

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

A Community Workshop of the Grand Haven Community Development District's Board of Supervisors was held on **Thursday, March 5, 2015 at 10:00 a.m.**, at the **Grand Haven Village Center, Grand Haven Room, 2001 Waterside Parkway, Palm Coast, Florida 32137.**

Present at the meeting were:

Dr. Stephen Davidson	Chair
Pete Chiodo	Vice Chair
Marie Gaeta	Assistant Secretary
Tom Lawrence	Assistant Secretary
Ray Smith (<i>via telephone</i>)	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Craig Wrathell	District Manager
Rick Woodville	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Howard McGaffney	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Barry Kloptosky	Field Operations Manager
Robert Ross	Vesta/AMG
Ashley Higgins	CDD Office Staff
Al Lo Monaco	Resident
Jim Gallo	Resident
Rob Carlton	Resident
Ron Merlo	Resident
David Alfin	Resident
Don Plunkett	Resident
Lisa Mrakovic	Resident

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

CONSULTANTS, GUEST REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS

Supervisor Davidson indicated that Ms. Louise Leister, District Horticulturalist, will provide information for the next meeting agenda.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

UPDATES: Amenity Manager

Mr. Ross reported that the new e-blast system for tennis is working great, with approximately 100 people signed up. He advised that the recently implemented croquet system is working well; the croquet players are happy with it.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if the tennis e-blasts will be sent every few months so that new residents can sign up. Mr. Ross indicated that most new residents sign up in the office.

Supervisor Lawrence asked if Mr. Ross is still tracking parking issues and inquired about the findings. Mr. Ross advised that Wednesday and Friday are busiest; it is a struggle to find parking, especially around 9:30 a.m., requiring many to park across the street. In response to Supervisor Lawrence's question, Mr. Ross indicated that parking is full primarily due to the scheduled activities on those days.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

UPDATES: Field/Operations Manager

Mr. Kloptosky distributed a proposal from Flagler Fence & Concrete Construction (Flagler Fence) for 500 lineal feet of black vinyl coated chain link fence; \$9,260 for a 6' high fence and \$7,900 for a 5' high fence. He indicated that the proposal does not include permitting or clearing costs, which could substantially increase the price.

Mr. Kloptosky referred to the stormwater pipe repair between 55 and 57 Osprey Circle and advised that S.E. Cline, Inc. (Cline), repaired a section of broken pipe but there were questions about the integrity of the remaining portions of the pipe. The pipe was cleaned with a jet-vac and the contractor videoed the pipe at a cost of \$2,150; another contractor will review the video to determine whether the pipe should be lined or replaced.

Supervisor Davidson noted that the District must have the definitive locations of underground pipes in the easements and asked if the contractor can locate pipes. Mr. Kloptosky will inquire.

Regarding the resident request for an additional streetlight on Eastlake Drive, Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the bulbs in nearby streetlights were replaced with higher-watt bulbs; he will follow up with the resident regarding the result. It was noted that the resident mentioned a tree that was interfering. Mr. Kloptosky notified Ms. Leister that the tree should be pruned.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that the concrete driveways and sidewalk at the Marlin Drive Pump House were completed and passed the final inspection. In response to Supervisor Gaeta's question, Mr. Kloptosky stated that he was not sure if the structure is hurricane compliant.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the contractor, who frequently works with the City, was extremely frustrated with the City, as they have never experienced a situation like this on other projects. He explained that the City has waivers for some contractors, which allows them to perform work without a permit; the contractor advised Mr. Kloptosky that, when his company works for the City, it is not required to obtain a permit because it has a waiver. Mr. Kloptosky wondered if the District could obtain the same type of waiver.

Supervisor Davidson felt that District Counsel should research it.

Mr. Kloptosky was advised by the contractor that, if he knew in advance of the issues that would occur with the City, he probably would not have accepted the job. Mr. Kloptosky discussed several delays encountered by the contractor, which were caused by the City.

Supervisor Davidson recommended documenting the experiences and presenting the documentation to the City Council.

Supervisor Lawrence advised that the District's City Councilman, Mr. Jason DeLorenzo, is an employee of the Home Builders Association and suggested that the District meet with him for advice about what the District can do about the issues with the City. Supervisor Davidson pointed out that he and Mr. Kloptosky met with Mr. DeLorenzo and other Council Members several years ago and were promised that things would improve; however they did not. Supervisor Davidson stated that he is willing to try again but felt that nothing would be as effective as a "Grand Haven Night" at a City Council meeting.

Mr. Kloptosky reported that all of the additional exit cameras were installed. Supervisor Lawrence asked about signage advising of the cameras. Mr. Kloptosky believed that nothing was decided. Supervisor Gaeta questioned why signage would be necessary. Supervisor Lawrence stated that it is necessary because it might be a deterrent; he suggested sending an e-blast to the community.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the Creekside Pool resurfacing project is going well and is ahead of schedule; the pool is being refilled and the coping repairs should commence tomorrow or Monday.

Regarding the pickleball courts, Mr. Kloptosky stated that he spoke to Cline regarding the difficulty Nidy Sports Construction (Nidy) had trying to obtain a permit from the City; the City would not accept a permit application from them because Nidy does not have a general contractor (GC) license. Mr. Kloptosky advised that Cline is willing to pull the permit; the proposed cost for use of the GC license and the oversight is \$750, not including the cost of the permit. Cline will bill the District for the cost of the permit, plus 5%, which is typical. Mr. Kloptosky noted that Cline must perform on site visits, which are \$120 per visit and there should be about three visits. In response to Supervisor Gaeta's question, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that Cline has not met with Nidy; he will provide the contact information for Nidy.

Supervisor Davidson asked if Nidy previously experienced anything like these permit issues anywhere else in Florida. Mr. Kloptosky replied no; they have never been required to pull permits to perform this type of work. Supervisor Davidson asked that Mr. Kloptosky obtain a statement from Nidy indicating their experience.

Supervisor Davidson stressed that the District needs to keep a diary of all of the permit and other issues related to the City. Mr. Kloptosky advised that most contractors do not want to document the issues because the City will punish them in the future. Supervisor Davidson noted that Grand Haven residents, who have a vote, are being punished. Supervisor Lawrence felt that the documentation should explain that the City changes or adds to the requirements, each step of the way, before issuing a permit.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he will proceed with Cline's proposal for GC services for the pickleball court project.

Supervisor Davidson stated that, once people are playing pickleball and other sports and if the café is expanded, parking needs will increase.

- **Potential Café Expansion**

****This item was an addition to the agenda.****

Mr. Ross discussed expanding the café capacity by 50%. He pointed out that the café's business has increased and expansion would be a great idea.

Supervisor Davidson reiterated that expanding the café will increase parking demands. He felt that the issues with the City should be resolved prior to commencing a project such as this.

Mr. Kloptosky recommended an overall upgrade of the cafe, such as replacing the bar top, floors, etc., simultaneous with expansion. He supported updating the café and expansion and suggested hiring a designer or having the District Engineer develop a conceptual plan.

A question was raised regarding the kitchen, if the café is expanded. Mr. Ross indicated that new equipment will be installed on Sunday, which will increase the kitchen’s capacity; kitchen improvements have been made.

Discussion ensued regarding quality of service if the café expands, reduced usage during the off season, etc.

Supervisor Lawrence asked Mr. Ross to present a conceptual plan, at the next meeting, of how the increased volume would be handled, if the café expanded.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Utility Easement Evaluation Project

i. Commencement

Supervisor Davidson recalled Mr. Kloptosky’s presentation, at the last meeting, regarding issues that develop when encroachments on easements destroy or damage underground pipes. He felt that Ms. Leister’s fee to assist with this project will be modest and should not be an impediment to the project.

Supervisor Lawrence voiced his opinion that, if the obstruction is something that the Architecture Design Committee (ADC) approved, the ADC should be financially responsible for the change. He stated that, “Since the ADC and GHMA is us, I think we should agree to pay for any changes, including replanting because, from the residents’ point of view, they relied on the ADC to give them guidance on their landscaping.”. Supervisor Lawrence supported Option 3, in the sample plan provided, with the District informing the resident of what can remain and making the owner responsible for any changes and upkeep, going forward. He believed that the District should mail a letter to the GHMA advising that the tree count is based on square footage and asking them to change the square footage requirements for properties with easements, by subtracting the square footage of the easement from the requirement.

ii. Policies

- **Who**
- **What**
- **When**
- **Where**

Evaluation by Ms. Leister and a Field Operations staff member was discussed.

Supervisor Gaeta discussed the many aspects of this project and questioned how owners could be made responsible; there should be “buy in” from the other parties, as well.

Supervisor Lawrence suggested informing the developer that they would be accountable if the ADC for new construction allows landscaping in the easements that could cause damage.

Mr. Wrathell discussed how this situation was handled in another district. He noted that about 10% to 15% of the property owners chose to pay on their own for removal and/or relocation of obstructions. He indicated that Option 2 was the most popular option, which involved clearing the right-of-way (ROW). Mr. Wrathell stated that the residents who chose Option 3 were those that wanted to maintain a blocked view of what was behind their homes. He felt that Option 3 would be most popular in Grand Haven, as residents have nowhere else to plant and will need the District’s permission to plant in the easement. Mr. Wrathell was sure that some property owners would not be comfortable with the language in the indemnification agreement but felt that the language is important.

Supervisor Davidson asked who would negotiate with property owners regarding what can remain in the easement. Supervisor Lawrence believed that Ms. Leister should be the technical expert. Supervisor Davidson noted that, if Option 3 is used, the cost would increase because of the fees for the evaluation and negotiation processes.

Supervisor Chiodo agreed that something must be done but the District must first determine the extent of the issue and felt that the solution should not “hurt” the property owners who did realize the situation and were not in control.

Supervisor Smith believed that the issue must be defined first by having Ms. Leister evaluate the situation.

Discussion ensued regarding the maps or plans depicting the outfalls. Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the documents exist but he must locate them. Mr. Kloptosky asked if the objective includes defining the pipe locations or only what is planted in the easements. Supervisor Davidson indicated that the objective is to identify any easement with a potential obstruction that could cause damage to the underground pipes. Mr. Kloptosky asked what the

Board plans to do with the information, once it is obtained, and questioned if the plan includes preventative measures. Supervisor Davidson presumed that the pipe locations must be determined in the easements with potential issues; he felt that the District should only remove things that will damage the pipes.

Mr. Kloptosky was unsure if it would be practical to be proactive; he felt that proactive action, including removing trees and other obstructions, prior to identifying a pipe issue, could lead to machinery damaging pipes that were not previously damaged. He suggested first identifying issues with the pipes and then completing necessary repairs; even if a heavy tree over a pipe could cause damage but has not, yet, he believed that the easement should be left alone until the pipe has damage.

Supervisor Davidson pointed out that Mr. Kloptosky's recommendation defeats the purpose of the entire project. Mr. Kloptosky voiced his opinion that the District could spend money clearing the easements but cause damage during the process. Supervisor Davidson noted Ms. Leister's belief that vegetation could be removed without damaging the underground pipes. Mr. Kloptosky reiterated his opinion that nothing should be done in the easement if the underground pipe is not damaged, as this was the process for the past seven years; the easements should only be addressed when a pipe issue arises. Supervisor Davidson felt that Mr. Kloptosky is arguing to delay repair work until there is a \$100,000 repair, rather than performing preventative maintenance. Mr. Wrathell acknowledged Mr. Kloptosky's position but stressed that the community is aging and the issue will worsen and, while pipes could be damaged when obstructions are removed, the benefits outweigh allowing the problems to fester before acting. Supervisor Smith reiterated that the issues should be defined before performing any clearing. Mr. Wrathell noted that, in another district, the trees were cut and the stumps were ground but the roots were not removed; the hope was that the roots would die. Supervisor Lawrence agreed that Ms. Leister should evaluate the easements.

iii. Right-of-Way/Easement Clearing Policy and Related Obstruction Removal Agreements

This item was discussed during Item 6.A.ii.

iv. Communication of Policies to GHMA, MADC and NADC

Supervisor Davidson indicated that the District must communicate its policy to the GHMA, MADC and NADC. When the builder and Board were the same entity, the Master

Declarations were violated and the ADC signed off. He stated that the District must establish a policy disallowing anything that could endanger the pipes or utilities.

Mr. Wrathell suggested enacting a process where the District must review and approve any issues that could affect the easements, perhaps having Mr. Kloptosky and Ms. Leister perform the reviews.

Supervisor Davidson asked Mr. Carlton if the ADC is abiding by the Master Declarations when it reviews a new site plan. Mr. Carlton felt that the District should develop a consensus and policy stating what can be planted in easements, as well as providing the easement locations to the ADC, for new construction.

Discussion ensued regarding whether a landscaping policy would impact the tree count requirement. Supervisor Davidson voiced his opinion that the ADC tree count requirement is denser than the City's requirement.

Ms. Leister will commence the easement inspection process.

Supervisor Davidson noted that the District should notify property owners of the findings, after the inspection, and remind them that vegetation should not be planted, in the future.

B. Procedures for Enforcement of Detention Pond Fishing Policies

Mr. Kloptosky recalled that certain areas occasionally have a high concentration of people fishing; residents expect something to be done when they report people fishing. He noted that most people are not residents and do not have a guest pass. In response to Supervisor Lawrence's question, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the locations include common and private property but most are on common property. He expressed concern about staff approaching people and felt that law enforcement should probably become involved. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the Sheriff was called several times for repeat offenders on Southlake; however, the people are usually gone by the time the Sheriff arrives. He noted one instance when a Deputy arrived but did nothing because the District does not have signage prohibiting fishing; Mr. Kloptosky advised the Deputy of the District's Amenity Rules but was told that nothing could be done if it was not posted.

Mr. Kloptosky discussed whether the District should issue trespass notices and, if so, who should issue them, whether the District's Amenity Rules were strong enough to enforce, etc.

Supervisor Davidson pointed out that some ponds and banks are owned by the CDD and have public access that allows a person to stand on the bank and look at the pond and sit on the

bank; however, a nonresident cannot fish in the pond, as that violates the Amenity Rules because fishing was defined as “use of an amenity”. He explained that, when a nonresident fishes on common property, a trespass notice can be issued; however, the situation is different when a person crosses private property and fishes from the common property bank because it involves the person trespassing on private property.

Supervisor Davidson indicated that Sheriff Manfre felt that, even if Grand Haven is a public community, the presence of gates gives the semblance “things are done differently, here”. Per Sheriff Manfre, the Deputy was referring to ponds in parks, etc., where it is an open community. Supervisor Davidson stated that Sheriff Manfre believed that signage was not required; the gates give the semblance that Grand Haven is a separate municipality with its own rules, which would allow the Deputy to respond to the complaint, even when signage is not present. He reported that Undersheriff Staly is researching the statutes to confirm Sheriff Manfre’s belief. Supervisor Davidson stated that, since it is a minor issue now, Sheriff Manfre would like to do what he can to help but without creating a major situation or institutionalizing it and making the matter more complex. Sheriff Manfre felt that, for common property, during normal hours, Mr. Kloptosky and staff can notify the Sheriff’s Office of the trespasser, using the nonemergency line, and a trespass notice would be issued. Supervisor Davidson indicated that, when someone trespasses across private property to access the common property pond bank, the resident should call the Sheriff’s Office directly and utilize the term “I feel threatened”.

Supervisor Lawrence voiced his opinion that this discussion is “making a mountain out of a mole hill”; he questioned why it is being discussed because the situation is under control. Supervisor Davidson advised that it is under discussion because residents are complaining about people fishing. Supervisor Lawrence stressed that it is not the CDD’s responsibility to keep people off of common property; if a resident has an issue, they should contact the Sheriff. Mr. Kloptosky interjected that most people who are fishing are not confrontational; they simply do not know that they should not be fishing in those locations. Regarding contacting Mr. Kloptosky or the Sheriff’s Office when fishing is observed, Supervisor Lawrence questioned how the resident could know that the person fishing is not a resident; he felt that, if a resident has an issue with someone, the resident could approach the person because it is not the CDD’s responsibility to “police” common property, after hours. Mr. Kloptosky acknowledged that some residents become upset with anyone, including residents, who are fishing because they do not want anyone there. Supervisor Gaeta agreed that the District should not be “policing” this situation.

Supervisor Davidson pointed out that the District can control access and use of the amenities; the act of fishing is use of an amenity. Supervisor Smith agreed with Supervisor Lawrence's comments and suggested that the District communicate to residents what to do if fishing is observed on common property or private property.

Supervisor Davidson questioned what residents should be told.

Mr. Wrathell recommended advising residents to contact the Sheriff if they have a concern about anyone they observe fishing in the ponds; the District should not be involved in distinguishing the property, etc. A resident voiced his opinion that, if a resident feels threatened, they should contact the Sheriff's Office. Supervisor Davidson questioned who would request the trespass notice, if a Deputy arrived. Supervisor Lawrence felt that trespass notices were not necessary, unless there are repeat offenders, at which time, Mr. Kloptosky can request the trespass notice. Supervisor Davidson again questioned who would do it after hours. Supervisor Lawrence asked why the Board is discussing something that does not happen a lot. Supervisor Davidson disagreed and stated "we are getting complaints". Supervisor Gaeta asked how many complaints. Mr. Kloptosky stated that complaints are received sporadically; he could only recall receiving multiple complaints about a repeat offender.

Discussion continued regarding a reporting procedure for residents to use when fishing is observed.

Supervisor Davidson questioned if the District can have the vehicle of a fisherman towed, if it is parked on Waterside Parkway. Mr. Kloptosky was unsure about the ordinances regarding towing within Grand Haven.

A resident recalled observing a vehicle parked in front of mailboxes and residents could not obtain their mail. He spoke to the person and the vehicle was moved to a location that blocked the street ROW. Supervisor Davidson recommended reporting the license plate number to the CDD office so staff can determine if it was a resident's vehicle.

*****The meeting recessed at 11:32 a.m.*****

*****The meeting reconvened at 11:45 a.m.*****

C. Personnel Manual and Job Descriptions

This item was presented following Item 6.D.

D. Grand Haven CDD Business Plan

Supervisor Smith recommended that discussion of this item be postponed so that he could be present. He felt that it is time for the Board to review the accomplishments and reprioritize the Business Plan.

This item was deferred to the next workshop.

▪ **Personnel Manual and Job Descriptions**

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

Supervisor Smith noted that he forwarded his comments on the Personnel Manual to Management's office.

Mr. Wrathell explained that the sample personnel manual included was a boilerplate version from another district. He recommended that the Board review this version and changes can be incorporated into the District's version.

The following changes were made:

Page 1, Section 010: Replace with the District's current Mission and Vision Statements

Page 1, Section 010: Move last paragraph to be first paragraph in Section 020

Page 2, Section 030, Paragraph 3 and throughout: Change "District Management" to "Board of Supervisors"

Page 4, Section 040, Paragraph 2: Delete first sentence

Page 4, Section 040, Paragraph 2: Change "Field Supervisor" to "Field Operations Manager"

Page 5, Section 101, Paragraph 1: Per Mr. Wrathell, including the "at will at any time," statement regarding employment here should alleviate need to include it elsewhere; therefore, the statement can be removed from other sections of the Personnel Manual.

Page 5, Section 102, Paragraph 1: Change "their supervisors" to "Field Operations Manager and District Manager"

Page 5, Section 102, Paragraph 2: Change "supervision" to "Management"

Page 6, Section 104, Paragraph 4 and throughout: Change "Personnel Department" to "Management"

Page 7: Insert "Section 106 HIRING OF RESIDENTS" and "It is the District's policy to not hire residents as employees."

Near the end of the Personnel Manual: Insert "700 MISCELLANEOUS EXCEPTIONS", stating "The Board of Supervisors has the ability to grant exceptions to any of these policies, provided it is in the best interests of the District."

Page 7, Section 108: Switch order of Paragraphs 2 and 3

Pages 9 and 10, Section 116: Delete entire section

Pages 10 and 11, Section 201: Delete entire section

Page 11, Section 202, Paragraph 2: Change “Generally, only supervisors and management personnel, or designated Human Resources Administrator of the District who have a” to “Only Management has a”

Page 11, Section 202, Paragraph 3: Change “the District’s director of personnel (“Personnel Director”)” with “Management”

Page 11, Section 203, Paragraph 1: Change “background, the employment references and credit worthiness of all applicants.” to “background and the employment references. The District may perform random drug testing and screening.”

Page 11, Section 203: Delete Paragraph 2

Page 11, Section 204: Insert “.” after “emergency” and delete “educational accomplishments, and other such status reports should be accurate and current at all times. If any personnel data has changed, notify the District Supervisor.”

Page 12, Section 205, Paragraph 2: Delete “Employees who are promoted or transferred within the District must complete a secondary introductory period of the same length with each reassignment to a new position.

Page 12, Section 205: Delete Paragraph 3

Page 12, Section 205, Paragraph 5: Following the last sentence, insert “At the discretion of Management, Paid Time Off (PTO) can be utilized.”

Page 12, Section 205: Delete Paragraph 6

Page 13, Section 209, Paragraph 1: Delete “Additional formal performance evaluations are conducted to provide both supervisors and employees the opportunity to discuss job tasks, identify and correct weaknesses, encourage and recognize strengths, and discuss positive, purposeful approaches for meeting goals.”

Page 13, Section 209: Delete Paragraph 2

Pages 13 and 14, Section 212: Delete entire section

Page 14, Section 301: Delete entire section

Regarding Section 303, on Pages 14 and 15, Mr. Wrathell recommended giving two weeks of vacation, per year, up to five years, on a “use it or lose” it basis. He explained that the District should avoid allowing employees to amass large amounts of vacation time.

Mr. Kloptosky referred to a statement in Section 303, which references carrying over unused vacation time and questioned if vacation time would be allowed to be carried over.

Mr. Wrathell pointed out that instituting a “use it or lose it” policy would force employees to use their vacation time. He noted that employees who do not take vacation time quickly “burn out” and suggested including a statement encouraging employees to take vacation time.

Supervisor Davidson recommended that Management revise Section 303.

Mr. Wrathell recommended providing two weeks of vacation, per year, up to five years, and three weeks of vacation from year five, forward.

Mr. Kloptosky discussed the vacation benefits in the employment agreements for all current employees. Numerous Supervisors were surprised by the generous vacation time provided in the current employment agreements. Mr. Kloptosky defended the generous vacation policy, stating that employees do not receive other benefits, such as health insurance and 401K plans.

The Board agreed that existing employees should be “grandfathered” in but new employees should accrue vacation at a rate of two weeks, per year, up to five years and three weeks after five years. Mr. Wrathell reiterated his opinion that a global “use it or lose it” policy should be implemented for all employees. Mr. Kloptosky stated that he has never allowed employees to carry over paid time off.

Mr. Wrathell suggested eliminating much of the verbiage in Section 303.

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

▪ **Fence at Waterfront Park**

*****This item was an addition to the agenda.*****

Supervisor Lawrence indicated that he discussed this matter with Mayor Netts, who discussed it with the City Manager. Mayor Netts reported that the City Manager would not support the project because he saw very little benefit to Grand Haven residents, as a whole; rather, only the residents adjacent to the park would benefit. Supervisor Lawrence then contacted Councilman DeLorenzo and will meet with him, on site, today.

Supervisor Lawrence advised that he now has second thoughts regarding the proposed fence. He noted that the park was built about five years ago; in that time, no complaints about people accessing the community through the park were received and, then, two or three complaints were received but none since. Supervisor Lawrence wondered whether the threat is

real. He noted a coquina path extending from the North Gate that runs directly behind all of the property in Creekside, which could provide access to those homes, as the path is not fenced off. Supervisor Lawrence felt that the District should hold off on the project and advise the City that the community has concerns about fencing along the coquina path; the District will monitor the situation but the City should be alerted to consider what it will do about the coquina path.

Supervisor Davidson voiced his opinion that the necessity for a fence becomes more acute, once there is actual contact with the homes in that area. He pointed out that many other fence requests would arise in other areas of the community, if the project were completed.

Supervisor Smith believed that, in reviewing the Board's long-term objectives, the perception of security should be discussed, as it is unclear to him. He recommended taking no action now and developing a long-term strategy, first, which encompasses all areas.

Supervisor Lawrence asked Supervisor Smith if he was comfortable with him discussing fencing for the coquina path with Councilman DeLorenzo. Supervisor Smith indicated that he was comfortable with Supervisor Lawrence discussing the Board's role in making the citizens of Palm Coast feel secure but not specifying Grand Haven; he does not want to spend the District's "political capital" on an individual decision until after the Board develops a long-term plan.

E. Evening Workshops/Community Information Sessions

Supervisor Davidson recalled that the Board previously discussed holding a regular CDD workshop, followed by a community information workshop. It was noted that the previous discussion was about holding the CDD workshop from 4:00 p.m., to 6:00 p.m., with the community information workshop commencing at 6:00 p.m.

Discussion ensued regarding the timing and scope of a community information workshop.

Mr. Wrathell felt that concept is good; however, the same people who currently attend meetings and workshops will be the same ones attending the proposed evening community information workshop. He believed that the only value would be for the District to say it held the workshop. Mr. Wrathell recalled the yearly budget public hearings and noted that the Board has a major presentation prior to adopting the budget. He stated that the budget public hearing is the District's primary informational session with residents.

Supervisor Davidson recommended tabling this item and discussing it at the next workshop, during the communications section of the business plan discussion.

F. Unfinished Business

i. Sailfish Drive Project

- **Commencement**

Mr. Kloptosky stated that the project is close to commencement; the District Engineer is awaiting clarifications from Cline regarding a few items in the proposal; Mr. Munson would like some items removed from the proposal.

Supervisor Davidson stressed the need to complete the project prior to the rainy season. Furthermore, residents must be notified of the logistics of the project. Mr. Kloptosky stated that the proposal contained an up charge of approximately \$7,000 if Cline had to make the driveways accessible each night.

Mr. Kloptosky and Supervisor Davidson preferred paying extra to provide nightly driveway access. Supervisor Lawrence pointed out that this project will set precedence for what the District does on other projects, such as resurfacing the roads; if the up charge is \$7,000 for this small project, it would be much higher for the larger projects. Mr. Kloptosky voiced his opinion that access would not be an issue when the roads are resurfaced; in this situation, the driveways will be dug up and it would be necessary to backfill them each night to provide access.

Supervisor Lawrence suggested adopting a District policy that, going forward, puddles in the streets or in front of driveways would not be addressed until the streets are being resurfaced. He voiced his opinion that the Board was “had” with regard to the Sailfish Drive project; the District is spending a lot of money on a small puddle that was insignificant.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that, this week, a resident in another area made an inquiry and provided photographs and video of puddles forming during a rain storm; it was exactly the same issue that occurred on Sailfish Drive.

Supervisor Smith questioned the availability of nearby parking for residents, if their driveways were not accessible for one or two nights, as he concurred that the accommodations made in this project would set precedence for future projects. Mr. Kloptosky explained the process for providing nightly access and voiced his opinion that the \$7,000 cost is worth it to keep residents happy. Supervisor Davidson felt that nightly access is necessary. Supervisor Smith suggested reminding the Sailfish Drive residents that the work is being completed, per the request of the neighborhood; therefore, they will not have access to their driveways for a night or two. Supervisor Lawrence stated that he changed his mind regarding paying extra to allow the

Sailfish Drive residents access each night because of Mr. Kloptosky's comment that access would not be an issue during future road resurfacing projects.

Discussion ensued regarding other areas where oak trees could cause damage and lifting.

ii. Croquet Court Renovation

• Commencement

Mr. Kloptosky reported that information was sent to Precision Land Grading to change the proposal date. The proposal will be given to Mr. Clark for preparation of a contract. He indicated that the tentative commencement date is mid-April. Supervisor Davidson questioned if, seasonally, mid-April is an appropriate time. Mr. Kloptosky advised that it depends upon the temperature and weather; the contractor will make a determination when commencement is nearer. Supervisor Davidson asked if the crew will be available in mid-April. Mr. Kloptosky stated that he is awaiting a response from the contractor. Supervisor Davidson stressed that the District must communicate with the croquet players.

Supervisor Smith asked about the scope of the project.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that the existing sod and 4" of sub-base will be removed and the ground will be refilled, laser leveled, compacted and resodded. In response to Supervisor Smith's question, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that the project involves rebuilding the existing Creekside croquet court on its current site.

iii. 37 Jasmine Drive Slope

Mr. Kloptosky advised that the District Engineer inspected the site and found that, in certain locations, the slope exceeds the 3:1 slope requirement specified in the contract. The District Engineer felt that the area must be regraded, as there are too many steep dips and it must have a consistent 3:1 slope. Regarding the requirement to clear 20" to 30' of the property, Mr. Kloptosky pointed out that the builder could argue that Tract D starts at about 5' from the home, as that is where the property line ends. He explained that the proposal did not clearly state that clearing should begin from the actual, existing retaining wall, which should have been included in the proposal. Mr. Kloptosky stated that, per the District Engineer, the inconsistency in the slope is the only matter that the District can argue.

Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he informed the builder of the issue.

Supervisor Davidson recommended providing the information to District Counsel and discussing this matter further, at the next meeting.

iv. Main Entrance Traffic Backup Study

Mr. Kloptosky advised that a second guard is stationed at the Main Gate, as requested, for a trial period of two weeks and improvement has already been observed in just four days. In response to Supervisor Smith’s question regarding administrative tasks that the extra guard can perform during slower times, Mr. Kloptosky stated that neither the security provider nor the CDD office had administrative work to give the extra guard. Supervisor Smith rejected Mr. Kloptosky’s response; every organization has nonprofessional duties that can be passed to nonprofessionals and strongly recommended that Mr. Kloptosky further investigate it. Supervisor Davidson directed Mr. Kloptosky to invite Ms. Cindy Gartzke, of ABM Security, to the next meeting to discuss the tasks being performed by the second security guard.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

UPDATES: District Manager

- **UPCOMING WORKSHOP/MEETING DATES**
 - **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGULAR MEETING**
 - **March 19, 2015 at 10:00 A.M.**

The next meeting will be on March 19, 2015 at 10:00 a.m., at this location. Mr. Wrathell noted that he will not attend the meeting.

- **COMMUNITY WORKSHOP**
 - **April 2, 2015 at 10:00 A.M.**

The next workshop will be on April 2, 2015 at 10:00 a.m., at this location.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

OPEN ITEMS

There being no open items, the next item followed.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

SUPERVISORS’ REQUESTS

Supervisor Lawrence questioned if Grand Haven Realty has the right to use the Grand Haven oak tree logo. Supervisor Davidson recalled that, several years ago, District Counsel researched this matter and found that Grand Haven Realty has the copyrights to the oak tree logo. Supervisor Davidson pointed out that Grand Haven Realty is allowing the CDD to use the oak tree logo. Supervisor Smith asked if the CDD has a long-term, guaranteed right to use the logo. No one knew and Supervisor Lawrence recommended making that a condition of the land swap deal. Supervisor Chiodo noted that the Grand Living facility still needs additional

conservation area; Mr. Jim Cullis, of Grand Haven Realty, has not given up but is becoming hard pressed to move the project forward. Supervisor Chiodo stated that Mr. Cullis was unsure how long the building contractor would wait. Mr. Wrathell speculated that, if Mr. Cullis wants the project to proceed, he must make a mitigation payment to the City.

▪ **Personnel Manual and Job Descriptions**

Discussion of this item resumed.

Mr. Wrathell advised that the vacation policy, Section 303, on Pages 14 and 15, will be revised, as previously discussed.

Page 16, Section 305: Delete everything following “New Year’s Eve”

Mr. Kloptosky noted that the employment agreements with the current employees use the term paid time off (PTO), rather than vacation time.

Page 14, Section 303: Change “VACATION BENEFITS” to “PAID TIME OFF (PTO)”

Mr. Wrathell suggested inclusion of the statement “The employee has discretion to use PTO as vacation or sick time.”.

Page 15 and throughout: Change “vacation”, “vacation time” and “vacation time off” to “PTO”

Page 17, Section 306, Paragraph 3: Change “their supervisor” to “Management”

Page 17, Section 307: Delete entire section

Pages 17 and 18, Section 308: Delete entire section

Page 18, Section 309, Paragraph 2: Insert “.” After “employees” and delete remainder of Paragraph 2 and Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, in entirety.

Pages 19 and 20, Section 314: Delete entire section

Pages 20 and 21, Section 403: Delete entire section

Page 21, Section 405: Delete entire section

Page 21, Section 407: Delete entire section

Page 22, Section 408: Delete entire section

Page 22, Section 409: Delete entire section

Page 22, Section 410: Delete entire section

Pages 22 and 23, Section 501: Delete entire section

Pages 23 and 24, Section 502: Delete Paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5

Page 24, Section 504: Delete entire section

Discussion ensued regarding a smoking policy. Mr. Kloptosky pointed out that four of the six CDD employees smoke and the proposed language implies that smoking would not be allowed anywhere on CDD property. Mr. Wrathell asked if there were issues with any employees smoking in the office. Mr. Kloptosky conceded that he had an issue with an employee smoking elsewhere but not in the office; there were issues with non smokers versus smokers. Mr. Kloptosky stated that there are designated smoking areas within the community and he instructed employees not to smoke in CDD vehicles and to be courteous around non smokers.

Page 24, Section 505: Change verbiage to “Smoking is allowed only in designated areas.”

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Supervisor Smith indicated that it would assist telephone participants if the microphone receiver was moved more towards the center or towards Mr. Kloptosky, as he speaks a lot during the meetings. Supervisor Davidson surmised that a longer cord is necessary.

There being nothing further to discuss, the workshop adjourned.

On MOTION by Supervisor Davidson and seconded by Supervisor Lawrence, the workshop adjourned at 2:02 p.m.

[SIGNATURES APPEAR ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE]

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chair/Vice Chair