

**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, December 11, 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	Assistant Secretary
Tom Lawrence (<i>via telephone</i>)	Assistant Secretary
Raymond Smith	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Rick Woodville	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Scott Clark	District Counsel
Mike Munson	District Engineer
Barry Kloptosky	Field Operations Manager
Robert Ross	Vesta/AMG
Ashley Higgins	Grand Haven CDD Office
Louise Leister	Horticultural Consultant
Cindy Gartzke	ABM Security Services
Frank Sockman	Sockman Realty
Bob Hopkins	Resident
Murray Salkovitz	Resident
Joanna Salkovitz	Resident
Rob Carlton	Resident
Fran Somerville	Resident
Jim Gallo	Resident
Brad Schaaf	Resident
Vic Natiello	Resident
Rick and Sherry Sabol	Resident
Frank Benham	Resident
Ron Merlo	Resident
Paul Szabo	Resident
Maryanne Guiglotto	Resident
Charles Greer	Resident
Russ Leavitt	Resident
Otto Bohmueller	Resident
Frank Tuscano	Resident
Lisa Mrakovic	Resident
Rich Burns	Resident

Carol Burns	Resident
Pat Malone	Resident
Don Plunkett	Resident
Alie Lind	Resident
David Alfin	Resident
Tom Byrne	Resident
Harriett Whiting	Resident
Nancy Beneducci	Resident

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Mr. Woodville called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

▪ **ROLL CALL**

******This item, previously the First Order of Business, was presented out of order.******

Mr. Woodville noted, for the record, that Supervisors Davidson, Chiodo, Gaeta and Smith were present, in person. Supervisor Lawrence was attending via telephone.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Ms. Fran Somerville, a resident, spoke of break-ins and potential break-ins, in the community and advised that an attempt was made on her home, while she was home. She indicated that she was not aware that she was supposed to notify Neighborhood Watch, nor did she know who to notify, which is why she posted about the event on the Grand Haven Neighbor website and expressed her disappointment that “we are letting these things happen and we are not being informed when they are happening”. Ms. Somerville stated that she received a response from Neighborhood Watch and was advised that, when an incident occurs, the resident must call the police; furthermore, she was told to complete an incident report on the Grand Haven website, which was incorrect information, as the incident report forms are on the GHMA website, which is different. She stressed that residents should be told of incidents immediately; the community needs better organization and volunteers. Ms. Somerville advised that residents should be informed of who their Neighborhood Watch representatives are.

Supervisor Davidson explained that Neighborhood Watch is not a CDD function; the issue of controlled access will be discussed later in the meeting, at which time Ms. Somerville can continue her comments.

Supervisor Gaeta indicated that much information can be obtained from the Grand Haven Community Information Guide and encouraged residents to read it, as it would likely answer many of their questions.

Mr. Jim Gallo, a resident, voiced his opinion that the CDD could improve its communication to residents about specific matters. He acknowledged that the CDD, GHMA and Neighborhood Watch are separate; however, many residents might not understand that. Mr. Gallo pointed out that all of the information is available through links on the CDD website but residents do not know that; therefore, the CDD and GHMA should communicate the information to residents. He suggested that important information that must be disseminated quickly could be posted on signs.

Mr. Brad Schaaf, a resident, volunteered to take over Neighborhood Watch, along with two other residents, who are willing to assist.

Supervisor Davidson reiterated that Neighborhood Watch is not a function of the CDD or the GHMA; it is coordinated by the Amenity Manager. He explained that Mr. Ross will collect information from interested residents and schedule a meeting. Supervisor Davidson stated that information should be directed to Mr. Ross, not the CDD.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if members of Neighborhood Watch must be owners or if non owner residents can be members. Mr. Clark advised that, as the CDD does not govern Neighborhood Watch, it has no say in who participates in it. Supervisor Gaeta pointed out that Mr. Schaaf is a renter, not an owner, and questioned if he would be allowed to lead Neighborhood Watch. Mr. Schaaf expressed the same question. A resident stated that any resident can volunteer for Neighborhood Watch.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

A. MINUTES

i. Approval of November 20, 2014 Regular Meeting Minutes

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

On MOTION by Supervisor Davidson and seconded by Supervisor Chiodo, with all in favor, the Consent Agenda Items, subject to review and approval by Supervisor Davidson, were approved.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

STAFF REPORTS

A. District Engineer

Supervisor Davidson explained that, due to limited parking, the District is working on expanding the Creekside parking lot; expansion of The Village Center parking lot will be considered in the future.

i. Design and Construction Estimate for Parking Lot Expansion

Mr. Munson presented plans for The Village Center parking lot project and advised that it will provide 22 regular and two handicapped additional parking spaces. He stated that Genesis is prepared to proceed with the constructions plans. Mr. Munson presented the fee estimate and noted that a portion was included in the conceptual phase; an additional survey may be necessary but tree removal will not be necessary.

Supervisor Davidson reiterated that The Village Center parking lot would be a long-range project; therefore, no decisions were necessary.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled that the Board requested a conceptual plan for expansion of The Village Center parking lot.

Regarding the Creekside parking lot project, Mr. Munson stated that a response from the City regarding the irrigation plan is pending; approval from the St. John's River Water Management District (SJRWMD) was received.

In response to Supervisor Gaeta's question, Mr. Munson advised that, based on the quantity of trees in the community, the City should not require tree mitigation for either parking lot project.

Mr. Kloptosky referred to the plans, which reflect only one bocce ball or shuffleboard court and asked if the second court was removed. Mr. Munson indicated that it was not removed; the survey did not encompass that area.

In response to Mr. Munson's question, Supervisor Davidson confirmed that the Board does not want to proceed any further with The Village Center parking lot project; however, the Creekside project may proceed.

Regarding the Sailfish Drive project, Supervisor Davidson stated that the project should commence prior to the rainy season, in June.

Mr. Munson indicated that the project involves installation of three stormwater inlets and new pipes under the road but not adding impervious areas; the concept is to improve drainage. Supervisor Davidson explained that the grade was flat and, for many years, water collected at the end of the road, on the exit to Waterside Parkway. Supervisor Davidson noted that minor corrections were made; however, the issue remained chronic. Mr. Munson pointed out that SJRWMD approved the plan and a permit was not required; the design plan is ready for submittal.

It was noted that this project was to be completed in conjunction with repaving Marlin Drive.

On MOTION by Supervisor Chiodo and seconded by Supervisor Smith, with all in favor, authorization for the District Engineer to proceed with the Sailfish Drive project, through the permitting process, and to obtain proposals for the Marlin Drive paving portion, were approved.

B. Amenity Manager

Mr. Ross indicated that a resident utilized a tennis court to have a tennis instructor give lessons to her daughters; he questioned if that practice is allowed or if the \$10 daily guest fee should be charged. Supervisor Davidson recalled that AMG's tennis instructor has an exclusive contract to teach within the District; therefore, no other tennis instructors are allowed to teach within the community. Mr. Ross noted receipt of \$440 in tennis fees, over the past two months.

Mr. Ross reported that the holiday tree lighting event was very successful.

Supervisor Lawrence questioned if the community was made aware of the exclusive contract with the tennis instructor and whether the rules state that exclusivity. Mr. Ross replied affirmatively.

Mr. Ross discussed the generous response from the community for Project Share; 14 bicycles and numerous toys were received, in addition to \$1,300 in monetary donations. In response to a question, Mr. Ross stated that the organizer might take a photograph that could be placed in The Observer. Supervisor Gaeta asked if donations were comparable to last year. Mr. Ross advised that donations were overflowing; the response was good.

C. Field/Operations Manager

Mr. Kloptosky presented a progression of photographs of the Marlin Drive Pump House repair project and explained the scope of work that was completed and the remaining work. He stated that the contractor is currently working on the flashing; the project is progressing. In response to a question, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the pump house is operating on the new pump.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that the project was \$72,000; Escalante Golf (Escalante) is responsible for 75% of the total cost. Supervisor Davidson explained that 75% of the function of the Marlin Drive Pump House is to provide irrigation water to the golf course; 25% of the function is to irrigate the CDD's common areas and tennis courts.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the contractor discovered and replaced a primer pump that was not functioning.

Regarding the Center Park paver project, Mr. Kloptosky advised that the project was completed, including installation of new pavers and landscaping; he presented photographs of the completed work. Supervisor Lawrence asked about the status of the benches. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that new benches were ordered because the old ones were rusted; the benches were delivered, mounting cups were fabricated and the benches are scheduled for installation.

Supervisor Davidson discussed the benefits of the Center Park paver project.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled questions regarding lighting in the Center Park area and that there was an issue with underground wiring; the wiring was repaired but additional underground wiring issues occurred and repairs are ongoing. Ms. Louise Leister, District Horticulturalist, noted that the improvements make the park more useable and enhanced the community. Mr. Kloptosky advised that the gazebo was painted, as well.

Mr. Kloptosky reported that erosion repairs were completed at the Jasmine Drive footbridge for \$3,175, along with repairs at the conspan bridge on Wild Oaks for \$3,072.70. In response to Supervisor Lawrence's question, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the repairs were charged to community maintenance, not capital expenditures.

Mr. Kloptosky advised that PBM Constructors, Inc. (PBM) will complete both driveways, the slab and both sidewalks at the Marlin Drive Pump House, for \$10,650; the contract is pending. He indicated that Escalante will be billed for 75% of the total cost.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled that two major erosion repairs were completed on Osprey in 2009; however, a new area failed, creating a depression, due to a break in the pipe. He advised

that the estimate from S.E. Cline Construction (Cline) is \$6,705 but he hoped that the time and materials cost would amount to approximately \$3,000.

Supervisor Lawrence questioned if the District should consider placing another pipe within the existing pipe, in case other breaks occur. Mr. Kloptosky will inquire about sleeving the pipe.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he signed the proposal for installation of two outside speakers for the current system for \$740.

Regarding the pickleball court at The Village Center, Mr. Kloptosky stated that he is working with Ms. Leister and Austin Outdoor (Austin) to develop landscape and irrigation plans required by the City. The information was submitted to the pickleball contractor who will submit a permit application.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the capital plan has a line item to run power and air conditioning to the sheds at Marlin Drive; the project is currently underway, as the City issued the electrical permit quickly. Supervisor Lawrence pointed out that the addition of air conditioning to the shed will extend the life of the equipment and materials stored in it.

In response to Supervisor Gaeta's question, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that, during the Marlin Drive Pump House project, the entire roof was replaced.

Mr. Gallo asked for an update on LED streetlights.

Mr. Kloptosky recalled that he suggested testing a section of streetlights; he pulled the Florida Power and Light (FPL) bills for the past year to use as a comparison following the test. He recommended conducting the test for one or two months; the cost comparison will be provided at a future meeting.

Mr. Gallo voiced his opinion that the District's permit issues are related to the Building Department, as those take much longer than electrical permits.

D. District Counsel

i. Traffic Light Bond

Mr. Clark had nothing further to add to the report in the agenda.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if Mr. Clark knew the interest rate on the accrued interest. Mr. Clark did not; the interest has accumulated since 1998.

ii. 37 Jasmine Drive

Mr. Clark had nothing further to add to the report in the agenda.

iii. Ninth Green O & M Assessments

Mr. Clark had nothing further to add to the report in the agenda.

iv. Coyote Trapping

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that a coyote was observed in the Creekside area, on several occasions; he sought advice and information from District Counsel.

Mr. Clark stated that a resident questioned why the CDD is not doing something about coyotes, such as trapping them. He reminded residents that a CDD is a limited purpose government; a statute specifies the things that the CDD is allowed to do and the CDD does not have authority to do things beyond those identified. Mr. Clark explained that this differs from cities or counties, which are general purpose governments and have jurisdiction and police powers to do things that enhance the health, safety and welfare of citizens. He acknowledged that the coyote situation is an animal control function of the City or County, not a CDD function. Mr. Clark further explained that, if the CDD involves itself in something that it should not do and, ultimately, something still occurred, it becomes a liability for the CDD.

Mr. Clark stated that, based on information obtained by Mr. Kloptosky, coyotes are not generally a threat to humans; coyotes seek out food sources, such as garbage or small animals. Residents should not leave food sources out for coyotes to find. He summarized that this matter is not within the CDD's jurisdiction.

A resident stated that she does not want anything done about the coyotes.

Mr. Vic Natiello, a resident, expressed his understanding that Mr. Kloptosky immediately contacts the alligator trapper when he receives notification about an alligator and questioned if, based on District Counsel's current advice regarding coyotes, Mr. Kloptosky should inform residents that they must contact an alligator trapper on his own. Mr. Natiello asked why the CDD would be involved in alligator matters but not coyotes.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that he contacts the alligator trappers because they did not want to receive notification from individual residents; they want the notification to come from the community. Mr. Clark advised that he does not oppose forwarding information to the trappers; however, he does not want the District to spend funds on an authorized activity.

Mr. Natiello questioned the District's position on other nuisance animals; he wants to know if residents should contact Mr. Kloptosky and if the information would be forwarded to the proper entity.

Mr. Clark recommended that the Board establish a policy.

Supervisor Davidson felt that residents should contact Mr. Kloptosky, who will notify the proper authorities.

Supervisor Smith preferred that residents only contact the CDD office with alligator incidents; residents should contact the appropriate authorities individually regarding all other nuisance animal matters.

Supervisors Chiodo and Lawrence agreed with Supervisor Smith.

Supervisor Gaeta felt that the policy should be the same for all nuisance animals; if residents contact Mr. Kloptosky regarding alligators, they should also contact him regarding other animals.

Supervisor Davidson summarized that three Supervisors are in support of residents contacting the proper authorities, individually, for all animals other than alligators, and two Supervisors favor utilizing the same system for all nuisance animals.

Mr. Natiello discussed the dangers of otters in the lakes and stated that he would call Fish and Wildlife every day.

Mr. Schaaf suggested that residents be required to sign a liability waiver every time they contact Mr. Kloptosky regarding an alligator, as simply calling the trappers might be construed as taking action.

Mr. Clark preferred that the District not be involved in the alligator matter, either; however, alligators are in lakes owned by the District, which distinguishes the situation from animals on private property; he summarized that the less the District does, the better.

In response to Supervisor Davidson's question, Mr. Kloptosky conceded that he could not recall whether the alligator trappers or another entity requested notification from the CDD, rather than individual residents; he must research his files. He recalled that the issue was the volume of calls and the basis was to allow the community to contract trappers directly, rather than individuals contacting an agency.

Mr. Frank Benham, a resident, pointed out that residents are already confused regarding who to call for certain issues. He felt that the procedure should be consistent for all animals; the District should not have a split procedure.

Ms. Leister stated that alligators are different than other animals and the quantity is greater; she recommended that alligators be reported to Mr. Kloptosky but other animals be reported individually.

A resident suggested that Mr. Kloptosky provide callers with contact information to report animals other than alligators.

Supervisor Gaeta favored having residents contact Mr. Kloptosky's office; she feared that if residents continually contact Fish and Wildlife, the community will become known as a "pain in the neck". She felt that one procedure would avoid confusion.

Supervisor Davidson summarized the recommendation for residents to call Mr. Kloptosky's office regarding all nuisance animals; Mr. Kloptosky would contact the alligator trappers directly and the resident would be provided with contact information for the proper authorities, for all other animal matters.

Supervisors Lawrence and Chiodo concurred with Supervisor Gaeta's recommendation.

Supervisor Smith disagreed and recommended against encouraging residents to contact Mr. Kloptosky's office.

Mr. Kloptosky felt that not much would change under a new policy; currently, his office contacts the alligator trappers when a notification is received and, if a call is received regarding other animals, the resident is provided with contact information. He saw no reason to promote the concept of calling his office for all animal related matters.

Supervisors Gaeta and Lawrence agreed with maintaining the existing procedure.

In response to Supervisor Lawrence's question regarding otters, Mr. Kloptosky stated that he was not aware of otter issues other than those reported by Mr. Natiello.

Supervisors Chiodo, Smith and Davidson agreed with maintaining the existing procedure.

▪ **Continued Discussion: Mulch Frequency (LL)**

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

Ms. Leister stated that she was asked for an alternative to mulching once per year; however, she knows of no alternative. She recommended a second dusting of certain areas, during the year, if the District is unhappy with those areas. Ms. Leister discussed the extensive mulching program in Grand Haven and noted that the cost for additional mulching would be approximately \$20,000, more.

Supervisor Davidson explained that the District currently spends \$41,200 for one mulching; he recommended discussing this matter during a workshop.

Ms. Leister reported that vine removal work is progressing rapidly; an e-blast was sent to residents. She detailed the vine removal and spraying process. Ms. Leister pointed out that

plants will be planted in areas exposed to traffic, views and noise. She stated that work is being completed on Ibis.

******The meeting recessed at 11:44 a.m.******

******The meeting reconvened at 11:57 a.m.******

▪ **Continued Discussion: Controlled Access and Security in District [PC/BOS]**

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

Supervisor Davidson reviewed a slide presentation of the roles of various security organizations operating within Grand Haven. He indicated that the Flagler County Sheriff's Office (FCSO) has policing powers over the public, common and private areas. He discussed various programs offered by the FCSO.

Supervisor Davidson explained that the CDD has no policing power; however, it has authority over the public or common areas and access control. He advised that the CDD can control access. Supervisor Davidson discussed the gate access device (GAD) and smart amenity access card (SAAC) systems, along with the resident database utilized in the community. He acknowledged minor resistance to the requirement for residents to provide a current copy of their vehicle registration; however, the registration information is how the District determines who is eligible to receive a GAD. Supervisor Davidson pointed out that the GAD information is recorded in the master database each time the vehicle enters or exits the community, which can provide useful information and assist in solving crimes.

Supervisor Davidson advised that the GHMA also has no policing powers; it has authority over private residences, administers the CC&Rs, private lawn maintenance contracts, the Architectural Design Committee (ADC) and the Fine Committee. He noted that several items within the CC&Rs help with security, such as disallowing solicitation and garage or estate sales, in the community.

Supervisor Davidson stated that residents should exercise reasonable preventative measures, including locking doors, reporting suspicious activities to the FCSO and participating in Neighborhood Watch. He discussed "hardening" residences to make them more resistant to burglaries and participating in the STAR Program.

Supervisor Davidson stated that Neighborhood Watch is a nongovernmental volunteer organization with no policing power or direct organizational relationship to the other organizations.

Supervisor Davidson recalled that Grand Haven was marketed as a “gated private club community”; however, it is a CDD and the public cannot be excluded from gaining access. He explained that, with regard to gate, the CDD can control but not restrict access.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that Sheriff Jim Manfre lives in Grand Haven. He reviewed the FCSO website and demonstrated how to search the crime database and pointed out the limited crime activity in Grand Haven. Supervisor Davidson explained the various types of crimes and noted that many are domestic and do not involve a threat. He advised of two burglaries in Grand Haven; one was solved and the investigation remains active for the other.

Mr. Natiello recalled that the number of incidents reported is much greater than actual crime and pointed out that an incident, such as a theft, could occur anywhere but the address listed is that of the person reporting the theft. He indicated that, several years ago, the data was collected for a two-year period and the data was indicative of the current data; there is virtually no crime in Grand Haven, the majority of the incidents were “Baker Act” type matters, which involve mental health actions.

- **Recent Burglaries**
 - i. **Are residents reporting break-ins to Neighborhood Watch? If no, why not?**
 - ii. **What should the Neighborhood Watch and the CDD do about this issue?**
- **Topics from Recent Interlocal Meeting**

Supervisor Davidson indicated that, when social media reported 40 burglaries in Grand Haven, it prompted the CDD, GHMA and Neighborhood Watch to hold a meeting to determine what information was accurate and what the entities could do to inform residents. The result of the meeting was an e-blast.

- i. **Dispelling rumors, exaggerated claims, etc. by presenting true reported official information discussion of the changing nature of the Community**

Supervisor Davidson indicated that those in attendance now know how to search the crime database and encouraged them to teach their neighbors.

- ii. **Reviewing “safety and security” procedures the GHCDD, GHMA and GHNW have already implemented and are currently in place**

Supervisor Davidson indicated that this involves the information he previously presented and recommended that the CDD and GHMA develop a document to be included on their websites which discusses what was done to improve the safety and security of the community.

iii. New infrastructure improvements underway (exit cameras, etc.)

Supervisor Davidson indicated that exit cameras will be installed to record license plates of exiting vehicles, which could assist law enforcement to identify criminals.

iv. Any additional measures to be undertaken by the CDD, MHA, and NW

This item was discussed in conjunction with other items.

v. Cost, effectiveness, and net return of additional measures suggested by others, such as manning all gates 24/7; roving security patrol 24/7; pedestrian fencing

Supervisor Davidson discussed perimeter improvements under consideration, including manning all gates 24/7, etc., at an approximate cost of \$500,000 per year, plus construction of guard houses at gates that currently do not have them. He recalled that the guard at the Main Gate is overwhelmed by construction traffic calls from the Wild Oaks entrance, which detracts attention from those entering at the Main Gate and creates a backlog and safety issues.

Ms. Cindy Gartzke, of ABM Security Services (ABM), presented the traffic count figures for a five-week period, at the Main Gate; the report reflects the number of calls received at the guard house. She stressed that the guards at the Main Gate must stop servicing the Main Gate, each time a call is received from the Wild Oaks and The Crossings call boxes. Ms. Gartzke recalled her recommendation, several months ago, for an additional guard at the Main Gate, from 8:00 a.m., to 2:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, to take the calls and alleviate traffic backups. She noted that landscapers are lined up daily to enter at 7:00 a.m., generating many calls from other gates; additionally, many calls are received when contractors return from lunch.

Discussion ensued regarding staffing the Main Gate with an additional guard Monday through Friday, from 8:00 a.m., through 2:00 p.m.

Supervisor Smith pointed out that the data presented reflects the number of transactions handled at the Main Gate; however, it does not provide information about the safety issue of traffic backing up onto Colbert Lane, due to the guard's attention being diverted to incoming calls. He summarized that the data confirms that the guards have "busy periods"; while he has observed backups onto Colbert Lane, they appear fairly infrequent. Supervisor Smith indicated that the cost for an additional guard would be approximately \$20,000; however, the data reflects busy periods from about 7:00 a.m., or 8:00 a.m., to 10:00 a.m. He felt that the data was not reflective of the busy period lasting until 2:00 p.m., daily. Supervisor Smith stated that the data is not sufficient for him to agree to spend \$20,000 for an additional guard.

In response to Supervisor Davidson's question, Ms. Gartzke confirmed that the guards are not able to see Colbert Lane; therefore, they could not record or track the number of vehicles backed up onto Colbert Lane.

Supervisor Gaeta agreed that the data provided by Ms. Gartzke was not sufficient to make a determination. She voiced her opinion that the Main Gate guard spends more time than necessary on certain calls. Supervisor Gaeta questioned if Ms. Gartzke could further define the nature of the calls listed in her report. She asked if construction traffic could be diverted to other gates.

In response to Supervisor Davidson's question, Ms. Gartzke stated that it would be unrealistic for the guards to record the nature of all incoming calls. Supervisor Davidson concurred, noting that tracking the types of incoming calls would add even more time to the process.

Supervisor Gaeta suggested that, if the incoming calls are repetitive, residents could be advised to email the Main Gate the evening before, so that the guards have a daily log of who is expected. She voiced her opinion that the gate issues are specific to the additional construction activities.

Supervisor Chiodo felt that more information is necessary, prior to making a decision, and that the District must expend effort to obtain the information; however, he did not believe that the guards should be the source of the information. He recommended that volunteers observe to determine what occurs in the guard house and collect information regarding the nature of the incoming calls, etc. Supervisor Chiodo pointed out that it should be determined whether the issues are related to contractors entering or others; the only way to collect the information would be to have an observer during the problematic hours. He felt that the observer should track the traffic count, the number of backups, the number and nature of the calls and whether the incoming calls are preventing the guards from servicing the Main Gate, causing the delays, or whether the delays are due to those entering lacking the necessary information to provide to the guard.

Supervisor Gaeta voiced her opinion that the District cannot facilitate collection of the data or offer guidance to ABM. She stressed that ABM should be offering solutions to the District, aside from adding another guard.

Supervisor Smith asked if the District's camera system could film the gate for a few weeks. Ms. Higgins confirmed that a camera could be added but the District must obtain a proposal from the camera contractor.

Supervisor Lawrence suggested that the guards be instructed to record the degree of backup towards Colbert Lane, every 30 minutes. Ms. Gartzke pointed out that the guards cannot see past two or three vehicles on the left side and only one vehicle on the right side.

Supervisor Davidson recommended that this matter be tabled to the next workshop and that additional data be collected, along with determining the cost to install a time-lapse camera. Supervisor Chiodo suggested that the Board identify the specific information that it desires in order to make a decision.

Ms. Gartzke noted that both incoming calls and incomplete information from visitors contribute to backups at the Main Gate. She was not in favor of emails to the guard house because it would take the guards equally long or longer to attend to emails as it does for calls.

Supervisor Chiodo reiterated that the Board should determine the types of information it wants in order to reach the best solution or method to acquire the data.

Supervisor Davidson asked District Counsel to comment on the concept of using observers. Mr. Clark indicated that the observers could sign a release form.

Mr. Schaaf advised that this is a "classic" industrial engineering study situation; the District must design what it wants and have people gather the information.

A resident questioned if the District could utilize volunteers to answer the telephone at the guard gate. All Supervisors felt that volunteers should not be used.

Mr. Otto Bohmueller, a resident, asked if the Board planned to discuss the burglaries in Wild Oaks or the causes.

Regarding roving security patrols, Supervisor Davidson recalled that the cost is \$35 per hour to hire an off-duty Sheriff's deputy, with policing power. He expressed his opinion that roving patrols are not effective because perpetrators can call each other regarding the patrol location so that crimes can be committed in other areas.

Regarding pedestrian fences, Supervisor Davidson indicated that, if Wild Oaks residents want a fence, a special assessment would be imposed on those residents; additionally, it is unknown whether the City would allow the fence. He pointed out that the fence could not be "locked"; the public must be allowed entry.

Mr. George Suhaj, a resident, contended that a pedestrian gate could be locked, provided the District has a call box to the Main Gate, to allow entry.

Mr. Clark stated that a pedestrian fence must be treated the same as a vehicle gate; the District must provide pedestrian access. A card system, call box or system to grant access must be in place.

Supervisor Davidson noted that the camera system allows the District to record vehicles entering the community and questioned if facial recognition cameras would be necessary at a pedestrian gate. He summarized that, if Wild Oaks residents want a fence and pedestrian gate, the proposal would include the fence and gate, a security camera possibly with facial recognition and a recording device.

Supervisor Smith felt that Wild Oaks residents should confirm whether they are willing to fund the expenditure; if not, the District should not do it. He felt that the Board should not simply dismiss the concept as unreasonable; the question is whether the Wild Oaks residents are willing to pay for the project.

Supervisor Davidson asked if Supervisor Smith was suggesting that the Board authorize Mr. Kloptosky to obtain quotes from several contractors.

Mr. Kloptosky advised that he spoke to a Wild Oaks resident who signed the petition in favor of the fence and pedestrian gate; however, the resident advised that, when he signed the petition, he was not aware of what would be involved. He indicated that, as the project would involve numerous contractors, he wanted to ensure that the Board wants him to expend the effort. Mr. Kloptosky pointed out that many lots in Wild Oaks are vacant and questioned how those that bought the property as an investment but do not live there would feel about the special assessment. He voiced his opinion the District should obtain additional input from residents and property owners.

Supervisor Smith favored obtaining input from Wild Oaks property owners regarding whether they are willing to fund the project. It was noted that a “ballpark” figure would be needed.

Mr. Suhaj pointed out that, since Wild Oaks began discussing this matter, the entire Grand Haven community expressed a desire to have all gates secured. He felt that the District should be prepared to pay to secure all gates.

Supervisor Davidson suggested discussing this matter at the next workshop.

Supervisor Lawrence reiterated that the District cannot prevent pedestrians from entering. Mr. Suhaj acknowledged that pedestrians cannot be prevented from entering; however, a gate would give the perception of security and make criminals think twice.

A resident questioned if the District has a right to photograph people entering the community. Mr. Clark indicated that the District can install cameras at the gate and insist that those entering have their picture taken but could not logistically manage those that walk through the vehicle lanes.

A resident questioned the cost for Grand Haven to “buy back” the roads and make them private. Supervisor Davidson indicated that it was not a possibility; the roads are public and cannot be bought back; they can only be turned over to the City or County. Supervisor Davidson stressed that the roads must remain public.

vi. Individual homeowners’ responsibilities to “harden” their residences (mandatory?)

Supervisor Davidson indicated that, if Grand Haven was a private community, homeowners could be required to “harden” their residences; however, while Grand Haven cannot require it, residents could or should take certain actions.

- **Citizens on Patrol (COP) Star Evaluation, recommendations and follow thru alarm systems installed and always activated when not home (perimeter, motion, glass alarms)**

Supervisor Davidson discussed the Citizens on Patrol (COP) program and the information and services offered. He explained that break-ins most often occur through sliding doors.

- **COP vacation patrol, neighbors watch**

Supervisor Davidson advised that COP offers a vacation patrol program.

- **NW involvement**

Supervisor Davidson noted that Neighborhood Watch is often impacted on what information can be released, due to ongoing investigations.

Mr. Murray Salkovitz, a resident, recalled that, for many years, Neighborhood Watch ran smoothly, with confirmed incidents being reported; however, recently, residents have posted about “burglaries” on the Nextdoor Grand Haven website, prior to notifying Neighborhood Watch or Mr. Kloptosky. Mr. Salkovitz advised that he, personally, and others involved with Neighborhood Watch, have been “bashed” to a ridiculous degree. He pointed out that, primarily, the person “bashing” the current Neighborhood Watch volunteers is the same person who

recently volunteered to “take over” the program. Mr. Salkovitz stated that Neighborhood Watch is not able to report a crime until the crime is confirmed; if Neighborhood Watch does not receive a report from the victim, it cannot confirm the crime. He indicated that, once a police report is received, the crime can be reported to the community immediately. Mr. Salkovitz recalled that, in many instances, the Sheriff asks Neighborhood Watch to refrain from releasing information because they have a suspect or are in the midst of an investigation and do not want to tip off a suspect. He explained that some residents are second-guessing Neighborhood Watch’s actions and the Nextdoor Grand Haven website has taken away all of the functions that Neighborhood Watch worked under. Mr. Salkovitz indicated that he resigned from Neighborhood Watch because of the attacks on himself and he does not want to deal with things that are outside of Neighborhood Watch’s control.

Supervisor Chiodo stated that he heard about the recent “burglaries” from the Nextdoor Grand Haven website. Mr. Salkovitz asked if Supervisor Chiodo meant that he read the rumors. Supervisor Chiodo replied affirmatively and indicated that the information prompted him to contact Mr. Salkovitz and Mr. Kloptosky to inquire whether residents were reporting incidents to Neighborhood Watch or Mr. Kloptosky and, if not, whether residents knew whom to contact. Supervisor Chiodo questioned whether the information was disseminated “enough”. Mr. Salkovitz advised that Neighborhood Watch has a responsibility to ensure that information is distributed to residents; however, residents have a responsibility, as well. Mr. Salkovitz referred to a resident who indicated that she did not know how to report an incident; the resident never attended a meeting and did not utilize the Grand Haven Community Information Guide, which contains information outlining exactly what to do. If residents do not utilize the information provided to them, they will never know what to do.

Supervisor Gaeta recalled that she was previously involved with Neighborhood Watch and noted that, prior to purchasing a home in Grand Haven, she attended CDD and other meetings. She stressed that Neighborhood Watch has always emphasized the protocol of what to do if there was an incident. Supervisor Gaeta voiced her opinion that Grand Haven is a safe community and the rumors are unfortunate. She discussed the previous security audit and the resulting Board actions. Supervisor Gaeta highlighted the importance of reading the Grand Haven Community Information Guide and noted that, to date, fewer than 1,000 of the 3,000 new guides were picked up by residents. She encouraged residents to prepare for the CDD meetings

prior to attending; she suggested that residents review the information in the agenda and be prepared to ask questions and actively participate at CDD meetings.

Supervisor Smith asked Mr. Salkovitz what he would be told if he asked the Sheriff to define the charter of Neighborhood Watch.

Mr. Salkovitz recommended that Supervisor Smith ask the Sheriff. He explained that Neighborhood Watch operates independently and does not report to the CDD or GHMA. Mr. Salkovitz stated that the Neighborhood Watch has no restrictions regarding who can participate but stressed that, when a person “takes personal shots” on a website, it draws a line.

Supervisor Lawrence recalled the history of Neighborhood Watch in Grand Haven and voiced his opinion that the CDD should produce a quarterly newsletter that contains a “Crime Corner” or disseminate critical information to the community, as necessary.

Regarding her resignation from Neighborhood Watch, Ms. Lisa Mrakovic, a resident, stated that she agreed with Mr. Salkovitz’s comments. She felt that the Nextdoor Grand Haven website has been the ruination of individuals who are no longer reaching out to the policies and procedures. Ms. Mrakovic believed that residents who believe that they are receiving community information when they visit the Nextdoor Grand Haven website are sorely mistaken; the website has caused residents to stop following procedures. She acknowledged that some areas of Grand Haven do not have effective captains but those that do are very successful.

Ms. Pat Maloney, a resident, discussed her experience on Neighborhood Watch and noted the benefits of the new database. She stated that the recent personal attack resulted in threatening messages on her telephone. Ms. Maloney indicated that she joined the Nextdoor Grand Haven website to monitor it. She felt that the initial intentions were good but certain residents have an agenda to undermine the hard work in Grand Haven and are accusing Neighborhood Watch of not investigating crimes, although those residents were told repeatedly at meetings and by the volunteers and Sheriff that Neighborhood Watch is not able to do so. Ms. Maloney indicated that Neighborhood Watch has not received an incident report since July, yet “crimes” are being discussed on the Nextdoor Grand Haven website. She believed that the website does more to destroy communication in the community than any other thing in the history of Grand Haven. Ms. Maloney voiced her opinion that the Neighborhood Watch program can no longer be effective, as long as the unrest exists in the community and with those creating the unrest desiring to “take over” Neighborhood Watch. She confirmed that those were reasons for her resignation from Neighborhood Watch.

Supervisor Davidson thanked Mr. Salkovitz, Ms. Mrakovcic and Ms. Maloney for their years of service to the community.

Supervisor Gaeta recalled that the Sheriff consistently advised that Grand Haven has the best Neighborhood Watch in Palm Coast.

Supervisor Davidson summarized that the CDD is a special purpose limited government, which does not have policing powers but has implemented security related things. He explained that the Sheriff resides in Grand Haven. Supervisor Davidson discussed the changing and growing community, resulting in additional service personnel and others entering the community. He questioned if the District could “license” people who work in the community; thereby requiring the individual to be photographed, fingerprinted, licensed, bonded and insured, in order to work within Grand Haven.

Mr. Clark noted the issue of a contractor refusing to adhere to the CDD’s terms; the CDD must still allow the person to enter the community. He indicated that the District cannot enforce such a requirement. Mr. Clark questioned if the District wants to be in the business of “endorsing” service providers.

Supervisor Davidson reiterated that a large group of people are permitted to enter the community with no authority. He stressed that, per the Sheriff, it is the residents’ responsibility to “harden” their homes because the District cannot control who enters the community. Supervisor Davidson pointed out that the homes that were burglarized had no alarm, contained no form of protection and/or failed to utilize the devices in place. Supervisor Davidson summarized that residents are lulled into a false sense of security thinking that Grand Haven is a private, gated community, when it is not.

A resident recalled observing people fishing in the pond; she photographed their license plates, approached them and requested their business cards. The men indicated that they were in Grand Haven to paint a house but could not provide the requested business card. Supervisor Davidson advised that the CDD cannot ask for the driver’s license of those entering the community and recommended that residents contact Mr. Kloptosky so that staff can address the situation. Supervisor Davidson recalled that the ponds are an amenity; therefore, nonresidents caught fishing can be issued a trespass notice and removed from the premises or be required to pay the nonresident \$10 daily fee.

A resident stated that the community appreciates the CDD Board and Neighborhood Watch volunteers more than they might know. She urged the Board and volunteers not to take

the comments on the Nextdoor Grand Haven website too personally. The resident voiced her understanding of the legalities but expressed concern that residents are not alerted to possible issues. She indicated that, when she inquired about a recent burglary, the CDD office informed her that there were no burglaries. The resident reiterated her request that the community be alerted when “something” is up.

Supervisor Davidson pointed out that the CDD cannot alert the community about something that it does not know about. The resident contended that the victim was traumatized. Supervisor Davidson stressed that, despite the trauma, the victim did not report the incident to the CDD or Neighborhood Watch. Supervisor Smith suggested that someone from the resident’s neighborhood volunteer for Neighborhood Watch. The resident stated that law enforcement was involved and questioned why there is no communication between Neighborhood Watch and law enforcement. Supervisor Davidson explained that the issue relates to receiving, controlling, verifying and disseminating information.

Ms. Nancy Beneducci, a resident, volunteered for Neighborhood Watch. She suggested that each Neighborhood Watch captain review the police report, create a report and send it to everyone in their neighborhood. Supervisor Davidson pointed out that the crime report is public information.

Ms. Sharon Downes, a resident, asked if the information today means that, if her home is broken in to, she cannot tell her neighbor. Supervisor Davidson replied no; he made no such comment.

Mr. Schaaf questioned what information cannot be “publicized”. Supervisor Davidson explained that the CDD does not report any crime information; the information is reported by Neighborhood Watch, through the amenity office; information is provided to Mr. Kloptosky and forwarded to Mr. Ross for dissemination. Mr. Schaaf asked what information can be “said”.

Mr. Natiello recalled a situation a few years ago which resulted in law enforcement playing the 9-1-1 audio at a meeting, which completely contradicted the homeowner’s public comments; that incident caused the community to lose credibility with the Sheriff’s office. He stressed that this type of situation was the reason that Neighborhood Watch verifies incidents because law enforcement becomes upset if confidential information is given out or information is misreported to the community.

Supervisor Davidson recommended that those interested in joining Neighborhood Watch direct their interest to Mr. Ross. Residents will be notified of a date and time for a

Neighborhood Watch meeting. In response to a question, Supervisor Davidson clarified that Neighborhood Watch is not disbanded; it is without a steering committee.

- **Additional measures: perimeter and interior cameras tied to alarm systems, smart phone monitoring**

This item was not discussed.

- **Traffic Count Report for Main Gate (ABM)**

This item was previously discussed.

A resident pointed out the complacency of residents in Grand Haven; he felt that residents should become involved and remain involved.

- **Continued Discussion: Agreement for Non-Resident to Utilize Amenity Facilities**

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

Supervisor Gaeta referred to Item 4, and asked if, under the definition, a nonresident amenity member would be allowed to attend a community event and, if not, how the District would enforce it, since the person would have a GAD and a SAAC. Supervisor Davidson felt that a nonresident amenity member should be allowed to partake in the amenities and District events. The Board agreed.

Supervisor Gaeta suggested adding an Item 10, stating “Individual must acknowledge, in writing, receipt of the Amenities Policies and Procedures and agree to adhere to, as such.” She felt that this would alleviate potential confusion.

Supervisor Davidson pointed out Item 4 and recommended expanding the verbiage to include Supervisor Gaeta’s suggestion. The Board agreed.

- **Consideration of/Decision on: Proposed Signage for Village Center and CDD Office**

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

Supervisor Smith felt that most people already follow the rules; he felt that the signage is negative to the majority who follow the rules compared to the small portion that do not. Supervisor Chiodo favored the signage, if it would be helpful. Supervisor Gaeta favored posting the sign; she did not believe that others would be offended.

Supervisor Davidson asked Ms. Higgins to comment on whether the addition of the proposed sign would abate abuse of staff by residents.

Ms. Higgins felt that the signage would do little to discourage those that already have an agenda; additionally, pointing out the sign would likely further aggravate the abusive resident.

She believed that comments would only come from residents who do not understand why the sign was posted; it would not stop rude residents.

Mr. Kloptosky concurred with Ms. Higgins; however, he favors any signage that would assist staff. He felt that it “could not hurt” to post the sign.

This item was deferred to the workshop.

*****Supervisor Gaeta left the meeting.*****

E. District Manager

Mr. Woodville wished the Board, Staff and residents happy holidays.

i. Upcoming Regular Meeting/Community Workshop Dates

- **COMMUNITY WORKSHOP**
 - **January 8, 2015 at 10:00 A.M.**

Mr. Woodville indicated that the next workshop is scheduled for January 8, 2015 at 10:00 a.m., at this location.

- **REGULAR MEETING**
 - **January 22, 2015 at 10:00 A.M.**

Mr. Woodville advised that next meeting is scheduled for January 22, 2015 at 10:00 a.m., at this location.

In response to Supervisor Davidson’s question, Mr. Clark confirmed that the Agreement for Nonresident Usage of the Amenity Facilities will not be included in the Amendments to Rules, Policies and Fees for All Amenity Facilities.

Mr. Clark recalled previous discussion regarding the tennis policy and whether a tennis professional could give lessons. He reviewed the rules and could not locate a policy; therefore, it should be added. Mr. Clark advised that the additional language should not delay advertising the public hearing.

Mr. Frank Sockman, of Sockman Realty, advised that the Vista Park Condominiums permits were issued by the City but they are awaiting one item regarding moving the easement; the request and revised drawings were submitted. Supervisor Davidson felt that the project is ready to proceed; the drawing redefined it and reflects the cart path; the description is fine. In response to a question, Mr. Sockman confirmed that the developer will pay to relocate the fence.

A. Continued Discussion: Proposed Amendments to Rules, Policies and Fees for All Amenity Facilities [BOS] *Public Hearing January 22, 2015*

This item was not discussed.

B. Continued Discussion: FY2015 Capital Needs Based on 10-Year Plan [TL]

This item was not discussed.

C. Discussion: Board Communications [SD]

This item will be included for discussion at the next workshop.

D. Continued Discussion: Controlled Access and Security in District [PC/BOS]

- **Recent Burglaries**

- i. **Are residents reporting break-ins to Neighborhood Watch? If no, why not?**
- ii. **What should the Neighborhood Watch and the CDD do about this issue?**

- **Topics from Recent Interlocal Meeting**

- i. **Dispelling rumors, exaggerated claims, etc. by presenting true reported official information discussion of the changing nature of the Community**
- ii. **Reviewing “safety and security” procedures the GHCDD, GHMA and GHNW have already implemented and are currently in place**
- iii. **New infrastructure improvements underway (exit cameras, etc.)**
- iv. **Any additional measures to be undertaken by the CDD, MHA, and NW**
- v. **Cost, effectiveness, and net return of additional measures suggested by others, such as manning all gates 24/7; roving security patrol 24/7; pedestrian fencing**
- vi. **Individual homeowners’ responsibilities to “harden” their residences (mandatory?)**
 - **Citizens on Patrol (COP) Star Evaluation, recommendations and follow thru alarm systems installed and always activated when not home (perimeter, motion, glass alarms)**
 - **COP vacation patrol, neighbors watch**
 - **NW involvement**
 - **Additional measures: perimeter and interior cameras tied to alarm systems, smart phone monitoring**

- **Traffic Count Report for Main Gate (ABM)**

These items were discussed during the Fifth Order of Business.

E. Discussion: Mulch Frequency [TL]

This item was discussed during the Fifth Order of Business

F. Update: Sailfish Drive

This item was discussed during Item 5.A.

G. Continued Discussion: Agreement for Non-Resident to Utilize Amenity Facilities

This item was discussed during the Fifth Order of Business.

H. Consideration of/Decision on: Proposed Signage for Village Center and CDD Office

This item was discussed during the Fifth Order of Business.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

OPEN ITEMS

This item was briefly discussed during the Fifth Order of Business.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

SUPERVISORS' REQUESTS

Supervisor Smith asked that discussion of CDD communications to residents be included on the next workshop agenda.

Supervisor Smith asked that discussion of the sewer issues be included for discussion on the next workshop agenda.

Mr. Gallo asked that the Board and Mr. Kloptosky view the CDD signage, at night, and recommended that the "Crime Watch" sign be illuminated.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

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

<p>On MOTION by Supervisor Davidson and seconded by Supervisor Smith, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 1:57 p.m.</p>
--

[SIGNATURES APPEAR ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE]

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chair/Vice Chair