1	MINU	TES OF MEETING
2	GRAND HAVEN	
3	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT	
4 5 6	The Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Grand Haven Community Development District was held on Thursday, July 21, 2022 at 9:02 a.m. in the Grand Haven Room, at the Grand Haven Village Center, 2001 Waterside Parkway, Palm Coast, Florida 32137.	
7	FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS – Call to Order/Roll Call	
8	Mr. McInnes called the meeting to order and conducted roll call.	
9	Present and constituting a quorum were:	
10 11 12 13 14	Chip Howden Kevin Foley Michael Flanagan John Polizzi Dr. Merrill Stass-Isern	Board Supervisor, Chairman Board Supervisor, Vice Chairman Board Supervisor, Assistant Secretary Board Supervisor, Assistant Secretary Board Supervisor, Assistant Secretary
15	Also present were:	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	David McInnes Howard McGaffney Scott Clark David Sowell Barry Kloptosky Vanessa Stepniak John Lucansky Mark Rohrbeck (via phone) Jake Kirkland (via phone) Denise Gallo Donna McGevna David Hall Marlene Hall Barbara Craig Bobbie Mehl The following is a summary of the discussion.	District Manager, DPFG Management & Consulting District Manager, DPFG Management & Consulting District Counsel, Clark & Albaugh, LLP District Engineer, Kimley-Horn CDD Operations Manager CDD Office Manager Amenity Manager, Vesta Property Services Celera IT Services Celera IT Services Resident
32	Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting.	
33	SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS – Pledge of Allegiance	
34	The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.	
35 36	THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS – Audience Comments – (for non-agenda items - limited to 3 minutes per individual)	
37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44	Ms. McGevna requested a timeframe for the letter that was to be sent out to the community, information on coquina rock that had been installed in more areas than what she had recalled being approved, cell phone access for the gates, and to view the variant budget. She additionally suggested bundling the timeframe for Mr. Clark's presence at the meeting and asked what had prompted the discussion on Sunshine Law at the previous meeting. Mr. Howden stated that landlines would be a topic of discussion at the next meeting. He clarified that Mr. Clark was the District Attorney, not the District Engineer, and stated that Mr. Clark would address the discussion on Sunshine Law during his report.	

Mr. Hall, Ms. Hall, Ms. Craig, and Ms. Mehl discussed an ongoing algae overgrowth issue in Pond 24. Ms. Hall suggested aeration for the pond and noted that she had received a letter regarding a fine for mold on her roof. Ms. Mehl additionally expressed concerns regarding shoreline erosion in Pond 24. Mr. Howden clarified that the letter was an HOA matter. He explained that the District was restricted by law on how often and what could be used to treat the ponds but indicated that this issue would be discussed further.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS – Staff Reports

A. Exhibit 1: Amenity Manager: John Lucansky

Mr. Lucansky provided clarification on the parking lot data included in his report. Mr. Flanagan indicated that he would like to receive parking lot data for Creekside as well, but noted that this was not as urgent of a need as obtaining parking lot data for the Village Center.

Before moving on to the next item, Mr. Howden mentioned that Solitude would be attending the next meeting to provide a full report. He encouraged residents interested in the pond situation to attend the next meeting. Mr. Kloptosky clarified that Solitude had yet to confirm if they would be attending the next meeting. Mr. Howden stated that it would be confirmed on the agenda whether Solitude would be in attendance.

B. District Engineer: David Sowell

1. Exhibit 2: Presentation of Stormwater Needs Analysis Report

Mr. Sowell explained that the Stormwater Needs Analysis report would be required by every 5 years. He presented the report and indicated that the District's current stormwater needs were satisfied. He noted that a plan would need to be developed to address future stormwater needs, particularly in regards to infrastructure.

Following discussion, the Board reached a consensus to proceed with discussing stormwater needs with Mr. Sowell at a future Workshop Meeting. Mr. Foley additionally requested a general outline of topics to be addressed.

Mr. Flanagan noted an error in which the dollars budgeted were shown in actual amounts, rather than in thousands. Mr. Sowell stated that this had already been corrected with the County. Mr. McInnes indicated that the corrected report would be emailed to the supervisors. Mr. Flanagan additionally pointed out that page 12 appeared to be missing from the report. Mr. McInnes stated that he would check into the missing page.

C. Operations Manager: Barry Kloptosky

1. Exhibit 3: Presentation of Capital Project Plan Tracker

Mr. Kloptosky asked for any questions on the tracker. Mr. Polizzi requested clarification on Lines 7, 9, and 20. Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that Lines 7 and 9 had been completed and that Line 20 had been cancelled. In response to a question from Mr. Howden, Mr. Kloptosky clarified that Line 22 had been completed. Mr. Foley requested a list from Ms. Leister with more information on the projects. Mr. Flanagan asked to have the status of the projects and the amount spent on the projects to be included in the list. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that this list would be provided.

2. Exhibit 4: Monthly Report

Mr. Kloptosky informed the Board that the crosswalk safety project was currently on hold due to supply chain issues and issues with the contractor. He explained that a proposal had been signed with a new contractor that was more local to the area. Mr. Flanagan requested that Mr. Kloptosky look into whether aggregating the amount of concrete that the District would purchase that year would allow the District some flexibility with the contractors.

Mr. Kloptosky explained that the sidewalk replacement project was on hold as well, as this project was to be done by the same vendor originally contracted to work on the crosswalk safety project. He stated that the same replacement vendor for the crosswalk safety project had been contracted to work on this project. He anticipated a start date for both projects to begin in 2 to 3 weeks if the materials were able to be acquired.

Mr. Polizzi inquired about additional sidewalks in need of repair. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he had staff prepare a projected list of sidewalks in need of repair. He stated that there was a total of 5,782 square feet of sidewalk repairs that would be necessary, which would cost approximately \$50,000.00. Mr. Polizzi asked if any of these areas were in Wild Oaks. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he would check to confirm. In response to a question from Mr. Flanagan, Mr. Kloptosky confirmed that sidewalks that were considered hazardous would be ground down in order to prevent accidents.

Mr. Kloptosky mentioned that the canopies had been installed and were currently awaiting final inspections. He noted that the doors for the Phase II bathrooms were still on backorder at this point in time. He indicated that the Phase III bathroom renovations were in progress and that the women's bathroom was nearing completion. He estimated that the Phase III bathrooms would be open by the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that the aeration for Pond 37 would be installed after the electrical wiring installation was completed. Mr. Foley asked if aeration would help reduce algae buildup. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he would not expect a significant difference.

Mr. Kloptosky stated that an adjustment had been made to one of the outfalls and indicated that this modification appeared to have reduced the stormwater drainage issue. He informed the Board that a house being built on the corner of Creekside Ct. and Creekside Dr. appeared to be causing drainage and flooding issues. He stated that a resident affected by the flooding had requested that the CDD resolve the issue. He indicated that he believed this was not a CDD issue and stated that he had suggested that the resident speak with the HOA on the matter.

Mr. Kloptosky requested guidance from Mr. Clark on the drainage issue. Mr. Clark indicated that he would need to obtain more information but noted that he could send a letter to the builder if they were discharging soil into the District's stormwater system. Mr. Kloptosky added that he could reach out to the builder.

Mr. Kloptosky noted that the asphalt repairs around the manhole covers were nearing completion. He proceeded to discuss the ongoing issues with Pond 24 and communication issues with Solitude. He explained that a proposal for additional assessments for Pond 24 had been signed two months ago but Solitude had only recently performed the assessments. He stated that he was currently waiting on more information on the results of the report from Solitude and noted that the pond was continuing to be treated.

Mr. Flanagan asked when Solitude's contract was up for renewal and requested that Mr. Kloptosky compile a list of alternative companies. Mr. Polizzi asked if another contractor could be brought in to resolve a specific problem. Mr. Clark indicated that contracts could generally be cancelled in part or in full. He noted that going through the RFP process would likely not be necessary.

Mr. Foley commented on an unpleasant smell that he believed came from a pond near the croquet court. Mr. Kloptosky stated that this may be from a chemical treatment that had been done on the court but indicated that he would look into the source of the smell to confirm.

Mr. Kloptosky informed the Board that the new Field Maintenance Supervisor that had been hired was no longer able to take the position. He stated that 2 other employees had left or would be leaving the District due to pay issues. Mr. Foley suggested allowing management more flexibility on compensation. Mr. Howden requested guidance from District Management and District Counsel on compensation. Mr. McGaffney recommended using the fund balance to increase the salary budget by a certain percentage and incentivizing through bonuses. Mr. Flanagan noted that the total compensation package should be considered, to which Dr. Merrill expressed agreement.

In response to a comment from Mr. Polizzi, Mr. Kloptosky advised against temporary employees. Mr. McGaffney stated that he would obtain localized information regarding salaries. He suggested authorizing Mr. Kloptosky to increase pay and making changes to the total compensation package. Discussion ensued regarding options for staff recruitment and retention.

Mr. Howden made a motion to authorize Mr. Kloptosky and District Management to adjust the salaries of current and future employees. Mr. Polizzi recommended requiring a monthly staffing report from Mr. Kloptosky. Dr. Merrill suggested amending the motion to make it clear this would be temporary until further information was provided to the Board to make a more permanent solution. Mr. Flanagan stated that he would like to include a "not to exceed" number in the motion. Mr. McGaffney suggested a 5% increase for all employees as a one-time incentive. Mr. Clark advised applying this increase individually. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that he agreed, as some employees had already recently received pay increases.

Mr. Howden revised his motion to authorize Mr. Kloptosky and Mr. McInnes to use no more than 5% of the current salary budget to recognize key employees and adjust salaries for future hires as a temporary solution, in addition to requiring the Operations and District Managers to report back to the Board.

On a MOTION by Mr. Howden, SECONDED by Mr. Foley, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board authorized the Operations Manager and the District Manager to use no more than 5% of the current salary budget to recognize key employees and adjust salaries for future hires as a temporary solution, in addition to requiring the Operations and District Managers to report back to the Board, for the Grand Haven Community Development District.

Following the motion, Mr. Foley inquired about the plan for Waterside Pkwy. Mr. Kloptosky indicated that a list of repairs needed for this road had been complied and explained that the contractor was waiting to obtain asphalt before providing a proposal. He asked if the Board would like to consider moving a section of Waterside Pkwy. up to be repaved. Mr. Foley expressed support for Mr. Kloptosky's suggestion. He noted that he would like to revisit Waterside Pkwy in the 10-year plan to confirm that the numbers were still reasonable.

Mr. Howden reminded the Board to try to manage expectations. Mr. Polizzi suggested sending a formal communication out to residents regarding the Board's priorities and current issues being experienced by the District. Mr. Howden indicated that he did not think this communication was necessary, to which Dr. Merrill expressed disagreement. Mr. Foley stated that he would be willing to write the communication. Mr. Howden indicated that overcommunication could be a problem and stated that he felt staff should write the communication.

On a MOTION by Dr. Merrill, SECONDED by Mr. Foley, with Dr. Merrill, Mr. Foley, Mr. Flanagan, and Mr. Polizzi voting "AYE", and Mr. Howden voting "NAY", the Board authorized the Vice Chair to write a communication to residents regarding the Board's priorities, supply chain issues, and staffing issues to be sent out via e-blast by the District Manager for the Grand Haven Community Development District.

(The Board recessed the meeting at 11:53 a.m. and reconvened at 12:06 p.m.)

D. Exhibit 5: District Counsel: Scott Clark

Mr. Clark clarified that the election memo brought up by a resident earlier in the meeting had been done proactively. He clarified that the public road access memo was not included in the agenda or the website due to containing sensitive legal analysis. He asked if the Board would like for him to attend the August 4 workshop in person. The Board agreed that Mr. Clark's attendance via Zoom would be sufficient. Mr. Howden requested to move up the District Engineer Contract on the agenda.

E. Exhibit 26: Consideration of District Engineer Contract

This item, originally Item F under the Sixth Order of Business, Business Items, was presented out of order.

Mr. Clark recommended that the Board adopt the contract with Kimley-Horn and authorize the Chair to sign. He provided clarification on the contract in response to questions from Mr. Polizzi. Mr. Polizzi additionally inquired about assigning Mr. Sowell to the District's accounts. Mr. Clark explained that the District had hired a company and not a particular individual.

Mr. Flanagan requested for staffing information to be included in the lump sums. Mr. Clark indicated that he would communicate this with Mr. Sowell. Dr. Merrill suggested putting Mr. Sowell at the top of the agenda going forward.

On a MOTION by Mr. Polizzi, SECONDED by Mr. Foley, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board approved the District Engineer Contract for the Grand Haven Community Development District.

Following the motion, Mr. Howden requested to move up Celera's items on the agenda.

F. Presentation of Celera Virtual CIO – Follow-Up to May 2022 Workshop

This item, originally Item A under the Sixth Order of Business, Business Items, was presented out of order.

1. Exhibit 11: Board Meeting Summary

Mr. Rohrbeck noted that the access points had been installed the day prior. He stressed the importance of replacing the CRM software. Mr. Flanagan asked if Ms. Stepniak and staff had been provided the training curriculum for MFA. Mr. Kirkland explained that initial documentation and training videos had been provided but a time had not yet been set to meet and enforce the authentication for all users.

Mr. Polizzi requested clarification on why multi-factor authentication was necessary. Mr. Rohrbeck explained the process by which an attacker could access Microsoft 365 if only one factor of authentication was in place. Mr. Polizzi asked how long authentication remained active, and Mr. Rohrbeck clarified that multi-factor could be set up to be remembered for a 30- or 60-day period before reauthentication would be needed.

Mr. Howden asked how multi-factor authentication would work with personal devices logged into multiple accounts. Mr. Rohrbeck explained that multi-factor authentication would be applied specifically for CDD accounts on devices, and other accounts on the device would not be affected.

225

226

227

228

229230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243244

245

246247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256257

258259

260

261262

263

264

265

266267

268269

270

271

2. Exhibit 12: Gatehouse Project Summary

Mr. Flanagan asked about for clarification on the guard house firewall, and Mr. Rohrbeck explained that this was a firewall specific for the physical guard house, as its current internet system presented vulnerabilities. Mr. Flanagan asked whether the guard house network could be looped back into the central network and its firewall, rather than having its own separate firewall and associated cost to implement. Mr. Rohrbeck stated that there were devices that could offshoot from a network's main firewall, but suggested that this may be problematic and slow down network traffic. Mr. Flanagan commented that a high modern ethernet bandwidth would mitigate any latency time issues. Mr. Rohrbeck indicated that it was their standard process to place a firewall at each physical location a network had. Mr. Flanagan additionally noted that the bullet point related to rebuilding the network had been in the updates for a long time, and asked about the major challenges that they were facing with the rebuild. Mr. Kirkland and Mr. Rohrbeck gave a summary of challenges related to the CRM resident information database, with Mr. Rohrbeck indicating that because network updates would break the CRM, they could not proceed with rebuilding the network until the data was exported from the CRM to a new system, allowing for the CRM to be decommissioned. Mr. Kirkland noted that the CDD staff was currently working in both systems, with guards having been recently trained in the new system, and that they were at the final stages of no longer needing the CRM. In response to a question from Mr. Flanagan regarding the nature of the cost, Mr. Kirkland explained that this was due to staffing time rather than any specific equipment needs.

Dr. Merrill asked what the status of the \$1,350 amount for the implementation of GateHouse solutions and decommissioning CRM was. Mr. Rohrbeck stated that everything had been approved, but had not been billed yet because the work had not yet been completed. Mr. Rohrbeck additionally stated that they were waiting on hardware for the server warranty renewal item.

In response to a question from the Chair, Mr. Kirkland advised that the completion of the transition would shift guards away from paper logs, instead logging visitors into the system. Mr. Kirkland also alluded to expanded modules and more features that would be available to residents in the new system, suggesting that these would be covered in an upcoming workshop meeting. The Board and staff additionally discussed integration with the Doorking access control software in place, and Ms. Stepniak provided some insight on the training and transition process for guards to using tablets to log entries. Dr. Merrill asked Ms. Stepniak to discuss with their gate guard supervisor to determine a reasonable date for the switch to occur.

Mr. Howden asked whether Celera had anything to report from a roadmap standpoint, and Mr. Kirkland stated that he did not, as the system was live and the modules could be implemented when decided.

Mr. Flanagan asked whether the Virtual CIO was on the call, which was confirmed. Mr. Flanagan suggested that the Virtual CIO provide insight from a business perspective on the operations changes that would take place, to give the Board additional guidance for decision-making. Mr. Flanagan additionally asked about encryption and security for guard house devices, and Mr. Kirkland explained that the computers would only work physically at the guard house location, and the tablets would have no readable information on residents if brought outside the workstation network.

3. Exhibit 13: Additional Module Descriptions

The Board asked Ms. Stepniak for input on what she felt the most useful and efficient modules would be to implement. Ms. Stepniak noted that the greatest level of frustration

came from potential inefficiencies at the guard house resulting in congestion in the mornings, and suggested that modules allowing for residents to call the guardhouse and have voicemails be entered directly to the tablet, as well as modules for automated attendants for the call boxes, would be the most helpful.

Mr. Howden requested for Celera to provide an overview of the automated attendant module. Mr. Kirkland explained that the automated attendant would be a specific phone number for registered residents to call, and the attendant would log the voicemail messages and attach it to the caller number's associated address for gatehouse guards to look up once the visitor arrived. Mr. Kirkland commented that this would free up guards from having to man the phone and voicemail log to manually put together the pen and paper visitor list for the day. Mr. Kirkland noted that the District could also implement a web version of the automated attendant system. The Board discussed mobile app solutions, with Mr. Howden stressing that efficiency, security, and convenience needed to be weighed.

Mr. Kirkland clarified that the modules being presented under the exhibit were the preliminary stages to other features. Mr. Polizzi noted that implementation of new systems would necessitate residents having accurate and up-to-date information on file, and Ms. Stepniak stated that she could send an e-blast requesting residents to verify their information. Ms. Stepniak asked whether permission was needed to send emails for the database directory purposes from a legal standpoint, and Mr. Clark stated that he would need to look into the matter further.

G. Exhibit 14: Consideration of Celera I.T. Services iPads Proposal - \$4,992.00

This item, originally Item B under the Sixth Order of Business, Business Items, was presented out of order.

Mr. Flanagan asked why the proposal was specific to iPads rather than tablets running on Android operating systems. Mr. Flanagan asked whether data entered into the tablets would substitute or support permanent records, and asked for clarification on how the process would work with the District Management team. Mr. Rohrbeck stated that this proposal had been brought in response to a request received from the Board for tablets. Mr. Rohrbeck opined that neither iPads nor Android devices would be ideal options in terms of Celera being able to remotely troubleshoot technical issues, and suggested possible consideration of Microsoft Surface devices because of greater PC type functionality. Mr. Howden recalled that the Board request was for tablets to be able to send documentation back and forth and for communications to be able to be captured on public record, as well as for Supervisor-specific notes to be made on the devices directly. Mr. Rohrbeck noted that the security stack could be installed on Surface tablets, though this would add to the District's monthly fee.

Mr. Howden noted that the Board members' CDD email addresses were listed publicly on the District website, and asked about security concerns that this may create. Mr. Rohrbeck noted that they had a spam filter and link protection for emails. In response to comments from the Chair regarding record retention, Mr. McInnes noted the process by which inboxes could be archived. Mr. Howden suggested that Mr. Flanagan discuss the Board's needs with respect to technology processes with the District Manager, who could then discuss with Celera which could provide recommendations and costs to the Board.

H. District Manager: David McInnes

1. Exhibit 6: Meeting Matrix

Mr. McInnes stated that the matrix was being provided for informational purposes, and asked the Board whether they had any questions.

Mr. Polizzi noted that a discussion on security and access was set for the workshop meeting on August 4, and asked for clarification on the planned format. Mr. Howden suggested that the discussion would start with public comments, then present the comments that had previously been submitted, then have Supervisors provide comment. Mr. Howden stated that some planned topics for discussion included gate-related security items such as the gates themselves and mobile devices; gate house guards and efficiency of work; non-gate security with the vegetative barrier, community call boxes, and waterfront park fencing; and general safety concerns such as stop signs, parking, and emergency generators for the Grand Haven Room. Mr. Howden acknowledged that they may not be able to thoroughly discuss everything planned as part of this workshop meeting, and explained that it was important for public comment to be taken first because of this. Mr. Howden additionally noted that he was in the process of writing up an overview on guard house operations for the attendees' benefit.

Mr. Polizzi stated that he generally approved of the format, but suggested that items other than security may need to be cut from discussions due to time constraints. Mr. Polizzi stated that he was in support for communicating what had been completed and what was currently in progress to directly address the community's concerns.

Dr. Merrill agreed that it would be helpful for residents to be made aware of what the District was working on. Dr. Merrill indicated that she felt it was particularly important to address limited public access, as she frequently heard feedback from residents regarding the access points not functioning to the effect of a true gated community. Mr. Howden recalled previous input from District Counsel regarding a process towards beginning to limit access, and asked Counsel for clarification. Mr. Clark stated that this would be related more to policy rather than being a legal matter.

Mr. Flanagan suggested having a set of slides which would provide a quick list of items that were underway to address concerns from residents, as well as items that the Board might specifically want to solicit resident input for.

Mr. Howden suggested that stop signs were not strictly a security matter and may not necessarily have to be part of these planned discussions. Mr. Howden requested input from Mr. Clark regarding the existing emergency generator at Grand Haven. He noted that an emergency generator had been installed at the Village Center to provide power for the ice machine and to charge cell phones. Mr. Clark provided background on special requirements official shelters needed to fulfill and advised against using the Grand Haven Room as a medical relief area.

Mr. Polizzi asked whether discussions with Solitude Lake Management were on the agenda for the August 4 workshop meeting, which Mr. Howden confirmed. Dr. Merrill noted that Mr. Kloptosky had reported difficulties in getting ahold of the vendor, and expressed concerns about their availability at the meeting. Mr. Howden suggested that the operations manager communicate to them that the Board had concerns about their performance in the community.

2. Exhibit 7: Action Item Report

Mr. McInnes stated that the action item report was up to date as of July 18, and that any lines in the table with a strikethrough would be removed in subsequent reports.

Dr. Merrill asked about the action item dated April 21, regarding the Operations Manager speaking with the guard supervisor about letting people into the community for café use. Mr. Kloptosky stated that he had talked to the guards and supervisor, and indicated that he could relay Board directives to them as needed. Dr. Merrill noted that the café was operated by Vesta but owned by Grand Haven, and asked whether Grand Haven was obligated to

 have the café open to the public. Mr. Clark advised that public usage of amenities was generally controlled by having members of the public buy memberships for unrestricted access, and noted that previous discussions had decided that there was not adequate space in the café for it to serve as a restaurant for the general public, commenting that this decision could be relayed to the guards. Mr. Howden recalled that the Board had discussed that non-resident outsiders could come to the café so long as they were guests of residents in the café. Mr. Howden suggested communicating to the guards that simply wishing to go to the café was not sufficient reasoning to be admitted. Dr. Merrill added that residents inviting guests should be responsible for calling the guard house ahead of time.

Mr. Kloptosky noted that the guards were also looking for clear direction from the Board regarding people intending to enter to eat at the golf club. The Board provided additional comments indicating that residents inviting guests to the location needed to call the guard house ahead of time.

Mr. McInnes clarified that the items for District Counsel dated June 16, related to advertising the August public hearing for rules changes and work on the contract proposal for Kimley-Horn, had been done.

- 3. Presentation of Qualified General Election Candidates
 - Seat 1 John Polizzi

Mr. McInnes stated that Mr. Polizzi qualified for Seat 1 without opposition, and would be automatically re-elected to the seat.

- Seat 3 Kevin Foley
 - Mr. McInnes stated that Mr. Foley qualified for Seat 3 without opposition, and would be automatically re-elected to the seat.
- Seat 5 Nancy Crouch

Mr. McInnes stated that Seat 5 had gone up for the general election due to Mr. Howden's announced retirement from the Board, and that Ms. Crouch was being briefed on ongoing topics with operations staff to ensure a smooth transition onto the Board in December. Mr. McInnes added that Ms. Crouch was now subject to Sunshine Law.

Prior to proceeding with the Consent Agenda Items, Mr. McGaffney informed the Board that Mr. McInnes had officially completed all training with DPFG and was fully geared towards taking over several CDDs. Mr. McGaffney acknowledged that Mr. McInnes had few residential Districts, allowing for greater flexibility for working with Grand Haven, and asked the Board if they would consent to him serving as the District Manager for Grand Haven CDD moving forward. There were no objections raised by the Board.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS – Consent Agenda Items

- A. Exhibit 8: Consideration for Acceptance The June Unaudited Financial Report
 - Mr. Polizzi commented that the payroll taxes appeared to be running with lower numbers than he had expected. Mr. McGaffney stated that there was a percentage factor and that it went through ADP, but they may have overbudgeted the payroll taxes.
- B. Exhibit 9: Consideration for Approval The Minutes of the Board of Supervisors Workshop Meeting Held June 2, 2022
- 408 C. Exhibit 10: Consideration for Approval The Minutes of the Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting Held June 16, 2022

Grand Haven CDD

Regular Meeting

July 21, 2022

Page 10 of 13

410 Mr. McInnes stated that the minutes had been adjusted per requests from Board members. 411 On a MOTION by Mr. Foley, SECONDED by Mr. Flanagan, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board approved all items on the Consent Agenda for the Grand Haven Community Development District. 412 413 Following the motion, Mr. Polizzi asked whether the amount listed under the adopted budget for 414 staff support payroll was what the discretionary fund numbers previously discussed was based on, 415 and received confirmation of this. 416 Mr. Kloptosky asked the Board whether they had any remaining questions for him. Mr. Foley 417 requested for Mr. Kloptosky to provide items that may need major repair as the Board continued to 418 solidify the District's 10-year-plan, indicating that ideally they wanted to avoid major expenditures of that nature that were unplanned. 419 420 (Mr. Kloptosky left the meeting.) 421 SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS - Business Items 422 A. Presentation of Recap on 10-Yr Projections for O&M & Long-Term Capital Plan Draft 423 1. Exhibit 16: Summary of Actual & Projected O&M & SRF Expenses, Assessments from FY16-FY32 – Original Format 424 425 2. Exhibit 17: Summary of Project O&M & SRF Expenses by Category, & Assessments from FY 23-32 – Alternate Format 426 427 3. In Depth List of O&M Revenue & Expenses Exhibit 18: FY16-FY22 428 429 Exhibit 19: FY23-FY29 Exhibit 20: FY30-FY32 430 431 Exhibit 21: O&M Definitions 432 4. Exhibit 22: In Depth List of SRF Projects – FY 23-FY32 433 5. Exhibit 23: Summary of Projected SRF Revenue, Expenses & Fund Balances – FY23-434 FY32 6. Exhibit 24: Recap of LTCP Status List 435 Mr. McInnes noted that all items between Exhibit 18 and Exhibit 24 were not new items. 436 437 Mr. McInnes explained the process that he and Mr. McGaffney had done to provide Exhibit 17 as a single-page spreadsheet condensing the financial information related to long-term 438 capital planning, across actual and estimated figures. 439 440 Mr. Foley made reference to the one-page spreadsheet under Exhibit 17, and requested that 441 the Board focus in on the café, as this represented a large portion of the total for Capital. 442 Mr. Foley additionally requested further detail to be represented for landscaping, and 443 questioned whether Firewise remaining at \$30,000 annually until 2032 was a realistic projection. Mr. Foley noted that the numbers for the fitness centers came out of the reserve 444 reports, and may need some filtering. Mr. Foley urged for a conservative approach towards 445 446 estimates made, acknowledging the amount of unpredictable factors that may cause finances to deviate from projections. 447

B. Exhibit 25: Presentation of FY 2023 Approved Proposed Budget – O&M & Special Reserve Fund

448

449

Mr. McInnes stated that he had reviewed previous budget presentations for the District, and that this Exhibit provided a summary and preview of how the presentation of the proposed budget would go in the scheduled and advertised workshop. Mr. McInnes noted that his opening statements would acknowledge difficulties in predicting costs for the next fiscal year given the current economic conditions, as well as indicated that the FY 2023 budget had been worked on by the Board since October 2021. Mr. McInnes provided an overview of projected increases and how they compared to the rate of inflation, adding that the proposed \$2,081.25 assessments for single lots constituted an increase of \$99.54 over the current year, and that the proposed \$4,162.51 assessments for double lots constituted an increase of \$199.09 over the current year.

Mr. Polizzi suggested that additional insight be given on areas where they felt they had been able to hold costs steady or reduce costs. Mr. Polizzi noted that acknowledging that some of the costs were held by contracts would also be helpful for the audience to understand.

Mr. McInnes noted that the last six fiscal years had an average of a 5.48% annual increase in assessments, and indicated that the projected 4.8% increase was below the average despite the current inflation rates. Mr. McInnes noted that he would explain that the special reserve fund provided funds for capital projects, which consisted of items found in the reserve study that the Board had agreed needed to be addressed. Mr. Foley stated that the projected capital projects total was at \$806,000.

Mr. Foley indicated that data being presented needed to be precise if possible, stating that he did not feel that the special reserve fund assessment increase should be rounded up for the presentation. Mr. Howden expressed some doubts on whether double lots should be presented along with single lots, and the Board suggested that keeping the verbal presentation to single lots would help with clarity.

Dr. Merrill asked whether the presentation would be provided via PowerPoint, and Mr. McInnes stated that he planned on using the document but reformatted. Mr. Polizzi suggested keeping the O&M information on one page of the document, and the special reserve fund information on a separate page. Mr. McInnes added that he had planned on having large posters with the proposed budget printed out for the presentation as a visual reference for residents.

Mr. Foley suggested that items related to long-term planning should be very clearly denoted as draft items that were not finalized.

(Dr. Merrill left the meeting at 3:21 p.m.)

C. Exhibit 15: Consideration of Celera I.T. Services Add-On Modules for Gate House System Proposal

This item was not discussed.

D. Exhibit 27: Discussion of Update on Resident Survey

Mr. Polizzi stated that eight residents had responded to a recent eblast that had been sent out, and that they had five volunteers who had been going through drafts of the survey, giving an overview of the feedback process working with Snap Surveys. Mr. Polizzi noted that one of the volunteers had indicated that none of the questions on the survey were marked as mandatory, and asked the Board whether they had any opinion on whether this should be the case.

Mr. Flanagan stated that he did not believe questions needed to be mandatory, but information on response rates for each question would be helpful to have. Mr. Howden stated that he did not have a strong opinion either way, but agreed with response rate reporting.

Mr. Polizzi noted that a "prefer not to answer" option for demographic questions on the survey had been added, as was common with these types of questions on other surveys. Mr. Polizzi stated that about five comment lines on questions had been removed due to perceived redundancies, and that

he would include the specific locations of removal when sending out the latest survey draft. In response to a question from Mr. Foley, Mr. Polizzi confirmed that Snap Surveys would be handling grammar and spelling checks for survey text.

Mr. Polizzi asked whether capturing email addresses as part of the survey would achieve what the District needed in terms of adequately updating the database. Comments were made suggesting that there may be difficulties with capturing the data from handwritten responses to the survey. Mr. Polizzi asked the Board whether they wished for the survey to include a return envelope to be mailed directly to Snap Surveys. Mr. Flanagan commented that anything that would reduce the amount of effort on the part of respondents would be positive.

Mr. Polizzi commented on the timing of sending the survey out, noting that everything should be ready to go by the third week of August. Mr. Polizzi asked the Board whether they would be in favor of sending out the survey as soon as possible, or delay distribution until after Labor Day weekend, indicating that some residents may be likely to travel for the holiday. Mr. Polizzi noted that the response window for the survey would be four weeks. Mr. Polizzi added that collection would open up three to four days after the mailing date due to shipping times. The Board agreed to allow Mr. Polizzi to make the decision on the timing of the survey release after he had received input from Snap Surveys.

Mr. Polizzi also provided an overview of communication ideas, noting past discussions on having a series of survey e-blasts, including via the Master Association's email lists; having a notice posted on *The Oak Tree*; placing posters in areas with high visibility; and contacting the Women's Club to request for them to communicate survey information to their members.

1. Exhibit 28: LCP Survey Contents Final

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS – Supervisors Requests

Mr. Flanagan requested that Mr. Kloptosky look into the possibility of pond aeration, particularly for Pond 11, to address observed midge fly issues. Mr. Howden indicated that he would speak with Mr. Kloptosky on this matter. Mr. Flanagan additionally requested that Mr. Lucansky look into flooding issues by the bocce ball courts, noting that while it wasn't critical, there had been some resident complaints about the poor drainage in the area. Mr. Howden stated that he would speak with the Amenity Manager regarding this matter.

Mr. Polizzi asked for the revised agenda packages to be sent by close of business on Monday, if possible. Mr. McInnes noted that prompt feedback on meeting minutes would help expedite the agenda package assembly process.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS – Action Item Summary

- A. The District Manager and Operations Manager will provide the Board with a status report from Ms. Leister on project status and YTD dollars spent on each project.
- B. The District Manager and Operations Manager will work on the discussed compensation issue.
- 532 C. Mr. Foley will draft communications to residents regarding the Board's priorities, issues with the supply chain, and staffing issues.
 - D. The District Manager will send the e-blast mentioned above.
- E. Mr. Flanagan will provide the District Manager with a list of Board needs on technology processes to provide to Celera, as well as laptop or tablet device needs.
 - F. The District Manager will send the Board a draft of the revised District Manager Summary for Budget Presentation prior to the August meeting.

David C. Mc Inner

□ Secretary

Assistant Secretary

Printed Name

Title:

565

539 G. The District Manager will work with Mr. Polizzi on e-blast language and posters regarding the resident survey. 540 541 H. Mr. Howden will speak with the Operations Manager to consider the possibility of aeration for 542 Pond 11. 543 I. Mr. Howden will speak with Mr. Lucansky regarding flooding issues near the bocce ball courts. 544 The Operations Manager will work with Guard 1 for the implementation date for guards using the 545 new systems and training for the use of the new system. 546 K. The District Manager will follow up with the Operations Manager on Solitude's attendance at the 547 workshop to address the Board's concerns. 548 NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS - Next Meeting Quorum Check: August 4th, 9:00 a.m. 549 Quorum Check 550 Mr. Howden, Mr. Foley, Mr. Polizzi, and Mr. Flanagan confirmed that they would be present for 551 the meeting, which would establish a quorum. Mr. Polizzi noted that he would only be present for 552 a portion of the meeting. Dr. Merrill was not present for the quorum check. 553 TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS - Adjournment 554 Mr. Howden asked for final questions, comments, or corrections before requesting a motion to 555 adjourn the meeting. There being none, Mr. Foley made a motion to adjourn the meeting. 556 On a MOTION by Mr. Foley, SECONDED by Mr. Flanagan, WITH ALL IN FAVOR, the Board adjourned the meeting, at 4:00 p.m., for the Grand Haven Community Development District. 557 558 *Each person who decides to appeal any decision made by the Board with respect to any matter considered at the meeting is advised that person may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made. 559 including the testimony and evidence upon which such appeal is to be based. 560 561 Meeting minutes were approved at a meeting by vote of the Board of Supervisors at a publicly noticed meeting held on 811812024 . 562 563 564 Signáture Signature

Printed Name

□ Vice Chairman

Title: