed that the District's questions must be answered by someone "higher up" with AT&T.

Regarding the Marlin Drive pump house, Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the City issued the permit to the general contractor, PBM Constructors, Inc., (PBM), and permits were issued for the roof and electrician. He stated that PBM will commence work on October 20; the time frame will be two weeks to install plus one week to install the new roof.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that, on Monday, October 13, flooding on Marlin Drive was reported by a resident. He investigated and found that the reuse pond overflowed; the City had a technician attend to the issue. Mr. Kloptosky recalled that, due to a lightning strike, the City's transponders within the pump house were not working; the City made a temporary repair but the City has not been using the system to fill the reuse pond. The City was manually operating the valves to fill the pond and inadvertently left them on, which caused the overflow. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he is seeking a credit for the water that overflowed and suggested that Management work with the water utility. He confirmed that the City is aware of what caused the

overflow and should offer a credit to the District. Discussion ensued regarding how to calculate the loss.

Mr. Kloptosky reported incidents of verbal resident abuse of CDD office staff related to deactivation of smart amenity access cards (SAACs). He noted that one resident posted about the incident on the neighborhood blog. Mr. Kloptosky felt that the abusive behavior is unacceptable and must stop.

Supervisor Chiodo pointed out that the District has rules regarding resident abuse of staff and questioned why those rules are not being enforced. Mr. Kloptosky stated that warnings could be issued, if the Board wants them to be issued. Supervisor Lawrence agreed with Supervisor Chiodo; the District must follow through. Mr. Kloptosky commended the office staff for their handling of the situations and noted that the CDD's policy was recited to the resident. In response to a question, Mr. Kloptosky offered to show the video evidence to the Board.

Supervisor Davidson asked Mr. Clark if the videos could be viewed during a public meeting so that residents could observe the CDD office staff's behavior in response to residents who are abusive, prior to the Board determining how to proceed.

Mr. Clark confirmed that the videos can be shown at a public meeting but questioned whether they should be shown. He recalled that the procedure was for the Chair, Field Operations Manager or District Manager to meet with the individual to give a verbal warning.

In response to Mr. Clark's question, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that he did not interact with either individual this time; however, he met with one of them in the past regarding similar situations.

Mr. Clark felt that, if available, Mr. Kloptosky should intervene and, if the issue cannot be resolved at that time, the person should be advised to attend a meeting to state their problem. He noted that the person should be informed that, if they speak before the Board and make accusations about the office staff, the video would be played during the meeting.

Supervisor Davidson recommended that Mr. Kloptosky and Mr. Woodville meet, individually, with those residents to discuss the situation.

Supervisor Lawrence noted that one person appears to be a repeat offender, despite prior counseling. Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that, previously, he and Mr. McGaffney, during his tenure as the Amenity Manager, spoke with the individual. Supervisor Lawrence asked what happens with a repeat offense, following the verbal warning. Supervisor Chiodo stated that, on the

second offense, the matter is brought to the Board and the person faces possible suspension of their amenity privileges. Mr. Clark felt that there is a one-year time frame and advised Mr. Kloptosky to treat this as a new offense and start the process with a verbal warning.

Supervisor Chiodo recommended that, going forward, Mr. Kloptosky immediately contact the individual to issue the verbal warning and inform them of the District's policy. Mr. Kloptosky stated that he will speak with both individuals.

Mr. Quinn recalled when the CDD enacted the system and questioned the legal standing for the District to demand a current vehicle registration and asked if the CDD is running the license plate numbers.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that the CDD is not running the plates. He recalled that, in the past, thousands of gate access devices (GADs) were enabled that were not tied to vehicles and former residents gave their GADs away when they moved, etc.; requiring a copy of the vehicle's current registration, enables the District to track the number of vehicles and who still lives in the community.

Mr. Quinn asked what action the District takes if someone's registration is expired.

Ms. Higgins indicated that requiring a copy of the current vehicle registration shows continued ownership of the vehicle. She explained that, if a vehicle is no longer owned by the resident, the GAD should be deactivated to avoid the person giving it to someone else to use.

Mr. Quinn pointed out that if a vehicle is sold in January but the registration does not expire until December, the GAD could be used until then. Ms. Higgins concurred but noted that most residents notify the office when they sell or change vehicles.

Mr. Kloptosky discussed the circumstances of one of the abusive residents who sold one home in Grand Haven but moved to another home within Grand Haven; when the new owner was issued GADs, the old GADs were deactivated. He explained that, although the person failed to inform the office that the property was sold or that he moved to another Grand Haven home, he was upset that his old GADs were deactivated and that he was required to obtain new GADs.

Supervisor Davidson advised that the current vehicle registration requirement also improves safety and increases property values in Grand Haven.

Mr. Hopkins recalled that, when the new system was implemented, the Board made the Field Operations Manager responsible for resolving issues before they come to the Board; however, it appears that the Field Operations Manager is not doing so. He indicated that the first

step should be the Field Operations Manager speaking to the individuals but Mr. Kloptosky's presentation of the issues today appears to be the first step.

Mr. Kloptosky reported the occurrence of several washouts, throughout the community, due to severe rains, over the past month. He advised that at least three washouts were on coquina paths, which were repaired by Austin. Mr. Kloptosky presented photographs of a washout in Wild Oaks; S.E. Cline Construction, Inc., (Cline) quoted \$3,073.70 to repair the washout, which he felt was a fair price. Discussion ensued regarding what can be done to avoid future washouts in that location.

Mr. Kloptosky reviewed an erosion issue at the Jasmine Drive footbridge entrance and recalled a repair to that area several years ago. He recommended that the same type of repair be completed for the washout at the Clubhouse Pier; Cline will provide a proposal. Mr. Kloptosky stated that the washout repairs are within his spending limits; however, they are being presented today to inform the Board of the situation. In response to Supervisor Chiodo's question regarding whether the conditions developed over time, Mr. Kloptosky voiced his opinion that they were the result of several recent major rainfalls, as the issues were not observed prior to the storms. He noted a washout issue on the path from East Lake to River Bend; Cline quoted \$2,226.40 but Austin was willing to fill and compact the area under the walkway and top it with soil, at no charge to the District. A new grate is needed on the drain at Heron Court and Flamingo and the drain must be cleaned; Cline proposed \$700 plus the clean out costs. Mr. Kloptosky is seeking a proposal for a heavier, custom grate.

Mr. Kloptosky noted a sink hole in the road at Scarlet Oaks Circle, in Wild Oaks. He noted that barricades were placed in the area but not by the CDD or the City; he speculated that the developer might have placed them, as it is in front of a model home. Mr. Kloptosky discussed previous sink holes in the community and felt that this sink hole could be related to a soft drain that was never capped.

Mr. Kloptosky referred to the streetlight outage at Center Park and advised that new wiring was required; the issue was resolved but required a new conduit line and wiring under the newly installed pavers. Discussion ensued regarding the original conduit and wiring. He noted that the paving contractor was accommodating and removed and replaced the pavers, for only \$400.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled residents that attended the last meeting and requested installation of a fence, at the South Gate, to block the backyard of their home. He met on site with Ms. Louise Leister, District Horticulturalist, to determine landscaping options. Mr. Kloptosky reviewed photographs of the area and expressed his opinion that the break in landscaping was because it was a fire entrance. In response to Supervisor Davidson's question, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that it was a preexisting condition; it existed when the resident purchased the property. He reported that the Fire Marshal was not aware of any restrictions against filling in the open area with landscaping; however, Ms. Leister preferred to leave it as a fire break. Mr. Kloptosky stated that Ms. Leister agreed to plant a hedge in the open space, which should solve the view issues.

Regarding the croquet court resurfacing project, Mr. Kloptosky advised that he asked the contractors if they were willing to hold their pricing until spring; both Austin and Precision Land Grading, Inc., (Precision) were agreeable. He noted that both also agreed that postponing the project until spring was the correct decision. Revised proposals were distributed for resurfacing and consulting services to clarify the Board's questions from the last meeting.

Supervisor Davison referred to the consulting proposal and pointed out that the court is a croquet court, not a "golf chipping facility"; the proposal must be corrected.

Supervisor Gaeta recalled that Precision's original consulting services proposal was \$5,000 and questioned if the cost is \$6,000, as listed in the revised proposal. She asked if the \$750 quote from Nu-Green by Corey, Inc., (Nu-Green) for aerification services was still accurate. Supervisor Gaeta asked if the amount for aerification, to be backed out of Austin's contract, was determined.

Mr. Kloptosky advised that Austin's aerification cost was \$375. Nu-Green's cost was \$700 for aerification and air injection services, with the aerification portion being \$300 but Austin's price included The Village Center court, as well. Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the aerification costs would be essentially the same but Austin does not offer air injection services, which were \$400 in Nu-Green's proposal. In response to a question, Mr. Kloptosky conceded that he was not sure if the Nu-Green proposal also included The Village Center court. Supervisor Davidson asked for a quote from Nu-Green that includes aerification of the Creekside and The Village Center courts, along with an estimate of the downtime when aerification and air

injections are performed. Responding to Supervisor Gaeta's question, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that \$375 should be backed out of Austin's contract.

Supervisor Chiodo recalled the Board's opinion that, since Precision will warranty the court for one year, the District should not pay for the first year of consulting services.

Mr. Kloptosky noted a misunderstanding regarding the consulting services and the warranty. He clarified that Precision is responsible for the turf, during the first year, so they will inspect the turf, at no charge, during the first year but will not prepare reports or coordinate with the District's maintenance contractor. Mr. Kloptosky explained that the consulting service is more in depth, including preparation of a report and meeting with the maintenance provider.

Supervisor Chiodo expressed an issue because it behooves Precision to inform the District of what must change, if there are issues during the first year. Supervisor Lawrence recalled that the Board discussed having the Superintendent for Escalante Golf (Escalante) inspect the court and felt that it would not be necessary to hire Precision for consulting services, during the first year. Mr. Kloptosky concurred that consulting services are probably not needed, during the first year. Supervisor Chiodo suggested advising Precision that providing the District with information related to his site visits, during the first year, could serve as a "proving ground" for whether the consulting services would be beneficial to the District in future years. Mr. Kloptosky reiterated his opinion that there should be no problem with not hiring a consultant, for the first year. Supervisor Gaeta felt that Precision planned to provide oversight, during the first year, to ensure that the turf was properly cut and that Precision would act as a liaison to the Board regarding Austin's maintenance of the court. Mr. Kloptosky expressed his opinion that Austin knows enough about court maintenance to determine if there is an issue; he reaffirmed his hesitancy to hire a consultant for at least one year. Supervisor Lawrence recalled a comment that Austin was not mowing the court correctly. Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that Austin does not perform the same type of mowing that Precision recommended; however, he was unsure about the difference between the types of mowing. Supervisor Lawrence asked that Precision provide further explanation of the mowing technique because the Board should know if Austin's mowing is detrimental to the longevity of the court. The Board requested that Precision attend the next workshop.

Regarding a previous recommendation to oversee the court, Mr. Kloptosky advised that the Austin contract provides for overseeding; Austin will oversee the Creekside court in

November, at no extra cost to the District. Supervisor Lawrence asked if it included a robust overseeding. Mr. Kloptosky replied affirmatively, stating that he confirmed with Austin that they will oversee with the product recommended. Mr. Woodville asked which court or courts it included. Mr. Kloptosky believed that Austin will oversee both the Creekside and The Village Center courts.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the Board must select a contractor for the croquet court project. Supervisor Davidson recalled the Board's consensus to hire Precision.

On MOTION by Supervisor Smith and seconded by Supervisor Gaeta, with all in favor, the Precision Land Grading, Inc., proposal to renovate the Creekside croquet court, including installation of new turf and removal and reinstallation of the hedge, in a not-to-exceed amount of \$36,000, was approved.

****The meeting recessed at 12:03 p.m.****

****The meeting reconvened at 12:15 p.m.****

▪ **Discussion: Political Candidates Meet & Greet [SD]**

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

Supervisor Davidson thanked Mr. Tom Byrne, a resident, for his efforts organizing and moderating the 'Meet the Candidates Night' event; it was very successful. He felt pleased that candidates addressed the questions posed by the Board, as the District's strategy was to pose the questions so that the candidates could not deny knowing about the District's concerns.

Regarding the question about the District's issues with permitting and the City's Building Department, Supervisor Davidson indicated that all of the candidates, with the exception of one incumbent candidate, were in agreement with the District's position that "something is wrong" and must be "fixed". He stated that the incumbent believed that the City employees "are all professionals and everyone is doing a great job".

In response to the District's question about installation of a fence along Waterfront Road, Supervisor Davidson reported that two were supportive; one stated that the City was marketing Waterfront Park as a tourist destination so, if the City "floods" the park with visitors, it should be the City's responsibility to protect Grand Haven residents from the park visitors. He reported the incumbent candidate's position that the City would not install a fence in that location.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that 90 people attended the event and parking was tight. He recalled that audio was not available outside of the meeting room.

Mr. Byrne thanked the CDD office staff for their assistance organizing the event.

Supervisor Davidson advised that an uninvited County Commission candidate attended. Mr. Byrne noted that, based on the response from City Council candidates, he contacted the County Commission candidates and, eventually, all requested to attend the October 15 event; however, due to the number of candidates already attending, he asked the County Commission candidates not to attend.

In response to Supervisor Davidson's question, Mr. Byrne stated that it was too late to organize another event.

Mr. Woodville recalled one of the candidates discussed permitting and acknowledged that the permitting process is subjective. The candidate stated that the codes exist but the City seems to add subjectivity to the codes.

Supervisor Lawrence recommended that, for future events, candidates should only be given three minutes to speak, rather than ten minutes, which would leave more time for questions. Mr. Byrne confirmed that all of the candidates liked the format that was used.

Supervisor Gaeta advised of an article in today's Observer, reporting that \$1.1 million of the money to build the new City Hall will come from the City's "Building Fund Access Permit" revenues, which could explain the reason for the current permitting process.

Supervisor Davison indicated that requests were received for two political candidate Meet & Greet events; one occurred. Supervisor Davidson explained that, for a previous political event, a resident rented the Grand Haven Room and Grand Haven residents attended the event; there was no outside advertisement. Supervisor Smith clarified that the candidate sent email invitations to individual residents.

Supervisor Davidson advised that, for another event, the resident wanted to open the event to nonresidents and advertise but that event did not occur.

Mr. Ross explained that his main concerns about political events would be parking and nonresidents attending the event. Regarding an upcoming event, Mr. Ross voiced his understanding that emails would be sent to only Grand Haven residents. He confirmed that some nonresidents might attend but the event is not being promoted or advertised in public media.

Supervisor Chiodo indicated that he is co-sponsoring the event with another resident. He stated that invitations will only be sent to Republican party members residing in Grand Haven; however, some nonresident friends might attend, as well. Supervisor Chiodo confirmed that the room was rented for the event and the food and beverages will be catered by AMG.

Regarding the anticipated attendance, Mr. Ross expected 70 attendees. Supervisor Chiodo felt that the number could exceed 70.

Supervisor Davidson advised that the District should develop parameters for these types of events. He summarized that this is a political event, sponsored by residents, for residents and the room is rented, with food and beverages provided by AMG. Supervisor Davidson noted that there must be an awareness of the room's capacity, the anticipated number of attendees and potential parking issues.

Supervisor Chiodo confirmed that he and his co-host are sensitive to these issues and advised Mr. Ross that, if an additional facilitator was necessary, the person would be compensated.

Supervisor Davidson asked Mr. Ross to draft these parameters so that they can be documented and memorialized by the Board, for use for future events. Supervisor Lawrence recommended passing it as a CDD Board policy. It was noted that only one facilitator was on duty last night, following the 'Meet the Candidates Night' event, to put away all of the chairs, etc.

Supervisor Chiodo pointed out that the upcoming event was the result of Congressman Ron DeSantis' request to hold an event at Grand Haven, which is representative of Grand Haven's influence in the community.

D. District Counsel

i. Cullis Transactions

Mr. Clark recalled that the Board directed him to send a letter to the City stating the District's position regarding the Tract K conservation easement. He presented the City's response which noted that no formal application submittal for Tract K was received. Mr. Clark stated his belief that Mr. Jim Cullis, of Grand Haven Realty, is prepared to execute the District's contract without the expanded area. He advised that no further Board action is necessary.

ii. 37 Jasmine

This item was discussed during the Third Order of Business.

iii. Request to Lift Trespass Notice

Mr. Clark reported that the resident was not in attendance. Supervisor Davidson advised that he contacted the Sheriff's Office for a report on the person requesting that the trespass notice be lifted and indicated that he received a "clear" report; there are no current outstanding issues related to this person. Mr. Clark indicated that he will invite the individual to attend a future meeting.

E. District Manager

Mr. Woodville provided an update regarding the SJRWMD outstanding permit compliance items. He stated that the SJRWMD continues its review of the matters, as they relate to the original development and permitting.

Mr. Woodville indicated that he sent a follow up email to the City regarding the refund for the traffic signal; however, no response was received. The refund would be approximately \$60,000 plus interest. Mr. Woodville indicated that the request was sent to several City employees. Supervisor Davidson recommended that the request be sent to the Palm Coast City Manager, Mr. Jim Langdon. Mr. Clark asked if Mr. Woodville received a copy of the original bond. Mr. Woodville replied no, the only documentation he located was a requisition of payment to the City. Supervisor Davidson questioned whether the requisition was sufficient evidence. Mr. Clark pointed out that the bond may have contained language whereby it could have expired; for the City to ignore the request is not a good response. Mr. Woodville clarified that the City did not indicate that they would not release the bond; rather, the City stated that, due to the age of this, it would take time to complete the research. Mr. Woodville speculated that the delay could be related to the Cullis development and whether a new signal might be necessary. Mr. Clark offered to make a public records request for a copy of the bond documents, which will require the City to respond.

Supervisor Davidson questioned if the bond was with the County or the City. It is believed that the bond was with the County. Supervisor Davidson pointed out that, if the District was contacting the City but it is a County matter, the wrong entity was contacted. Mr. Woodville recalled that the bond requisition was for the City of Palm Coast, which was why the City was contacted. Supervisor Lawrence believed that the District dealt with the City because the City took over the DRI in 2001.

The Board directed Mr. Clark to proceed with a public records request.

i. Upcoming Regular Meeting/Community Workshop

○ **COMMUNITY WORKSHOP**

- **November 6, 2014 at 10:00 A.M.**

The next workshop is scheduled for November 6, 2014 at 10:00 a.m., at this location. Supervisor Chiodo noted that he will be unable to attend this workshop.

○ **REGULAR MEETING**

- **November 20, 2014 at 10:00 A.M.**

The next meeting is scheduled for November 20, 2014 at 10:00 a.m., at this location.

Regarding whether a workshop will be necessary, Supervisor Gaeta recalled the Board's request that Precision attend the next workshop. Supervisor Chiodo pointed out that the District will not engage Precision until April; therefore, it was not an immediate issue. Supervisor Lawrence questioned if there are sufficient items to merit a workshop in November.

Supervisor Davidson directed the Board to funnel items to the District Manager and, if the level is sparse, the workshop could be cancelled. In response to Supervisor Davidson's question, Mr. Woodville confirmed that the workshop could be cancelled later; a decision today was not necessary. Mr. Woodville explained that, in other CDDs, the District Manager would assemble workshop items, present them to the Chair and the Chair would make the decision regarding whether to hold the workshop.

Supervisor Gaeta suggested that a workshop be held for two hours, on November 20, prior to the Regular Meeting. In response to a comment regarding advertising requirements, Mr. Clark confirmed that anything that the Board does in a meeting can be done at a workshop; therefore, it would not be necessary to advertise.

Discussion ensued regarding the December workshop and meeting dates. Mr. McGaffney advised that a workshop is scheduled for December 4 and a meeting is scheduled for December 18. It was noted that, historically, the December workshop was cancelled. Mr. McGaffney confirmed that it is on the schedule.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

BUSINESS ITEMS

A. Continued Discussion: Proposed Amendments to Rules, Policies and Fees for All Amenity Facilities [BOS]

Discussion ensued regarding setting a public hearing date. The Board agreed to hold the public hearing at the January meeting. Mr. Clark indicated the public hearing should be advertised December 15 and 16 and the version to be considered at the public hearing must be on file at the District Manager's office. Supervisors were directed to submit all draft changes by the November 20 meeting.

B. Continued Discussion: CDD Check In at Both Amenity Centers [TL]

Supervisor Lawrence indicated that he heard from two residents that nonresidents are still getting through to use the amenity facilities. He asked if other Board Members heard similar comments. Supervisor Lawrence felt that, with the new procedures, the District essentially stopped nonresidents from using the facilities.

Mr. Ross advised that, over several months, no nonresidents have been discovered using the facilities.

Supervisor Lawrence stated that the allegation was that nonresidents who are not spot-checked are using the facilities. He asked Mr. Ross if any residents relayed their concerns to him.

Mr. Ross stated that a former resident who played tennis was discovered, once Supervisor Gaeta provided him with the name; he believed that the current system is working. Mr. Kloptosky noted that random scanning increased recently but no one was discovered, other than the one tennis player. Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that he heard similar allegations but when checked, no one was discovered; he speculated that it has become a hearsay situation.

Supervisor Davidson noted that one reason for implementing the system was to alleviate unremitted wear and tear on the tennis courts. He pointed out that, since implementing the scanning system, "gate and amenity access" revenues are 177% above budget and "tennis" revenues are up 205%.

Supervisor Smith did not hear anything and did not favor 100% scanning.

C. Discussion: Pier Rental Fee and Capacity

This item was discussed following Item 6.G.

D. Discussion: Political Candidates Meet & Greet [SD]

This item was discussed during the Fifth Order of Business.

E. Discussion: Removal of Stop Sign at 9 Front Street [TL]

Supervisor Lawrence discussed the history of the stop sign and pointed out that the District might be liable if there was an accident because the street does not have stop bars.

Supervisor Lawrence indicated that residents signed a petition to have the stop sign removed; he expressed his support for removal.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled the reason the sign was installed. He noted that at least one resident was against removing the sign because of residents who still speed. Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that stop bars could be installed, if the sign remained. He recalled that, when the stop sign was installed, the Board essentially acknowledged the potential danger and questioned if the District would be liable for an accident, if the sign was removed.

Mr. Clark indicated that anyone can file a lawsuit, regardless of the situation.

Supervisor Gaeta surmised that the safety issue remains.

Mr. Clark stated that he was more concerned about the existence of a stop sign that was not visible and did not have a stop bar than about removing the sign. He felt that the District should either remove the sign or make it visible and install stop bars, so that the sign is in compliance.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that stop bars could be installed. Regarding visibility, one sign is visible but a tree blocks the other; however, the tree could be trimmed.

Supervisor Lawrence suggested installation of speed bumps. Supervisor Chiodo did not favor speed bumps and voiced his opinion that a stop sign is needed in that location. Supervisor Gaeta concurred with Supervisor Chiodo.

Regarding potential liability, Supervisor Davidson posed the question whether the District faces a potential claims bill process, "if a known safety issue is brought, on the part of residents, and the Board reacts by putting up a device to try and control that, and then, because other residents do not like the aesthetic look of it, or feel that no one is paying attention to it, the Board removes it and there is a crash, with a fatality".

Mr. Clark stated that the Board has discretion on those matters and is entitled to make a decision regarding whether to have the device. He noted that the situation is further confused by the question of whether the District even has authority to install traffic control devices. Mr. Clark recalled that the Board chose to install the stop sign but acknowledged that it might be difficult to issue tickets, if the stop sign does not adhere to the protocol of a sign that the City or

County would install. He thought, if the District removed the sign, it would win a lawsuit. Mr. Clark advised that, if the sign remains, it should be “the right way”.

Discussion ensued regarding who should inspect the sign. Mr. Clark indicated that the sign is regulated by the Department of Transportation (DOT) and the decision about whether to install traffic control devices on the streets is under the jurisdiction of the City or County. Supervisor Davidson directed Mr. Kloptosky to contact the City of Palm Coast Traffic Engineer to inspect the stop sign to determine if it is necessary.

F. Discussion: Expected FY2015 Capital Needs Based on 10 Year Plan [TL]

Supervisor Gaeta pointed out that, in the first item on the list, the estimated costs reflect amount in the millions. Supervisor Lawrence clarified that the costs with “M” behind the amount should be “K”, for thousand.

Discussion ensued regarding the expected Fiscal Year 2015 capital needs, the scope of work to be completed, contractors, estimated costs, relocating a playground, etc.

The Board authorized Mr. Kloptosky to proceed and complete the following items at the estimated costs listed:

Additional parking at Creekside	\$ 64,000
Landscape repairs (\$50,000 vine removal; \$25,000 other)	\$ 75,000
Replace 3 cameras	\$ 1,050
Repair sidewalks lifted by tree roots	\$ 10,000
The Crossings-replace 3 gate operators & 3 gates	\$ 25,000
Replace 2 gazebo columns @ South Entrance	\$ 3,000
Repave roads - Sailfish & Marlin WSP to Lakeside Way	\$204,308
Replace stop bars/arrows	\$ 5,000
Install concrete on two entrances to Pump House	\$ 6,800
Install power and A/C to one storage shed	\$ 4,850
Marcite pool and spa - Creekside	\$ 36,500
Marcite kiddie pool - Creekside	\$ 8,000
RegROUT/repair pool and spa coping - Creekside	\$ 6,000
Replace 1 Treadmill - Creekside	\$ 4,500
Replace 2 Bikes - Creekside	\$ 5,000
Replace pool filters - Creekside	\$ 1,500

Replace spa filter - Creekside	\$ 500
Replace 7 pool umbrellas - Creekside	\$ 1,400
Replace treadmill - The Village Center	\$ 4,000
Refinish GH room wood floor - The Village Center	\$ 2,000
Install an Electronic Cabinet in VC office closet - The Village Center	\$ 2,500
Replace 2 VC Boilers with hot water tanks - The Village Center	\$ 1,500
36" heavy-duty open burner range - The Village Center	\$ 4,317
Replace Café bar top - The Village Center	\$ 6,550

Upon review, the Board did not authorize the following items for completion at the present time:

Additional parking at The Village Center	\$ 77,000
Creekside croquet in soccer field to replace two ½ courts	\$ 31,880
Replace GH room ceiling - The Village Center	\$ 7,325
Add 6 fans to GH room - The Village Center	\$ 2,250
Repair GH room A/C ducts above ceiling - The Village Center	\$ 10,000

The Board determined that the following items must be reviewed for further clarification of the anticipated expense:

Replace vinyl picket fence – WS	\$ 14,000
Replace tile floors in both bathrooms - The Village Center	\$ 14,000
Install jungle gym in children's playground - The Village Center	\$ 10,000
The following items were previously completed and removed from the list:	
LineCook Pro 55 lb Propane Fryer - The Village Center	\$ 799
Jamco UK360 Stainless Steel Work Bench - The Village Center	\$ 469

Discussion ensued regarding use of granite or another type of material for the new bar top. Supervisor Gaeta expressed concerns about granite. Mr. Kloptosky stated that he consulted various contractors and was informed that granite is a standard bar top material.

Mr. Charlie Greer, a resident, indicated that he owned several bars and restaurants and voiced his preference for a sealed wood bar top; he finds them "warmer" and sound better. He felt that granite is a hard, cold surface that must also be cleaned and sealed, on a regular basis. Mr. Greer believed that a wood bar top would be a more attractive option than granite.

G. Discussion: Resident Letter Regarding High Security Fence by Waterfront Park [TL]

Supervisor Lawrence stated that he drafted a letter to the City; however, he realized that the tone of the letter might result in residents demanding that the CDD request permission from the City to install a security fence on the City's property but at the CDD's expense. He felt that the CDD should pressure the City to install the fence, as the City should be accountable for stopping people from going from City property onto private property.

Supervisor Davidson recalled the comments of a City Council candidate, last night and his discussion with Mr. Clark regarding the District's \$50,000 payment towards the project. He noted that, in 1997, the developer was required by the DRI to provide money for the engineering and rough and grading for a park to be constructed on the north perimeter of Grand Haven. In response to Supervisor Lawrence's comment, Supervisor Davidson advised that a \$50,000 limited and complete payment was negotiated; the District was a good neighbor and contributed to the park. He noted the candidate's statement that the City is promoting the park as a destination, which is causing problems for adjacent properties that are not protected by fencing; therefore, the City should be responsible for protecting the property owners.

Supervisor Davidson felt that the City should be informed that the only options would be for each individual property owner to install a fence or for the City to install a fence on its property. He stressed that the CDD cannot install a fence because it does not own property along the park.

Supervisor Lawrence asked if the CDD, on behalf of its residents, could petition the city to install the fence. Mr. Clark replied affirmatively. Supervisor Davidson recommended sending a letter to residents, regarding their petition, followed by a Board Member approaching the City, after the new City Council members are sworn in.

The Board agreed that Supervisor Lawrence could revise the letter and present it for review at the next workshop or meeting or send it, without further Board review.

▪ Discussion: Pier Rental Fee and Capacity

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

Mr. Ross advised that, currently, there is no rental fee for the piers. He inquired about the capacity for the piers. Discussion ensued regarding setting rental fees and determining capacity levels.

Mr. Kloptosky was directed to inquire about the cost for the District Engineer to conduct a load study to determine and certify the capacity of the piers.

The Board agreed to not charge a fee to reserve the pier.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

OPEN ITEMS

Mr. Kloptosky provided an update regarding installation of LED streetlights. He spoke to an electrician and suggested conducting tests of certain types and numbers of lights and monitoring the utility costs.

Supervisor Davidson expressed his opinion that Ms. Leister must begin work on the “in between house” easement matters, as plants are growing.

Supervisor Gaeta inquired about the status of Item D., Supervisor Davidson advised that there was nothing additional to report.

Mr. Kloptosky presented the sample signage for the pier and amenities, at Wild Oaks. Discussion ensued regarding where to locate the amenity usage sign.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

SUPERVISORS’ REQUESTS

Supervisor Davidson indicated that he spoke with a County Commission candidate and a resident regarding rumors surrounding the Vista Park Condos. He indicated that the City recently received a Brownfield grant, which can be used to evaluate abandoned properties that are eyesores within a community; Phase 1 and Phase 2 inspections can be completed to determine whether the building is serviceable and, if it is not serviceable, the grant funds could be used to demolish the building. Supervisor Davidson asked for the Board’s authorization to contact the person supervising the Brownfield grant to obtain details about the grant.

Supervisor Lawrence recommended first contacting Mr. Frank Sockman, of Palm Coast Realty, as the last report was that the structure was fine. It was noted that an inspection was probably completed prior to the sale of the property; therefore, the inspection should be public record.

Supervisor Lawrence expressed concern about the District becoming involved in a matter relating to private property. Mr. Clark concurred that the Board might be stepping outside of the lines and noted that, while the status might be of interest to the community, he was not in favor

of the Board trying to influence action related to private property. It was suggested that the information be turned over to the GHMA. Supervisor Chiodo pointed out that the outcome would have a major influence in the CDD's assessments. In response to Supervisor Gaeta's question, Supervisor Davison agreed to act as a liaison, on behalf of the District. Supervisor Smith stated that he heard many rumors and found most to be false.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that the candidate reported that Mosquito Control is using experimental mosquito traps, which are free to communities. He recommended that the District request the traps.

Regarding the cell tower, Supervisor Davidson advised that there could soon be a decision from the County that would allow the tower to be installed. He indicated that the last reported location was on the County's property adjacent to the fire road in The Crossings.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**DETERMINE NEED FOR
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP ON:
November 6, 2014**

Supervisor Chiodo felt that the November workshop would not be necessary.

Supervisor Davidson asked what happens if something arose that required discussion of the Board. Mr. Clark advised against officially cancelling the workshop and recommended that the Board have a consensus that it was not necessary and determine the need closer to the workshop date.

Supervisor Davidson advised that, near November 1, the Chair and District Manager will determine whether the workshop would be necessary.

Discussion ensued regarding the possibility of calling an emergency meeting if a serious matter arose. Mr. Clark explained that the bar is high when calling an emergency; it must be a true emergency and not just an item of interest. He indicated that an emergency meeting can be convened within a few days and the local media should be notified. Mr. Clark advised that, other meetings, such as special meetings, require advertisement seven days in advance.

Supervisor Lawrence noted that the Board has never had cause to call an emergency meeting; he felt that waiting two additional weeks to discuss something would not be a major delay.

Mr. Woodville summarized that the November workshop will not be held unless the Chair and District manager determine that the workshop is necessary.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

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

On MOTION by Supervisor Gaeta and seconded by Supervisor Davidson, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

[SIGNATURES APPEAR ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE]

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chair/Vice Chair