

**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, May 19, 2016** 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 (<i>via telephone</i>)	Vice Chair
Marie Gaeta	Assistant Secretary
Tom Lawrence	Assistant Secretary
Ray Smith	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Craig Wrathell	District Manager
Howard McGaffney	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Cindy Cerbone	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Scott Clark	District Counsel
Jim Sullivan	District Engineer
Barry Kloptosky	Field Operations Manager
Robert Ross	Vesta/AMG
Roy Deary (<i>via telephone</i>)	Vesta/AMG
Ashley Higgins	Grand Haven CDD Office
David Cottrell	Aquatic Systems, Inc.
Jim Gallo	Resident
Joe Daily	Resident
Al Lo Monaco	Resident
Dennis Seiferheld	Resident
Ray Moore	Resident
Rob Carlton	Resident, GHMA President
Ron Merlo	Resident
Don Plunkett	Resident
Frank Benham	Resident
Tom Byrne	Resident
David Reisman	Resident
Vic Natiello	Resident
Morgan Evans	Resident
Randy Ecker	Resident Guest

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Mr. McGaffney called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m., and noted, for the record, that Supervisors Davidson, Gaeta and Smith were present, in person. Supervisor Lawrence was not present at roll call. Supervisor Chiodo was not present.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Regarding midge flies, Mr. Morgan Evans, a resident, asked if the District obtained proposals to stock fish in the pond, within 30 days. Mr. Kloptosky obtained a proposal and Mr. David Cottrell, of Aquatic Systems, Inc. (ASI), would speak about it later. Mr. Evans asked when the roads near Flamingo Court would be resurfaced. Mr. Kloptosky stated that the work was in the Request for Proposals (RFP) phase. Mr. Evans asked if a semi-annual financial report is produced. Mr. McGaffney stated that Management provides monthly Unaudited Financial Statements to the Board, at each meeting. The Board reviews and approves the statements. An audit is conducted, annually. In response to Mr. Evans' question, Supervisor Davidson stated that, upon request, Management could email a copy of the Unaudited Financial Statements to him, each month. Mr. McGaffney asked Mr. Evans to provide his contact information and stated that Mr. Evans would be added to the Agenda Distribution List.

Mr. Jim Gallo, a resident, stated that bicycles were not being parked in bicycle racks.

Mr. Dennis Seiferheld, a resident, introduced Mr. Randy Ecker, a guest. Regarding Mr. Clark's letter to them, Mr. Seiferheld read and responded to the following, from the letter:

1. *"You were observed on the tennis courts without proper authorization to be there."*

Mr. Seiferheld stated that Mr. Ecker was authorized because he was his guest and he registered Mr. Ecker, as a guest.

2. *"When you were asked to leave, you did not follow those instructions."*

Mr. Seiferheld stated that Mr. Ecker was not asked to leave. They were playing tennis on Wednesday morning at 9:00 a.m., and two Sheriffs appeared and issued the Trespass Notice.

Mr. Seiferheld stated that, on the audio, it was repeated, numerous times, that Mr. Ecker refused to pay; however, Mr. Ecker paid, many times. Mr. Seiferheld acknowledged that Mr.

Ecker did not pay on the day of the Trespass Notice or the previous day but it was not “like he was skipping onto the courts, slipping under the fence and trying to get away with not paying; he has checks”. Mr. Seiferheld understood that Mr. Ecker was in violation but hoped that the matter could be resolved and a procedure could be developed so that Mr. Ecker could play, as a guest, provided he pays the guest fee.

Mr. Seiferheld recalled Supervisor Chiodo’s comment that he, as the resident, had not followed the rules and did not register Mr. Ecker. Several years ago, Mr. Ecker was going to play as a regular substitute and, at that time, Mr. Seiferheld registered Mr. Ecker as his guest.

*****Supervisor Lawrence arrived at the meeting, at 10:10 a.m.*****

Mr. Ecker acknowledged that he did not pay the guest fee 100% of the time but wished to address inaccuracies. He has played tennis in the District for two years and estimated that he paid 80% to 85%, during the first year. Mr. Ecker presented \$70 in checks and stated he paid cash, also. The intent was never to sneak onsite and play. The matches were at 7:30 a.m., and the office was closed; several times, checks were given to “Charlie” and “Charlie” offered to get the checks from Mr. Ecker at the tennis courts. Since the office was closed, Mr. Ecker stated he tried to “put systems in place” but did not follow through as well as he should have.

Regarding the Trespass Notice incident, Mr. Ecker stated that Mr. Ross’ statements “You never pay.” and “You refuse to pay.” were untrue. Mr. Ecker indicated that he never tried to take advantage of the system and did not appreciate that two Sheriffs came and he was not given warning. He felt that Mr. Ross should have told him that they must work out an arrangement, since the guest fee was not paid 100% of the time. Mr. Ecker stated that his tennis partners did not know whether he paid and found Mr. Ross’ treatment of the residents unacceptable, as the residents assumed he paid.

Mr. Clark stated the letter to Mr. Ecker was sent based on the comments at the last meeting. Mr. Ross subsequently advised Mr. Clark that the letter was incorrect and that Mr. Ecker was not asked to leave and a clarifying letter was sent to Mr. Ecker. Mr. Seiferheld and Mr. Ecker contacted Mr. Clark and wished to address the Board. It would be appropriate for the Board to hear from Mr. Ross prior to taking action.

Mr. Ross stated that Mr. Ecker’s synopsis was correct and acknowledged criticizing the residents for playing tennis with someone who was not paying. Guests must sign a waiver and pay the guest fee before playing and the rule was broken.

Mr. Seiferheld asked if, as a resident, he broke the rule. Mr. Ross stated that Mr. Seiferheld did not sign Mr. Ecker in that morning.

Mr. Seiferheld read the following from the Amenity Rules:

“The property owner or registered renter inviting the houseguest or daily guest must be present upon registration, unless other arrangements have been made with the Amenity Manager’s office.”

Mr. Seiferheld stated that he made that arrangement. Approximately two years ago, he and Mr. Ecker were told to register Mr. Ecker as a guest because he would be playing tennis regularly; therefore, he made “other arrangements”. Mr. Seiferheld assumed that he was “clean”.

Mr. Ross stated that the rules require signing in and signing a waiver, daily. Mr. Seiferheld felt that Mr. Ross was not listening; the rules state, “*unless other arrangements have been made*” and other arrangements were made. Mr. Kloptosky asked if Mr. Ross was aware of another arrangement. Mr. Ross replied no. Mr. Kloptosky asked who the other arrangements were made with. Supervisor Gaeta stated that Mr. Seiferheld made arrangements with “Linda”. Mr. Seiferheld stated that might not be the current rule. Mr. Ross stated that Mr. Ecker has not signed the waiver; Mr. Seiferheld made an arrangement several years ago but liability must be covered. Mr. Seiferheld would be happy to “do that” but, from the time the arrangements were made, he followed the rules and was never told that he must change or do something different.

Mr. Clark acknowledged the difference of opinion regarding the Amenity Rules, which the Board should consider and determine procedures for situations such as this. The Board must determine whether to lift the Trespass Notice or continue it and whether other action should be taken. The letter that was sent would be considered the first warning, under the Amenity Rules; therefore, the probable first action was already taken, which creates a situation where Mr. Ecker could be suspended, upon a subsequent violation.

*****Mr. Wrathell and Ms. Cerbone arrived at the meeting, in person, at 10:20 a.m.*****

Supervisor Gaeta asked Mr. Seiferheld if the Amenity staff ever advised him that guests must pay the \$10 guest fee every time the guest played. Mr. Seiferheld replied yes. Supervisor Gaeta stated that, per Mr. Ecker, he did not always pay the \$10 fee. Mr. Seiferheld responded affirmatively but stated he did not know if Mr. Ecker paid every time; he did not ask but assumed that Mr. Ecker paid each time.

Supervisor Lawrence stated the Amenity office opens at 8:00 a.m., and asked how guests who would play tennis at 7:00 a.m., would pay and sign a waiver. Mr. Ross stated that the tennis

court time slot is 8:00 a.m., to 9:30 a.m. Supervisor Lawrence asked if people are allowed to play at 7:00 a.m. Mr. Ross stated that work must be done before 8:00 a.m., so, it becomes an issue, if players arrive very early. Mr. Ross pointed out that a guest can sign the waiver and pay the day before. Mr. McGaffney asked if a waiver could be valid for a specified time. Mr. Clark stated that a long-term waiver could be drafted but payment must be addressed.

Supervisor Davidson suggested addressing the following items at the next workshop and developing a procedure:

- How to handle early hours.
- Repeat players and a time limit for waivers.
- How repeat players pay.

Supervisor Davidson questioned if the Trespass Notice should remain in force while an understandable and enforceable procedure is developed.

Mr. Clark voiced his opinion that continuing the Trespass Notice was not appropriate, in this circumstance, primarily because Mr. Ecker was not asked to leave and did not refuse to leave, which was the purpose of the Trespass Notice, nor was he an endangerment or involved in criminal activity. The Trespass Notice should be lifted while a policy is developed but Mr. Ecker should be reminded that he was warned and could face a lengthy suspension, if he plays but does not pay; the Amenity Rules provide for suspension of daily guests.

Supervisor Davidson recalled Mr. Ross' understanding that a liability waiver must be signed and payment received, each day, and asked about the audit trail if a guest pays cash to an amenity facilitator. If the Trespass Notice is lifted, a temporary procedure must be implemented. Mr. Clark confirmed that a long-term waiver could be provided by tomorrow. Regarding payment, it was suggested that Mr. Ecker pay in advance. Mr. Ecker asked about obtaining an annual pass to play tennis. Supervisor Davidson stated that an annual pass could be purchased for \$2,500. Mr. Ecker stated the issue with paying in advance was that, when he paid in advance, there were two rainouts so his payments were carried forward. It was noted that a guest pass could be punched when the person plays.

Supervisor Davidson surmised that a guest could pay in advance but should not pay cash, on the day of, because there must be an audit system.

Supervisor Lawrence felt that this was an isolated incident, which the Board should not spend a lot of time on. Mr. Ross and Mr. Deary should be empowered to develop the procedure

and Mr. Clark should draft a waiver that is valid for one year. Supervisor Davidson stated that the procedure must be approved by the Board. Supervisor Gaeta agreed.

Supervisor Smith asked how early a tennis court could be reserved. Mr. Ross stated 8:00 a.m. In response to Supervisor Davidson's question, Mr. Ross confirmed that people practice on the tennis courts before 8:00 a.m.; players sign up for the 7:30 a.m., practice time slot.

Supervisor Davidson stressed that lifting the Trespass Notice was not intended to circumvent Mr. Ross; this situation was due to a misunderstanding, misinterpretation and lack of rules for this particular circumstance. Supervisor Smith suggested that, as an act of good faith, Mr. Ecker could estimate the number of times he did not pay the guest fee and submit payment. Supervisors Lawrence and Gaeta agreed, because Mr. Ecker knew he should have paid.

Supervisor Davidson voiced his opinion that the Amenity Policies were unclear regarding whether the resident or guest must pay the guest fee. Mr. Seiferheld stated that the rules state: "All daily guests must pay the usage fee of \$10, per daily guest, per day." Mr. Clark confirmed that the intention was for the guest to pay the daily fee and not the resident.

Mr. Al Lo Monaco, a resident, recalled that, years ago, when clubs came in to play, the resident was required to collect the fee and turn it in; this situation is different.

Mr. Ross recalled that, when he brought up the issue of former residents playing tennis up to the Board, several months ago, the Board directed him to have a Trespass Notice issued, if the nonresident did not pay the daily guest fee. Supervisor Davidson stated that is why he stated that this situation was not one individual's fault and no one was pointing fingers. It is a procedural problem that, according to the procedures, as Mr. Ross understood them, this was a trespass offense but the resident and guest thought not and District Counsel felt there were many misunderstandings so a procedure must be developed.

On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Gaeta, with all in favor, lifting the Trespass Notice issued to Mr. Randy Ecker, effective immediately, subject to Mr. Ecker's understanding of the District's rules, rates, fees and policies regarding suspension, authorization for District Counsel to draft an extended liability waiver and for Mr. Ecker to pay, at sign up, in advance, and execute the annual liability waiver, were approved.

Supervisor Davidson stated that Mr. Ecker will execute a long-term waiver and prepay the daily guest fee. Management will notify the Sheriff's Office.

******Supervisor Chiodo joined the meeting, via telephone, at approximately 10:42 a.m.******

▪ **Update: 2016-2017 Roadway Resurfacing Pre-Bid**

******This item, previously Item 7.D., was presented out of order.******

Mr. Sullivan indicated that the mandatory pre-bid meeting was held on Friday; three contractors participated. The majority of contractor questions were focused on the concrete portions of road. All three contractors appeared to be, primarily, asphalt paving contractors; therefore, they had questions and concerns regarding the engineering necessary to complete the concrete roadway removal and reconstruct those roads. Following the meeting, Staff discussed the concrete roadway issue and the recommendation is to eliminate the concrete sections from the bid package. The contractors were advised that addendums, based on questions, would be provided by this coming Friday.

Mr. Sullivan recalled that the 2016 portion of the project contained two concrete sections on Front Street and the 2017 portion contained a concrete section on Lakeview Lane. The intent was that all concrete road sections would be demolished and repaved with asphalt, with an underlying limerock base. The concrete roads were showing extensive wear and, additionally, Lakeview Lane had a drainage issue so water ponds on the pavement.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the contractors' concerns were because they did not have engineers on staff and would have to contract an engineer to obtain the necessary permits from the City to perform the work.

Mr. Sullivan presented maps of the concrete sections and explained that, to avoid damage to asphalt roadways near the concrete section on Lakeview Lane, those roads must also be eliminated from the bid scope. The recommendation was to eliminate the identified sections and address them, separately. Another option was for the District Engineer's engineers to perform work related to permitting and obtain the permits so that the contractor can complete the construction portion. The work could be advertised separately and include additional drawings that contractors could provide to an engineer to complete design work and obtain a permit.

Supervisor Smith asked if the suggestion was to eliminate only the concrete portions. Mr. Sullivan stated for 2016, only the concrete section would be removed but, for 2017, the concrete and asphalt sections of Lakeview Lane would be removed from the scope, as the asphalt

sections could sustain damage, when the concrete work was subsequently performed; for 2017, a few asphalt roads would also be removed from the overall scope.

Supervisor Lawrence stated that the concrete sections on Front Street appear to be intact and asked about applying asphalt on top of the existing concrete. Mr. Kloptosky stated that the concrete sections are cracked. Those concrete sections were constructed with proper base material; the sections are cracked so construction could not occur on top of them.

Supervisor Davidson asked about the result of the pre-bid meeting and the bid documents. Mr. Sullivan reiterated that the contractors primarily had questions about what information could be provided so that the design and permitting could be obtained for the concrete sections. In addition to the concrete removal on the Lakeview Lane section, Mr. Sullivan anticipated that drainage structures and pipe would be necessary. Supervisor Davidson asked about the reaction to the percentage of curb work. Mr. Sullivan stated that, for the purposes of bidding, contractors were to estimate 10% of the length of the road segments to require curb replacement. There was a question regarding the extent of damage that might be found and the level of repair expected, if there was significant damage to the road. The contractors were told that the expectation was for minor damage to be repaired; if extensive damage was discovered, it would be addressed at that time. Supervisor Davidson asked if the contractors were capable of completing the curb work or whether it must be subcontracted. Mr. Sullivan believed that the contractors could perform minor curb repairs and replacement.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if architectural information was provided to the contractors so that they could see what needs to be completed, as well as specifications. Mr. Sullivan stated that the contractors received descriptions of the work and a project map; no additional drawings were provided. Supervisor Lawrence asked if the contractors were asked to tour the area. Mr. Sullivan replied affirmatively.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that the concrete work should also be eliminated from the project scope because, in order to install underground drainage on Lakeview Lane, the underground piping must extend from inlets to a drain box in the roundabout; it would not be practical to resurface the roadway if it must be dug up to install the drains. The concrete roads should not be included in the resurfacing project; they should be under a separate scope of work. At the pre-bid meeting, the contractors had questions, objections and concerns about the concrete portions. If each contractor hired a different engineer, there could be three different ideas of how to address the concrete sections; therefore, a central drawing should have been provided but one

does not exist so, given the time limitations, the best option would be to remove the concrete sections from the scope of work. Mr. Kloptosky voiced his opinion that the concrete work should be completed before the milling and resurfacing. He was concerned because the 2016 and 2017 work both contained areas with curb deflections that must be pulled out and the contractors had questions about estimating the amount, as there were no specifications.

Mr. Kloptosky recommended the following timeline:

1. Separate the concrete and asphalt work
2. Identify the curb and gutters, in house, and provide the list to an infrastructure contractor for repairs
3. Complete all curb and gutter repairs.
4. Complete the concrete sections.
5. Complete all of Lakeview Lane, including the drainage work.
6. Complete the asphalt paving work.

Supervisor Davidson asked why Mr. Kloptosky was against eliminating the concrete sections and completing them at another time and completing the asphalt resurfacing now. Mr. Kloptosky stated that there would still be the curb and gutter repair issue. Supervisor Davidson voiced his understanding that the District could contract, directly, with S.E. Cline Construction, Inc., (Cline), to complete the curb and gutter work. Mr. Kloptosky stated that, currently, the curb and gutter work was included in the bids. Supervisor Davidson stated that the Invitation to Bid (ITB) must be revised, anyway.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that, given the large scope of the resurfacing project, it would require monitoring but he does not have time to monitor it. Based on the pre-bid meeting, Mr. Kloptosky was not confident with proceeding with the current ITB; the ITB should be changed.

Supervisor Smith asked if Mr. Kloptosky recommended delaying the entire road resurfacing project until the curbs were completed. Mr. Kloptosky replied affirmatively; the areas that require curb and gutter repairs should be completed first and separately from the resurfacing work. Streets that do not require curb and gutter repairs could be resurfaced, if the Board wants to complete some repaving in 2016.

Mr. Kloptosky noted the ITB and questioned if the bids should be received and rejected or if the ITB could be withdrawn.

Mr. Clark prepared a draft addendum that would eliminate the sections previously specified by Mr. Sullivan. Since the last meeting, the decision was made to hold a mandatory

pre-bid meeting. The concern now is that some contractors might not bid or some might bid high if the concrete sections are not removed. Today was the first time Mr. Clark heard Mr. Kloptosky express his concern about the curb and gutter repairs. If the Board wants to delay the project, Mr. Clark recommended pulling the ITB.

Supervisors Lawrence surmised that, based on Mr. Kloptosky's statements, the District cannot "count on" the contractors to perform the curb and gutter work, as it would be outside their normal scope. Mr. Kloptosky clarified that some paving contractors can perform the curb and gutter work but none of them attended the pre-bid meeting.

Supervisor Davidson asked if Mr. Sullivan anticipated this outcome from the pre-bid meeting, based on the ITB. Mr. Sullivan replied no but the process was different from others in that drawings are usually provided and the contractors bid on what they see in the drawings. He felt that none of contractors reviewed the ITB very closely and might have attended because the pre-bid meeting was mandatory. There was the likelihood that some may opt out of bidding, resulting in only one or two bids.

Supervisor Smith favored pulling the ITB and Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Kloptosky working together to develop a plan to be discussed at a workshop. Supervisor Chiodo agreed.

Regarding working together, Supervisor Davidson asked Mr. Kloptosky if he was receiving sufficient engineering support and guidance from Mr. Sullivan or if Mr. Kloptosky was actually developing the design parameters on his own for the project.

Mr. Kloptosky stated:

"I would not say that I am not getting design support. When I think that design support is called for, it is provided but, I think, what I found myself doing, over the past number of weeks, not only with this project but with other projects, is almost like screaming out, wanting to be heard because I believe there is a different process or different processes that can be used, different approaches, and I do not think that was happening with this project so I had a concern about it with the 'RFP' going out this way, right from the start and I think I have expressed that. So, there may need to be some sort of change made regarding scope or how we are going to approach this and then seek the design support that we need. I will give you an example; if we do the concrete things first, we know what we need to do there, we know what the bidders are going to need; we need a design. That stuff all has to be put in place first and, correct me if I am wrong,

Jim, because they cannot bid on something that they do not see. We cannot expect the contractor, to bring him in and say here is Lakeview Lane, we want to drain this, tell me what you come up with and show me a drawing. Everybody you talk to, they are going to come up with something different and you are never going to get an apples-to-apples bid. I am concerned, moving forward, that we follow a certain process.”

Corollary to rescinding the ITB, Supervisor Lawrence stated that, at a workshop, Mr. Kloptosky and Mr. Sullivan would present a recommendation of how to proceed with the concrete sections and curbs. Mr. Kloptosky suggested abandoning the resurfacing project, as it is, and that he and Mr. Sullivan develop a plan following the correct sequence.

Supervisor Davidson stated that the notification to the contractors who attended the pre-bid meeting should clearly state that the project is not “dead” but the current ITB was rescinded and would be replaced.

On MOTION by Supervisor Smith and seconded by Supervisor Gaeta, with all in favor, rescinding the Roadway Resurfacing 2016/2017 Project Invitation to Bid, notifying the contractors who attended the pre-bid meeting and for District Counsel to draft the notification, were approved.

Supervisor Lawrence noted that Mr. Sullivan already projected three years of roadwork and asked if he could project five years. Mr. Sullivan stated that he could project five years out but the last two years could change, due to wear and tear, etc. Supervisor Lawrence asked for the most useful and accurate time frame that could be projected. Mr. Sullivan was comfortable projecting three years, as priorities can change.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- i. April 7, 2016 Community Workshop**
- ii. April 21, 2016 Regular Meeting**

B. APPROVAL OF UNAUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

- i. Unaudited Financial Statements as of April 30, 2016**

These items were presented following the Fifth Order of Business.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

BUSINESS ITEMS

A. Consideration of/Decision on: Resolution 2016-6, Approving the District's Proposed Budgets for Fiscal Year 2016/2017 and Setting a Public Hearing Thereon Pursuant to Florida Law; and Providing An Effective Date

Mr. Wrathell presented Resolution 2016-6 for the Board's consideration. On Page 2, under "Revenues", "Assessment levy: general", an assessment increase was proposed. "Infrastructure reinvestment" reflected a proposed decrease and an increase was proposed for "Assessment levy – Escalante, LLC³". The proposed amounts for other revenue sources remained the same.

With regard to "Expenditures", Mr. Wrathell noted a slight Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustment for "District management", "Administrative", "Accounting" and "Assessment roll preparation". "Legal – general counsel" increased from \$80,000 to \$87,500, due to the Fiscal Year 2016 trend. "Insurance: general liability & public officials" was proposed to increase from \$10,600 to \$11,896; Mr. Wrathell will make sure that, if the insurance rates continue to rise, coverage would be shopped. "Website hosting & development" remained the same but new statutory requirements could affect CDD websites. Beginning July 1, agendas must be posted on the CDD website at least seven days in advance of the meeting; therefore, it must be determined whether items could be added to an agenda and discussed, after the agenda was posted. "Music licensing" was added and proposed at \$3,000. The "IT support" line item was over budget for Fiscal Year 2016, due to a significant amount of computer and server work; however, the proposed budget remained at \$15,000, as extensive work was not anticipated in Fiscal Year 2017. The "Tax collector" line item was increased 2.5%.

In response to Supervisor Smith's question, Mr. Wrathell confirmed that the proposed budget would continue being discussed at meetings and workshops; revisions could be made between now and the time the budget is adopted.

On Page 3, Mr. Wrathell stated that "Street lights¹" decreased from \$48,000 to \$43,000, in anticipation of savings from the conversion to LED street lights. "Garbage - spas/café" increased slightly, "Water – Creekside - #324043-45080" increased from \$6,500 to \$12,000, due to a significant upward trend in Fiscal Year 2016. The "Aquatic contract" line item increased slightly and a "Lakebank spraying" line item for \$6,128 was added. "Insurance: property" increased from \$39,000 to \$42,172"; the rate increase was expected, given the number of claims filed by the District. "Landscape maintenance contract services" increased from \$515,380 to

\$531,420, which was consistent with the escalator in the contract, "Landscape maintenance: croquet" increased from \$26,000 to \$28,000 and a "Firewise/diseased vegetation replacement" line item of \$15,000 was added. "Payroll" included a 5% increase, "Payroll taxes" were increased accordingly, a \$50,000 "Health insurance" line item was added but the actual amount will be budgeted, once known, plus an escalator and, if still under the \$50,000, it will be reduced but, if more, the amount will be left at \$50,000 or slightly more. "Insurance: workers' compensation" was under budgeted in Fiscal Year 2016 so it was increased from \$8,000 to \$9,750 for that adjustment. "Amenity Management" increased from \$477,225 to \$491,562" and "Amenity Operations & Maintenance" increased from \$61,795 to \$63,624, per the contract. On Page 4, "Amenity cable/internet" increased from \$10,500 to \$14,500 based on increased usage. "Pool chemicals" and "Pest control" increased slightly. "Amenity maintenance" increased from \$75,000 to \$85,000 and "Security staffing contract services" increase slightly.

The following changes were made:

Page 4 and throughout: Change "Security operations" to "Gate access control operations"

Page 4 and throughout: Change "Security staffing contract services" to "Gate access staffing contract support"

On Page 4: The proposed budget amounts for "Village center telephone, fax" and "Creekside telephone & fax" will be reduced based on bills received from the new telephone provider.

On Page 4: "Guardhouse & gate facility maintenance" was increased from \$17,500 to \$18,500 and "Gate communication devices" was reduced from \$15,000 to \$12,000.

Supervisor Davidson asked why "Community information guide" was budgeted at \$20,000, even though advertising revenue would cover the cost of the guide. Mr. Wrathell explained that it would be an expenditure; therefore, any advertising revenue would be booked as an offsetting revenue, under "Revenues"; however, he recommended against it. If the Community Information Guide (CIG) is completed in Fiscal Year 2016, it could be removed from the proposed Fiscal Year 2017 budget.

The following change was made:

Page 4: Delete the entire "Community information guide" line item

Mr. Wrathell stated that the "General infrastructure replacement/repair" line item, on Page 4, increased from \$590,969 to \$631,500. While the amount would be higher, assessments

would still be lower because, as reflected in the table on Page 5, the \$62,697 amount being reserved for the Road Project, during Fiscal Year 2017, would be lower than the \$239,723 amount reserved during Fiscal Year 2016.

Supervisor Smith felt that the projected amount to reserve in Fiscal Year 2018 would be \$275,398, compared to the \$62,697 in Fiscal Year 2017, which would set the District up for a much larger assessment increase in Fiscal Year 2018. Supervisor Lawrence stated that the projected amount for Fiscal Year 2018 was based on the initial long-range road plan that anticipated spending nearly \$1 million in Fiscal Year 2018 but that figure is no longer accurate. Supervisor Smith asked if the \$275,398 amount would need to be reserved for Fiscal Year 2018. Supervisor Lawrence replied no, not at all. Supervisor Smith suggested revising the Fiscal Year 2018 amount listed in the table.

Mr. Wrathell stated that, in certain years, the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) projects budget is lower and more falls into reserves; however, the Fiscal Year 2018 projected amount to reserve for the road project could be adjusted.

Supervisor Smith stated that the proposed Fiscal Year 2017 “Fund balance - ending”, on Page 5, would be approximately \$381,000 more than in the Fiscal Year 2016 adopted budget; and questioned whether the District would be “over assessing” residents.

Mr. Wrathell stated that this District’s budget is fine-tuned and, in the scheme of a \$3.5 million budget, under spending by \$25,000 to \$30,000 would be good. If the District goes over budget, the “Fund balance - ending” would be reduced, which would require a budget amendment. Mr. Wrathell felt that the District’s budget is already fine-tuned and he would not be comfortable fine-tuning it so much that it creates exposure. In future years, the Board could choose to use excess fund balance to reduce or maintain assessments levels but he would not recommend doing so, now, as the District’s infrastructure is aging and there could be a disaster.

Mr. Wrathell stated that the Wild Oaks “Debt Service Fund Budget - Series 2004A Bonds”, on Pages 13 and 14, would mature in Fiscal Year 2017. Once the November 1, 2016 and May 1, 2017 payments are made, the bond would be closed out and Wild Oaks residents would realize a savings in the subsequent fiscal year. Supervisor Davidson asked if Bond Counsel and Arbitrage fees would be reduced. Mr. Wrathell stated that no Bond Counsel fees were being incurred but the Dissemination Agent fee on the Series 2004A bonds would be eliminated, after Fiscal Year 2017.

Mr. Wrathell referred to Page 15 and reviewed the “Debt Service Fund Budget – Series 2008 Bonds”, related to all other property except for Wild Oaks, which would mature in a few years. The “Projected fund balance surplus/(deficit) as of September 30, 2017” of \$166,109 could be applied to the last payments and, if allowable in the Trust Indenture, the “Debt service reserve account balance (required)” could also be applied to the payments.

Supervisor Lawrence asked if the “Projected fund balance surplus/(deficit) as of September 30, 2017”, of \$166,109, could be split and used to pay more each year before the last year of the bond. Mr. Wrathell stated that the \$166,109 could be split into thirds, which could reduce assessments by approximately \$50,000, over the next three years. Supervisor Lawrence preferred that approach. Supervisor Smith preferred to discuss it and did not want to make the decision now. Mr. Wrathell stated that the Fiscal Year 2017 assessments were not proposed to increase very much; therefore, it might be best to leave them and use the funds to reduce assessments in a future year, when assessments might be projected to increase more.

Mr. Wrathell reviewed the “Proposed Assessments”, on Page 17, and noted that there would be four fewer units to assess in Fiscal Year 2017. The “Admin & Field Ops” assessment was anticipated to increase by \$79.15, per unit, and the “Infrastructure Reinvestment” assessment would decrease by \$74.61, per unit. The Wild Oaks “DSF” assessment would decrease by \$455.63, due to payoff of the Series 2004A bonds, and the “DSF” assessment, on the other properties, would remain the same, at \$391. Overall, the non Wild Oaks assessments would increase \$4.54, the Wild Oaks assessments would decrease \$451.09 and the golf course assessments would increase \$3,516.

Regarding whether the District would be over assessing, Mr. Wrathell stated that he prefers to be conservative because it would be better to build surplus than to under budget.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that the \$3,375 “Marlin Dr pumphouse variable speed drive unit” line item, on Page 20, was related to the item that the Board was considering purchasing but decided against; the item should be removed. Supervisor Smith recalled that the District invoiced Escalante Golf (Escalante) for its share of the pump that was replaced and asked if Escalante paid, as he believed that Escalante was resistant to paying for it. Mr. Kloptosky did not know if Escalante paid but recalled that Escalante was averse to paying for the spare variable speed drive. It was noted that Page 20 did not include Escalante’s 75% share of the \$900 pump house maintenance equipment cost.

Mr. Wrathell summarized that the \$3,375 line item would be removed from Escalante's assessment and \$675 would be added for Escalante's share of the pump house maintenance cost.

Supervisor Davidson summarized that \$37,000 was removed from the budget; \$20,000 for the CIG, \$15,000 for the Firewise disease vegetation and \$1,000 each for The Village Center and Creekside telephone service. Ms. Leister should be consulted regarding the \$15,000 to address Firewise disease vegetation, which was removed from the proposed Fiscal Year 2017 budget. Supervisor Lawrence stated that Ms. Leister should also advise about the status of vine removal because, typically, \$50,000 of the \$75,000 in the CIP budget was for vine removal.

▪ **Presentation: Audited Financial Report for Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2015, Prepared by Grau & Associates**

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

Mr. Wrathell presented the Audited Financial Report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2015. On Page 3, the District's net position, as of September 30, 2015, was \$19,461,042. The District's net position, in comparison with the prior fiscal year, was (\$816,255); the decrease was due to depreciation of the District's assets. The District maintains its assets very well; therefore, the assets should far exceed their depreciated useful life. The overall fund balance position increased \$448,854, in comparison to the prior fiscal year. Page 17 showed that the District's bond proceeds were held in treasury money markets, approved in the Trust Indenture, and the balance of funds were held in a Qualified Public Depository (QPD), in FDIC insured accounts. The "Independent Auditor's Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters", on Page 23, confirmed that Management has internal controls in place to protect against fraud and embezzlement. The "Report to Management", on Page 27, confirmed no current or prior year findings or recommendations; it was a clean audit.

Supervisor Gaeta asked if the insurance cost increased because the District had to include Tract K. Mr. Wrathell stated that, as unimproved land, Tract K would be included in the general liability coverage; however, once something is constructed, the land would be added to the District's property insurance.

******Mr. Wrathell and Ms. Cerbone left the meeting.******

Mr. McGaffney read Resolution 2016-6 into the record:

"A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE GRAND HAVEN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT APPROVING PROPOSED BUDGETS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016/2017 AND SETTING A

PUBLIC HEARING THEREON PURSUANT TO FLORIDA LAW; ADDRESSING TRANSMITTAL, POSTING AND PUBLICATION REQUIREMENTS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE”

On MOTION by Supervisor Davidson and seconded by Supervisor Gaeta, with all in favor, Resolution 2016-6, Approving the District’s Proposed Budgets for Fiscal Year 2016/2017, as amended, and Setting a Public Hearing Thereon Pursuant to Florida Law for Thursday, September 1, 2016 at 5:00 p.m., in the Grand Haven Room, Grand Haven Village Center, 2001 Waterside Parkway, Palm Coast, Florida 32137, was adopted.

Mr. McGaffney stated that Supervisor Chiodo was dropped from the call in to the meeting at an unspecified time.

B. Discussion: Updated FY2017 CIP (to be provided under separate cover)

This item was discussed later in the meeting.

C. Presentation: Audited Financial Report for Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2015, Prepared by Grau & Associates

This item was presented following Item 5.A.

- **Consideration of Resolution 2016-7, Accepting the Audited Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2015**

Mr. McGaffney presented Resolution 2016-7 for the Board’s consideration. He read the title into the record:

“A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE GRAND HAVEN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT HEREBY ACCEPTING THE AUDITED FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 2015”

On MOTION by Supervisor Gaeta and seconded by Supervisor Smith, with all in favor, Resolution 2016-7, Accepting the Audited Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2015, was adopted.

*****The meeting recessed at 12:14 p.m.*****

*****The meeting reconvened at 12:26 p.m.*****

- **Consideration of /Decision on: Proposal from Aquatic Systems, Inc., for Sport Fish Stocking in Ponds 1 and 2**

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

Mr. McGaffney distributed a \$6,381.50 proposal from ASI for sport fish stocking in Ponds 1 and 2.

Mr. Cottrell reviewed the proposal for stocking 5" bream, at a 60:40 ratio of shellcracker and bluegill fish. Approximately 100 bream, per acre, was proposed, as that was the most that the local fish farm could supply. A fish farm in Alabama could supply 3" to 4" bream but the delivery fee would be higher and would be dependent upon a large enough purchase to make it worthwhile to transport the fish. Fingerling speckled perch would be stocked; larger sizes are not available. Of the \$6,381.50 cost, approximately \$4,500 would be for the bream; the cost for bream is much higher than perch. The fish could be stocked within two weeks.

On MOTION by Supervisor Davidson and seconded by Supervisor Smith, with all in favor, the Aquatic Systems Inc., proposal for sport fish stocking in Ponds 1 and 2, in a not-to-exceed amount of \$6,831.50, was approved .

Supervisor Lawrence asked if the District should stock all ponds with shellcracker fish, as a preemptive move. Mr. Cottrell did not recommend it, unless midge flies were an issue at a particular pond. Supervisor Davidson pointed out that the cost to stock 50 ponds, at \$4,000 to \$6,000 per pond, would be very expensive.

Supervisor Smith asked if the larger sized bream were selected because they would immediately eat the midge fly larvae. Mr. Cottrell stated that all fish would eat the larvae; 5" bream were selected because they were large enough that they would not be eaten by bass. With smaller fish, a percentage would be lost. Discussion ensued regarding the time needed for the bream to become effective in controlling midge flies. Supervisor Davidson will consult an expert and report at the next workshop.

- **Consideration of /Decision on: Proposal from Aquatic Systems, Inc., for Upland Cordgrass Area Treatment**

****This item, previously Item 7.C., was presented out of order.****

Mr. Cottrell presented the ASI proposal for upland cordgrass area treatment, along with a map of the upland cordgrass, in common areas, which was identified by a bright green line. In response to Supervisor Lawrence's question about ponds with bulkheads, Mr. Kloptosky

explained that Ponds 1 and 2 have common areas with cordgrass and weeds develop near the water. Supervisor Davidson asked why Austin Outdoor (Austin) cannot spray the land above the bulkhead. Mr. Kloptosky was advised by Austin that they cannot spray within 20' of the water. Supervisors Davidson and Lawrence felt that Austin should be able to spray up to the bulkhead. Mr. Cottrell was not familiar with landscape rules but recalled Austin making that comment on a site visit in Wild Oaks. Supervisor Davidson stated that clarification was necessary, as it did not make sense because the spray could not wash into the pond. Mr. Kloptosky felt that the issue was not with something washing into the pond; the issue was spraying in close proximity to the pond waterline. Supervisor Gaeta noted that her pest control person told her he could not spray her private property because of it possibly washing into the pond, which has a bulkhead.

Supervisor Davidson asked if the spray would kill spartina. Mr. Cottrell stated that it is a very selective broadleaf herbicide weed control; it would not kill the spartina.

Mr. Cottrell stated that areas that the Board did not want sprayed could be removed. The proposal was for quarterly treatments, at \$1,532, for an annual cost of \$6,128, which would provide a high level of control; however, semi-annual treatments would probably be sufficient. In response to Supervisor Davidson's question, Mr. Cottrell confirmed that, to the best of his knowledge, all of the areas were on common property and not on private property.

Discussion ensued regarding treatment frequency. Mr. Kloptosky recommended starting with quarterly treatments because many banks were in very poor condition. Mr. Cottrell suggested treatments in June and September and then transitioning to semi-annual. Supervisor Davidson asked who would remove the sprayed vegetation, once it dies. Mr. Kloptosky stated that Austin would probably remove the dead vegetation but would charge for it.

Mr. Kloptosky pointed out that many areas are along the walking paths and numerous resident complaints were received because residents expect the area to have a nice appearance, since they must maintain their adjacent property.

In response to Supervisor Davidson's question, Mr. Cottrell confirmed that the proposal could be approved on a per treatment basis, with Staff advising when to treat.

Discussion ensued regarding treatment areas. Mr. Gallo noted areas in certain PLM villages, where the HOAs, through the PLM contractor, maintain the pond bank, and those contractors are not required to use ASI, who is the only licensed applicator of herbicides, in the area. He asked if the assumption was that PLM contractors were doing the right thing or were possibly spraying weeds with incorrect chemicals, since those contractors are not licensed to use

the same chemicals as ASI. Supervisor Davidson wondered if spraying, by the CDD, would duplicate work already being performed on some PLM ponds. Mr. Kloptosky stated that ASI would treat the CDD common areas. Mr. Gallo discussed a pond treated by a PLM contractor; the contractor was not told to exclude spraying certain areas, such as common areas.

Discussion ensued regarding areas sprayed by PLM contractors, the PLM's plans and properties that were cited for violating maintenance Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs). Mr. Kloptosky stated that the GHMA should notify the PLM contractors to spray only behind private property. Supervisor Smith felt that, if a PLM contractor is already spraying 90%, they should spray it all. Mr. Kloptosky recalled that the map reflected common areas that require spraying; the PLM areas are separate. If Austin treats bulkhead ponds, those should be eliminated from the ASI proposal and the cost adjusted, accordingly.

Mr. Gallo stated wanted the CDD to notify the GHMA about chemical restrictions so that the PLM contractors could be put on notice. Mr. Kloptosky will clarify, with Austin, to find out if the chemical treatment law changed, as they used to treat but recently advised that they could not treat within a specified distance from the pond bank. In response to Supervisor Lawrence's question, Mr. Cottrell confirmed that certain chemicals should not be sprayed near the bank.

Supervisor Davidson asked if the PLM landscape contractors were licensed by the State. Mr. Gallo replied affirmatively. Supervisor Davidson stated that, if licensed, the contractors must follow the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) regulations.

On MOTION by Supervisor Davidson and seconded by Supervisor Gaeta, with all in favor, the Aquatic Systems, Inc., proposal for quarterly treatment of broadleaf weeds in upland cordgrass areas, along District common areas, in a not-to-exceed amount of \$1,532, per treatment, with the number of treatments to be determined by Mr. Kloptosky, without further Board input, authorization for District Counsel to prepare an agreement and for Mr. Kloptosky to confirm the treatment areas and coordinate clean up of dead vegetation, were approved.

- **Consideration of /Decision on: Proposal from Aquatic Systems, Inc., for Littoral Shelf Planting and Monthly Maintenance Add On to Master Agreement**

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

Mr. Cottrell distributed a proposal for littoral shelf planting and monthly maintenance, as requested by Mr. Kloptosky, to address erosion at 29 Osprey Circle.

Supervisor Davidson recalled that littorals were previously planted and some residents removed them. Mr. Kloptosky stated that the property owner understands the benefit of littoral plants and hoped that the plants would not be removed, again. Mr. Cottrell stated that 60, 4" duck potato plants were proposed. Since this proposal was for only 29 Osprey Circle, Supervisor Lawrence asked if other areas needed the same type of plantings. Mr. Cottrell indicated that all areas on the western side of the pond, down to the turn, probably need plantings, as all were experiencing erosion issues, and noted that planting behind only one home could cause other homeowners to question why plants were not installed behind their homes. Supervisor Davidson pointed out that, if plants were installed behind all of the homes, many residents would remove them. Supervisor Lawrence believed that residents did not initially remove the plants; the plants were removed when they grew tall and ruined the view. Mr. Kloptosky stated that residents removed the plants when littoral plants were installed at Pond 7. To avoid fallout, Supervisor Davidson felt that littorals should only be installed when there is verified erosion and a resident requests littorals. Discussion ensued regarding whether to notify the nearby residents of the planting at 29 Osprey Circle, the reason for it and residents must request the littoral plantings.

Mr. Cottrell stated that planting additional 80' stretches would cost \$180, per stretch.

Discussion ensued regarding covering the exposed mitered end.

Mr. Cottrell stated that other plant types could be considered and recommended golden canna. Some plants will naturally seed adjacent areas. The Board agreed.

On MOTION by Supervisor Davidson and seconded by Supervisor Smith, the Aquatic Systems, Inc., proposal for littoral shelf planting at 29 Osprey Circle, in a not-to-exceed amount of \$292.95, with a \$5, per month, maintenance fee, and authorization for District Counsel to prepare an amendment to the Aquatic Systems, Inc., Master Agreement, were approved.

▪ **CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS**

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

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

i. April 7, 2016 Community Workshop

ii. April 21, 2016 Regular Meeting

Mr. McGaffney presented the April 7, 2016 Workshop Minutes and April 21, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes for the Board's consideration. Revisions to the minutes were previously submitted to Management.

B. APPROVAL OF UNAUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

i. Unaudited Financial Statements as of April 30, 2016

Supervisor Davidson presented the Unaudited Financial Statements as of April 30, 2016.

Supervisor Smith asked if the \$100,000 in revenue was related to late assessment payments. Mr. McGaffney replied that it was likely related to late payments; some property owners do not pay on time. Supervisor Smith thought that the Tax Collector paid the District, in full, and it was then the Tax Collector's problem to collect the taxes. Supervisor Davidson explained that the Tax Collector does not "float" the full amount to the District. The Tax Collector collects the taxes and transmits those funds to the CDD, as collected. Supervisor Smith acknowledged his misunderstanding that the Tax Collector process was a safeguard "that we would never not get all of the money due to us". Supervisor Davidson stated that the District would eventually receive the funds through a tax certificate sale or lien on the property. Mr. Clark stated that the tax certificate sale process begins around June 1.

Supervisor Davidson wanted an investigation into the high water bills at Creekside, as the expense was already at 103% of budget. Mr. Kloptosky stated that staff would investigate. Leaks in the spa and pool were repaired but, if the water bills continue to be high, the leaks might not be repaired. Supervisor Davidson asked if potable water was used in the spas and pools. Mr. Kloptosky replied affirmatively. Ms. Higgins stated that the Creekside water bills fluctuated month-to-month.

On MOTION by Supervisor Lawrence and seconded by Supervisor Smith, with all in favor, the Consent Agenda Items, as amended, were approved.

- **Discussion: Updated FY2017 CIP (to be provided under separate cover)**
*****This item, previously Item 5.B., was presented out of order.*****

Supervisor Lawrence distributed and reviewed the updated Fiscal Year 2017 CIP. "Rejuvenate coquina path along Front Street" was added. Regarding future road needs of

\$1,067,900, with current road reserves of \$300,000, Fiscal Year 2018 road reserves of \$547,642 and \$77,277 budgeted for Fiscal Year 2016 road work, which might not be used, the District would only need another \$142,981 to complete the estimated \$1,067,900 in future road repairs. The Fiscal Year 2017 CIP included \$230,000 for “Repair VC Buildings Stucco”. The planned CIP projects for Fiscal Year 2017 total \$487,800, against a CIP budget of \$631,500, leaving approximately \$145,000 for the remaining CIP projects. The Village Center stucco project could cost less than the anticipated \$230,000.

Supervisor Lawrence stated that the District Engineer should provide a three-year road projection, each year. The last projection, in 2014, was for \$6 million, over 20 years. A five-year projection would also be beneficial for planning purposes.

- **Consideration of/Decision on: Resolution 2016-8, Implementing Section 190.006(3)(A)(2)(C), Florida Statutes, and Instructing the Flagler County Supervisor of Elections to Conduct the District’s General Election**

****This item, previously Item 7.A., was presented out of order.****

Supervisor Davidson presented Resolution 2016-8 for the Board’s consideration.

On MOTION by Supervisor Davidson and seconded by Supervisor Gaeta, with all in favor, Resolution 2016-8, Implementing Section 190.006(3)(A)(2)(C), Florida Statutes, and Instructing the Flagler County Supervisor of Elections to Conduct the District’s General Election, was adopted.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

STAFF REPORTS

A. District Engineer

There being nothing additional to report, the next item followed.

B. Amenity Manager

There being nothing additional to report, the next item followed.

C. Field/Operations Manager

This item was presented following Item 6.D.

D. District Counsel

Regarding the traffic light bond, the proposed agreement is under review by the County. The County Attorney advised Mr. Clark that the matter was “moving along” and thought there would be no major issues with it.

Mr. Clark drafted a proposed resolution abandoning the pedestrian access easement in Creekside Village, adjacent to North Park Road. The District should publish a notice of its intent to abandon the pedestrian portion of the platted easement and conduct a public hearing. This action would shore up the District's efforts to exclude access at that point. Mr. Kloptosky asked if the maintenance and utility easements would remain intact. Mr. Clark replied affirmatively; the resolution was very specific. In response to Mr. Kloptosky's question, Mr. Clark would make it clear that the area is intended to be an emergency Firewise exit.

Regarding the Board's questions about raising the height of the North Park Road fence from 3' to 6', Mr. Clark stated that the agreement with the City specifically states the allowable fence height; therefore, the District must obtain permission from the City to increase the height. Mr. Kloptosky requested but did not receive a quote for a 6' fence. It was suggested that Supervisor Chiodo approach the City about the District increasing the fence height. Supervisor Davidson recalled that Mr. Mark Carman, City of Palm Coast Senior Precinct Commander, and Commissioner Jason DeLorenzo, were not in favor of the fences that the City installed around other parks and stated that the City would never do it again; it generated many complaints.

▪ **Consideration of/Decision on: Proposals from Terracon Consultants Inc., for Moisture Intrusion Remediation Design Services**

****This item, previously Item 7.B., was presented out of order.****

- **Phase 1**
- **Phase 2**

Mr. Kloptosky recalled instructing Mr. Kristopher Linster, of Terracon Consultants, Inc., (Terracon), to split the original \$38,000 proposal into phases, with Phase 1 being design through bidding and Phase 2 being construction and construction oversight. The overall cost was reduced to \$29,750, in the new proposal. Phase 1 was \$15,750 and Phase 2 was \$14,000.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that he did not want to give any firm or contractor the contract for this project, when it could be completed in phases and could be better monitored.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that Mr. Linster adjusted the Phase 1 proposal to reflect what was requested; a few clarifications would be necessary. Mr. Kloptosky advised Mr. Linster of his opinion that the project should be completed in phases, beginning with repair of the upper walls of the A-frame roof, as it is the source of the water intrusion, and that the Phase 1 proposal might need further revision to exclude the bidding portion. Once the A-frame section is repaired, Mr. Kloptosky wanted to delay further repairs until it is determined whether the repairs were

successful. In Phase 2, Mr. Kloptosky stated he would “pick away” at the scope of work because certain work could be completed in-house.

Mr. Linster will be invited to attend the next workshop to discuss the proposals.

▪ **Field/Operations Manager**

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

Ms. Higgins stated the CIG was nearly complete. The following questions were posed:

1. *Should owners and tenants be included for rental properties if both want to be included?*

The Board agreed that either the owner or tenant should be included but not both.

2. *Should children’s names be printed in the CIG?*

The Board agreed that anyone over 18-years-old, with an amenity pass, could be included.

3. *Should titles or suffixes be used in the CIG? Previously, they were not used.*

The Board agreed that titles would not be included but suffixes, such as Jr., Sr., etc. could be included but job or degree-related suffixes would not be included.

4. *Should nicknames be printed?*

The Board agreed to listing the name as the person wrote it on their form, subject to the provisions of the third question.

Ms. Higgins stated that the CIG information should be submitted to the printer next week.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that the Creekside rear parking lot expansion should be completed during the first week in June but he was doubtful. Some June meetings, normally held at Creekside, were moved to The Village Center. The project was one or two weeks behind schedule, due to contractor and City issues. The Village Center bathroom cabinets and granite countertops will be installed the week of June 6. Staff will demo the existing cabinets. A resident contacted the Post Office about a mailbox issue and was advised that the CDD was responsible for maintaining the locks and boxes, which was incorrect, as the CDD only maintains the surrounds. Mr. Kloptosky referred to emails from the Post Office confirming that they maintain the boxes; the emails will be forwarded to Management. The gate access provider’s name changed to Universal Security and Universal Security was merging with Allied Barton; there would be no changes to the District’s service or gate personnel.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that, when the District took responsibility of the Clubhouse Pier, the land adjacent was inherited. Supervisor Davidson discussed an area with Brazilian peppers that

a resident complained about and wanted removed. It was noted that the condominium project near that area was defunct. Maintenance of this area will be discussed at the next workshop.

Regarding the Vista Park Condominium project, Supervisor Davidson stated that the advertised delinquent 2015 property taxes due was \$138,227; of the total, \$109,697 was due for the annual CDD assessment on the 48 condominium units entitled; the 2014 property taxes, totaling \$157,491 remains unpaid, as well, for a total of \$290,000 in unpaid taxes.

Supervisor Davidson noted that Escalante owes \$43,803 for the annual CDD assessment. Taxes can be paid before the end of May before the property goes to a tax certificate sale.

Mr. Kloptosky received complaints from Wild Oaks residents about vendors entering Wild Oaks through the exit gate. Discussion ensued regarding whether the District could do anything. Supervisor Davidson suggested instructing residents to provide the vehicle license plate number and name or marking on the vehicle, so the District can follow up.

Mr. Kloptosky requested a discussion item for the next workshop regarding using bicycle racks and how to enforce the policy. A sample Amenity Violation Tracking Log was provided.

E. District Manager

i. 2,607 Registered Voters in District as of April 15, 2016.

Mr. McGaffney indicated that there were 2,607 registered voters residing within the boundaries of the District as of April 15, 2016.

ii. Upcoming Community Workshop/Regular Meeting Dates

o COMMUNITY WORKSHOP

▪ June 2, 2016 at 10:00 A.M.

The next workshop will be held on June 2, 2016 at 10:00 a.m.

o BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING

▪ June 16, 2016 at 10:00 A.M.

The next meeting will be held on June 16, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. Mr. McGaffney indicated that the following items would be included on the next workshop agenda:

1. Discussion Item: Parcel Along Intercoastal
2. Presentation: Terracon Consultants, Inc.
3. District Engineer and Field/Operations Manager: Update on Roadway Project Plans
4. Presentation by Mr. Ross: Recommended Policy or Procedure for Repeat Guests
5. Discussion: Bike Rack Policy and Enforcement

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

BUSINESS ITEMS

- A. Consideration of/Decision on: Resolution 2016-8, Implementing Section 190.006(3)(A)(2)(C), Florida Statutes, and Instructing the Flagler County Supervisor of Elections to Conduct the District’s General Election**

This item was presented following the Fifth Order of Business.

- B. Consideration of/Decision on: Proposals from Terracon Consultants Inc., for Moisture Intrusion Remediation Design Services**

- **Phase 1**
- **Phase 2**

This item was presented following Item 6.D.

- C. Consideration of/Decision on: Proposal from Aquatic Systems, Inc., for Upland Cordgrass Area Treatment**

This item was discussed following the Fifth Order of Business.

- D. Updated: 2016-2017 Roadway Resurfacing Pre-Bid**

This item was presented following the Third Order of Business.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

OPEN ITEMS

This item was not discussed.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

SUPERVISORS’ REQUESTS

Supervisor Davidson stated that a combined Firewise and Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) Day will be held during the Memorial Day Barbecue. There will also be a CERT volunteer drive on June 6, at 7:00 p.m. Ms Julie Allen is the new Florida Forest Service Wildfire Mitigation Specialist for this area.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 2:12 p.m.

On MOTION by Supervisor Gaeta and seconded by Supervisor Davidson, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 2:12 p.m.



Secretary/Assistant Secretary



Chair/Vice Chair