

**FIDDLER'S CREEK  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
DISTRICT #1**

**REGULAR MEETING  
AGENDA**

**September 26, 2012**

# Fiddler's Creek Community Development District #1

6131 Lyons Road, Suite 100 • Coconut Creek, Florida 33073

Phone: (954) 426-2105 • Fax: (954) 426-2147 • Toll-free: (877) 276-0889

September 20, 2012

## ATTENDEES:

Please identify yourself each time you speak to facilitate accurate transcription of meeting minutes.

Boards of Supervisors  
Fiddler's Creek Community Development District #1

Dear Board Members:

The Board of Supervisors of the Fiddler's Creek Community Development District #1 will hold a Regular Meeting on **Wednesday, September 26, 2012 at 8:00 a.m.**, at the **Fiddler's Creek Club and Spa, 3470 Club Center Boulevard, Naples, Florida 34114**. The agenda is as follows:

1. Call to Order/Roll Call
2. Special Counsel Update: Bankruptcy Proceedings
3. Consideration of Security RFP Results and Contract Award or Renewal
4. Developer's Report/Update
5. Engineer's Report
6. Approval of **August 22, 2012** Public Hearing and Regular Meeting Minutes
7. Other Business
8. Staff Reports
  - a. Attorney
  - b. Manager
    - i. Unaudited Financial Statements as of August 31, 2012
    - ii. Fiscal Year 2013 Proposed Meeting Schedule
  - c. Operations Manager
9. Audience Comments/Supervisors' Requests
10. Adjournment

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me directly at 239-464-7114.

Sincerely,



Chesley E. Adams, Jr.  
District Manager

CA:dg

**FOR BOARD MEMBERS AND STAFF TO ATTEND BY TELEPHONE:**

**CALL IN NUMBER: 1-888-354-0094**

**CONFERENCE ID: 8593810**

# MEMORANDUM

Date: 9/18/12

To: Fiddlers Creek #1- Board of Supervisors

From: Chuck Adams- District Manager

Re: Security Personnel Services RFP Results

---

At the direction of the Board, staff put out an informal Request for Proposals for Security Personnel Services. Staff utilized the most recently adopted contract and specifications that were adopted by the Board, while only removing those portions that pertained to sealed bidding and references to CDD #2 (including services being provided within the boundaries of CDD #2). The positions for which the RFP was made were 1- 24 hour a day main gate guard; 1- 24 hour a day roving patrol (each position totaling 8,760 hours annually) and 1- 45 hour a week Supervisor.

Staff reached out to four of the largest, most reputable security firms in the area, (by phone and then electronically provided the RFP). The firms contacted include Allegiance, G4S (formerly Wackenhut), Kent and Weiser. All participated in the mandatory pre proposal meeting, except Weiser, with Allegiance and G4S providing proposals.

The financial tabulation is as follows:

Allegiance	\$307,780.00 Annually
G4S	\$292,537.80 Annually

The CDD Boards adopted a combined cost sharing budget, for Fiscal Year 2013, that includes \$457,176 for Security Contractual Services, which is inclusive of periodic off-duty Sheriff Services. As you will recall the shared costs are split between the CDDs based upon the number of assessable units. As a result, CDD #1 is responsible for 66% of the costs and therefore, has budgeted \$303,185 for Security Contractual Services for Fiscal Year 2013.

# MEMORANDUM

Date: 9/17/12

To: Fiddlers Creek CDD #1- Board of Supervisors

From: Chuck Adams- District Manager

Re: Security/Safety- personnel services contract change additional considerations

---

This memo is intended to provide a comprehensive review and understanding of all aspects of the existing program that must be considered/dealt with if in fact the Board considers moving away from the current agreement for security services personnel.

## **Background**

Both CDDs are a party to the inter-local agreement that indicates the CDDs will share the costs of the security program, as a whole. The current cost sharing methodology is based upon the number of assessable units within each CDD. The CDDs are currently jointly entered into a security personnel services agreement with the Fiddlers Creek Foundation to provide these services at cost and with an annual not to exceed provision. The CDDs have adopted their budgets for Fiscal Year 2013, with appropriations based upon the continuance of the inter-local agreement and agreement with The Foundation.

The security personnel services agreement, with The Foundation, must be renewed annually by a Notice of Intention to renew that must be provided jointly, by both CDDs, no later than 30 days prior to the expiration date of the agreement, which is November 30. (notice must be sent no later than November 1)

## **Recent Actions**

Pursuant to Chapter 190 F.S., and the additional powers bestowed upon the CDDs, they have the authority to provide security services as they deem best serves the interest of the CDD within their specific boundaries. In this effort they may choose to renew the existing agreement with The Foundation (jointly or independently), develop and implement there own in house security personnel services program (jointly or independently) or out source for these services (jointly or independently). Of course all of these options could have varying financial impacts.

At it's July meeting, the Fiddler's Creek CDD #2 Board of Supervisors voted unanimously to continue the security personnel services agreement with The Foundation as it pertains to the provision of security services within it's boundaries.

At it's August meeting, the Fiddler's Creek CDD #1 Board of Supervisors voted, on a 3-2 vote, to defer consideration of renewal and on a 4-1 vote directed staff to put out an informal request for proposals for these services and to bring those results to their September meeting to further the discussion/consideration regarding renewal of the existing agreement with The Foundation.

### **Potential Future Actions and Additional Considerations**

1) Should CDD#1 ultimately choose to jointly renew (with CDD #2) the agreement with The Foundation, a joint notice of intent to renewal with a new annual not exceed amount must be transmitted to The Foundation no later than November 1, 2012. No further action required beyond this is necessary.

2) Should CDD #1 ultimately choose not to jointly renew the agreement with The Foundation, the inter-local agreement between the CDDs will need to be revisited and amended to, at a minimum, remove the cost sharing language pertaining to security services. The CDD will need to consider how it will provide the security services within it's own boundaries.

- As discussed above, one option is for the CDD to develop/implement it's own in house program. This is not currently being discussed and would take a significant amount of time to achieve through a planning, interviewing, hiring and training process. The development/implementation of it's own in-house program is not considered to be a viable option as it would be in essence the same approach as the CDDs currently have in the "at cost" agreement with The Foundation.
- The other option available to the CDD is to outsource the security personnel services. This would require award of a contract to a qualified vendor no later than November 1, 2012, to insure adequate time for the vendor to be able to "staff up" and train that staff for the post.

There are several other items that must be considered:

1) The current level of service within CDD #1 is 24/7 manning of the main entry, which services the entire Fiddler's Creek Community, 24/7 roving patrol services and 24/7 remote monitoring/operation of the Championship entry. These costs are a significant portion of the total cost of the current program that is shared by both CDDs. It is anticipated that should CDD #1 desire to continue to provide this same level of service, a budget amendment will be required that would transfer a portion of the CDDs surplus fund balance into the revenue stream to offset the loss of revenue from CDD #2 cost sharing contribution.

2) The CDD will need to make accommodations for an on-site office for the Security Manager to operate from. Staff is not currently aware of any on site office space, therefore, the CDD would need to either lease off site space or utilize the main gatehouse. Many of the Manager's responsibilities include meeting with existing residents over various issues or to replace access clickers or in registering new residents into the data base and issuing new clickers. Other activities requiring office space, include staff meetings, training, vendor meetings etc. The use of the gatehouse for these purposes, does not seem practical, therefore the only viable option is off site office space, which can prove to be very inefficient and inconvenient for the residents. The estimated cost of an off-site office, including CAM, is \$18K annually.

3) The CDD will need to make accommodations for data storage (server). The CDD owns a very sophisticated technology package at it's entries. These packages include a basic database including names, addresses, phone numbers and clicker assignments. The packages also monitor the ingress and egress activity, both electronically and through the use of cameras, and including several photos of each entry/exit transaction. The data is extremely important, in the event of an incident, and requires significant amounts of server storage capacity. Currently, the data is stored on a server owned by Gulfbay and managed by their IT Department. A new server could be established in an off-site office.

The estimated cost of server, installation, remote communication and routine maintenance is \$40K in year one, with ongoing communication and maintenance estimated at \$10K annually.

4) The roving patrol provides a dual purpose of security observation/reporting/first responder as well as monitoring for certain Foundation violations. Without oversight by the Foundation, an outsourced security program will likely not be able to accurately observe and report these violations to the Foundation for follow up. This will likely require the Foundation to address the observation requirements by another means that may add cost to the Foundation budget.

5) Roving patrol vehicle. The CDD will need to purchase, operate, maintain and insure it's own patrol vehicle. This cost is currently shared with CDD #2 and runs approximately \$37K annually. In assuming this expense 100%, the result is an increase in vehicle expense of \$12,580.

6) The "learning curve" and complexity of the CDD post orders. As with any new assignment, there is a period of time which the vendor will need in order to adequately familiarize themselves with the project layout, systems, key contacts, unique issues and most importantly the CDDs post orders (more specifically the very complex access procedures) As all are aware it is vitally important that the access procedures be followed to a "T", in order to properly safeguard the tax exempt status of the CDDs bonds. This can be an area of risk during the learning curve.

1 **MINUTES OF MEETING**  
2 **FIDDLER’S CREEK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT #1**

3  
4 A Public Hearing and Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Fiddler’s  
5 Creek Community Development District #1 was held on **Wednesday, August 22, 2012, at 8:00**  
6 **a.m., at the Fiddler’s Creek Club and Spa, 3470 Club Center Boulevard, Naples, Florida**  
7 **34114.**

8  
9 **Present at the meeting were:**

10 Phil Brougham	Chair
11 James Curland	Vice Chair
12 Gerald Bergmoser	Assistant Secretary
13 Jim Schutt	Assistant Secretary
14 Robert Slater (via telephone)	Assistant Secretary

15  
16  
17 **Also present were:**

18 Chuck Adams	District Manager
19 Cleo Crismond	Assistant Regional Manager
20 Tony Pires	District Counsel
21 Terry Cole	District Engineer
22 Alice Carlson	AJC Associates, Inc.
23 Ron Albeit	The Foundation
24 Aleida Martinez Molina (via telephone)	Weiss Serota, Special Counsel
25 Tony DiNardo	Developer
26 Eileen Robertson	Resident
27 Jesse Fritz	Resident
28 Jack _____	Resident
29 Elliot Miller	Resident
30 Jerry _____	Resident

31  
32  
33 **FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

34  
35  
36 Mr. Adams called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m., and noted, for the record, that  
37 Supervisors Brougham, Curland, Schutt and Bergmoser were present, in person. Supervisor  
38 Slater was attending via telephone.



41 **On MOTION by Mr. Brougham and seconded by Mr.**  
 42 **Curland, with Mr. Brougham, Mr. Curland and Mr.**  
 43 **Bergmoser in favor and Mr. Schutt dissenting, authorizing Mr.**  
 44 **Slater's attendance and full participation, via telephone, due to**  
 45 **special circumstances, was approved. (Motion passed 3-1)**

46  
47  
48 **SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Special Counsel Update: Bankruptcy Proceedings [Aleida Martinez Molina]**

49  
50  
51 Ms. Martinez Molina reported that nothing of substance has taken place in the  
52 bankruptcy, with the exception of the court's decision regarding the golf litigants and the appeal  
53 filed, in response to the decision.

54 *\*\*\*Ms. Martinez Molina left the meeting.\*\*\**

55  
56 **THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Developer's Report/Update**

57  
58 There being no developer's report or update, the next item followed.

59  
60 **FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Engineer's Report**

61  
62 Mr. Cole presented Draw #70 for the 2005 Series bonds, in the amount of \$3,880.16.  
63 The work was primarily related to work with the water management district certification and  
64 permit review with the developer and his attorney. In response to a Board Member's question,  
65 Mr. Brougham confirmed that the funds are drawn from the operating fund, as there are no funds  
66 in the bonds. Mr. Cole stated that he is tracking the funds that would be due back to the general  
67 fund.

68 Mr. Cole indicated that he and Mr. Brougham visited Lake 6, at Mallard's Landing, last  
69 Friday, as there was resident concern regarding a geotube in the water. He reviewed pictures of  
70 the conditions and geotubes, indicating that the water is about half a foot above the control  
71 elevation, which is expected this time of year. Currently, several feet wide of sod is covered. He  
72 pointed out an area where the UV protection screen from over the top of the geotube came loose  
73 or was not secured properly, which is what the resident was possibly concerned about. Mr. Cole  
74 indicated that the problem will be corrected and noted that only a few locations with problems  
75 were discovered. He described how the UV strips are attached to the geotube. Mr. Cole  
76 confirmed that the repair costs will be the contractor's responsibility.

77 Mr. Brougham noted that there was an anonymous comment on the blog stating that the  
78 District wasted its money installing geotubes and that the contractor did not sufficiently raise the  
79 elevation so that the high waters would not inundate the geotubes. Mr. Brougham stated that he  
80 attempted to explain the situation; however, the person chose to remain anonymous and refused  
81 his invitation to attend today for an explanation. For the record, Mr. Brougham confirmed that  
82 the contractor performed the work they were hired to do and the results are what was anticipated.

83 In response to a question, Mr. Cole indicated that the contractor has not been notified; he  
84 will first identify the areas and then provide the contractor with a list. It was suggested that the  
85 contractor be notified that preliminary inspections have revealed this problem. A Board Member  
86 recommended asking if a different colored UV screen is available, which may look better.

87 Mr. Brougham stated that additional fill material may need to be installed at the lake  
88 bordering Peppertree and Bent Creek, as there is a depression where sediment may have fallen  
89 away.

90

91 **FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Affidavit of Publication for August 22,  
2012 Public Hearing and Regular  
Meeting**

92

93

94

95 Mr. Brougham presented the affidavit of publication for today’s public hearing and  
96 regular meeting.

97

98 **SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Hearing to Consider Resolution  
2012-10, Adopting the Final Budget for  
Fiscal Year 2013, Pursuant to Florida  
Law**

99

100

101

102

103 Mr. Adams indicated that the District’s programs are essentially the same as the previous  
104 fiscal year and, as a result, assessments are identical to last year. Mr. Adams stated that Ms.  
105 Alice Carlson, of AJC Associates, Inc., is in attendance today to answer questions regarding the  
106 lien roll.

107 Ms. Carlson distributed spreadsheets detailing the lien roll adjustments. She highlighted  
108 the adjustments related to the 2006 bonds, noting that five (5) Cotton Green 2 units were sold  
109 and prepayments were received for one (1) Hawk’s Nest unit and one (1) Bent Creek unit. She  
110 advised that changes were minimal.

111           Regarding the 1999 bonds, Ms. Carlson advised that the Runaway Bay neighborhood is  
 112 being replatted from 49 to 98 lots; the debt on that property will be divided in half; meaning,  
 113 each property owner's annual assessment, will be reduced from approximately \$5,000 to \$2,438.  
 114 She indicated that it appears the replatting is being done as needed. Of the 98 lots, 19 were sold  
 115 and others are pending. Units were sold in a few other neighborhoods. This area contains 442  
 116 total units with 335 sold and 107 unsold. A Board Member asked if this information is  
 117 consistent with the most recently adopted updated assessment methodology and the approved  
 118 reorganization plans. Ms. Carlson replied affirmatively.

119           Ms. Carlson noted that the 2002AB and 2005 bond series do not have platted  
 120 neighborhoods. For both, the assessments are allocated on a per-acre basis to the various folio  
 121 numbers of the unplatted property within CDD #1; both bond issues go across the same property.  
 122 Ms. Carlson advised that the bankruptcy plan called for the principal and interest payments to  
 123 stop and the interest to be accrued through a given date; for both bonds, the interest will accrue  
 124 through November 1, 2012. A new amortization is created and the first principal and interest  
 125 payment will be due May 1, 2013, for both bonds.

126           *\*\*\*Mr. Brougham opened the Public Hearing.\*\*\**

127           No members of the public spoke.

128           *\*\*\*Mr. Brougham closed the Public Hearing.\*\*\**

129  
 130           **On MOTION by Mr. Curland and seconded by Mr.**  
 131 **Bergmoser, with all in favor, Resolution 2012-10, Adopting the**  
 132 **Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2013, was adopted.**

133  
 134  
 135 **SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Resolution 2012-11,**  
**Imposing Special Assessments and**  
**Certifying an Assessment Roll**

138  
 139           Mr. Brougham presented Resolution 2012-11 for the Board's consideration.

140           *\*\*\*Mr. Slater left the meeting and did not vote on this item.\*\*\**

141  
 142           **On MOTION by Mr. Schutt and seconded by Mr. Bergmoser,**  
 143 **with all in favor, Resolution 2012-11, Imposing Special**  
 144 **Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll, was adopted.**  
 145 **(Motion passed 4-0, with Mr. Slater not voting)**

146 Mr. Brougham asked that the adopted budget and supporting documents be posted on the  
147 District's website within the next week.

148

149 **EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Discussion/Consideration: Renewal of  
Security Services Personnel Agreement  
with The Foundation**

150

151

152

153 Mr. Brougham indicated that, under the current security agreement with The Foundation,  
154 the District pays actual personnel and benefit costs. It is a one (1)-year contract, which expires  
155 December 1, 2012. CDD #1 and #2 must agree on all actions concerning security. Each year,  
156 the Boards have the option to renew the contract, as is, ask for quotes from other vendors or go  
157 through the sealed bid process. Mr. Brougham felt it is appropriate to make a decision now.

158 **\*\*\*Mr. Slater rejoined the meeting, via telephone.\*\*\***

159 Mr. Brougham asked the audience for their comments.

160 Ms. Eileen Robertson, a resident, indicated that she does not understand the standard for  
161 bidding out all CDD contracts. Mr. Brougham indicated that the CDD is required by statute to  
162 bid any maintenance contracts over \$195,000. As the security contract is not maintenance and in  
163 conjunction with the last changes in the District's Rules of Procedure, the requirement to bid the  
164 security contract was removed. Mr. Brougham explained that the Board still maintains the  
165 option to bid the contract. Mr. Pires discussed statute thresholds and which services must be bid,  
166 pursuant to statute and which do not, as well as noting that the CDD can mandate bidding of  
167 certain services, within its rules. Mr. Pires explained that, in the case of the security contract, the  
168 District modified its rules to eliminate the bidding requirement.

169 Discussion ensued regarding bidding the contract, bid documents, etc.

170 Mr. Curland referred to a contract security services analysis document received from Mr.  
171 Adams, going back to 2006. Mr. Curland noted that in 2011, a fixed price contract was in place,  
172 with The Foundation, for security services. Mr. Adams concurred. Mr. Curland stated that the  
173 contract amount was \$437,912. Mr. Adams clarified that the budgeted amount was \$437,912  
174 and the contract amount was \$435,912. Mr. Curland pointed out that \$450,000 was expended in  
175 2011 and asked for an explanation of the overage. Mr. Adams indicated that the security  
176 contract does not run concurrent with the calendar or fiscal year; it begins December 1, each year  
177 and terminates November 30. Mr. Adams reviewed the data pertaining to that agreement period

178 and found that the total expenses were \$444,201.32, related specifically to the agreement with  
179 The Foundation. There were other items in the figures, which Mr. Adams netted out. In  
180 response to Mr. Curland's question, Mr. Adams confirmed that the expense was approximately  
181 \$9,000 over budget. Mr. Curland asked how the District could be billed for more than its  
182 contracted amount. Mr. Adams stated that the overtime and vacation were what likely pushed  
183 the expense up, as they were not anticipated; however, the District will pay the vacation expense,  
184 as it is an actual cost to The Foundation, in providing the services. Mr. Curland referred to the  
185 contract terms. Mr. Adams agreed but stated that he is simply trying to explain. Mr. Adams  
186 confirmed that the District expended more than the contracted amount.

187 Mr. Curland referred to the email information received from Mr. Albeit. Mr. Curland  
188 addressed the average hourly pay breakdowns, under Item #2, and asked for specific salaries for  
189 each rover, rather than an average. Mr. Curland questioned why The Foundation is, on average,  
190 paying \$13 to \$15 per hour for employees and paying a single employee nearly \$23 per hour.  
191 Mr. Albeit stated that this is the way the department is staffed.

192 Mr. DiNardo indicated that the District has had a great track record since security was  
193 transferred to The Foundation. He pointed out that The Foundation does not pay the cheapest  
194 rate they could get; there are long-term employees. Mr. DiNardo warned the Board that The  
195 Foundation will not participate in any bid process; if the Board elects to go out to bid, they are  
196 electing to no longer use The Foundation for security services. He stated that he refuses to go  
197 through a bid process because he knows that security has always been the highest priority. Mr.  
198 DiNardo forewarned that, if the Board wants to gamble with security, it is their prerogative but  
199 that is why there are elections.

200 Mr. Curland discussed the structure of The Foundation's security personnel, noting it is  
201 high quality; however, he feels that an organization of that size does not need what equates to  
202 two (2) high-paid managers, meaning Mr. Charbonneau and the Safety Captain. Mr. Albeit  
203 indicated that Captain Dupree is a manager of an operation that is seven (7) days per week, 24  
204 hours per day and he feels that the salary is deserved. Captain Dupree generally works a  
205 different shift than Mr. Charbonneau, giving managerial coverage at nights and on weekends.

206 Mr. DiNardo questioned why Mr. Curland does not ask similar questions about the  
207 landscaper.

208 Mr. Pires pointed out that, in Paragraph 6 of the First Amendment, the contract clearly  
209 states that the maximum annual compensation is \$435,912 and questioned how the District paid  
210 an extra \$9,000. Mr. Brougham felt that is a question for Mr. Adams to explain and adjust.

211 Mr. Brougham voiced his feeling that several of the security personnel have worked with  
212 The Foundation for a significant number of years and they deserve an increase in salary. Mr.  
213 Brougham feels that most residents are satisfied with the security services. He advised the Board  
214 to beware of what they wish for, if they choose to make any changes, because it could take the  
215 District years to recover from taking a step in a certain direction. Mr. Brougham stated that the  
216 last time this was bid was 2009.

217 Discussion ensued regarding the security of the community.

218 Mr. Curland suggested going through an informal RFP process to gauge interest from  
219 other vendors and to compare services and pricing.

220 Mr. DiNardo reiterated his threat that, if the District goes out for bid or RFP, The  
221 Foundation is out. Mr. DiNardo promised the Board that this will be an election issue if they  
222 vote to go to an RFP.

223 Mr. Bergmoser gave credit to Mr. Charbonneau and The Foundation but voiced his  
224 opinion that, as elected officials, the District should not be “no bidding” on any contracts; there  
225 should be no sole source contracts without at least knowing what services are offered. An RFP is  
226 not the same as awarding a contract; valuable information could be obtained. Mr. Bergmoser  
227 stated that, personally, he does not want to change suppliers but he feels the District cannot  
228 continue renewing contracts without competitive proposals.

229 Mr. Albeit voiced his opinion that the District knows what The Foundation provides and  
230 asked what the Board is trying to save by going to a lower cost security contractor. Mr. Albeit  
231 acknowledged that there are vendors that will propose a lower cost and questioned the value of  
232 saving residents a few dollars per month.

233 Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ noted that the cost is not the only matter; there could be other or new  
234 technology that is not being used.

235 Mr. Albeit stated that the community is one of the examples used for security in  
236 communities.

237 Discussion ensued regarding the vehicle brands and models used by The Foundation. It  
238 was pointed out that The Foundation, not the CDD, owns the vehicles.

239 Mr. Fritz voiced his annoyance that the Board is considering trying to save money on  
240 security.

241 Mr. Jack \_\_\_\_\_, a resident, asked Mr. DiNardo to explain his statement that if the  
242 Board bids the contract, The Foundation is out of it. Mr. DiNardo stated that The Foundation  
243 will not participate if the District elects to obtain bids because he cannot lower the costs any  
244 further; he will not go through the process. Mr. DiNardo inferred that, if the District uses any  
245 other vendors, it will receive a lower quality service and costs will increase.

246 Mr. Brougham asked Mr. DiNardo to confirm that, if the District invites even one (1)  
247 other company to bid, The Foundation will cancel its contract. Mr. Pires confirmed that the  
248 District can invite other companies to bid. Mr. DiNardo stated that he will not cancel The  
249 Foundation's contract, which expires in December. Mr. DiNardo advised that there is a Board  
250 Member election in November and he will wait until November to see the results of the election,  
251 prior to deciding what to do. Mr. Pires pointed out that the renewal notice must be sent no later  
252 than November 1.

253 Mr. Joe \_\_\_\_\_, a resident, wondered, given the vendor's expense for the RFP process,  
254 if local security vendors will take the RFP/bid process seriously knowing that they probably only  
255 have a 5% chance of being awarded the contract. He questioned if it is a legitimate exercise.

256 Mr. Curland reiterated that the District is trying to see what other vendors can offer and if  
257 it is comparable; the District is not trying to push The Foundation out of the community. Mr.  
258 Curland noted that the contract has not been reviewed in four (4) years.

259 Mr. Brougham stated, for the record, that he feels the District should renew its contract  
260 with The Foundation. He respects that other Board Members wish to complete a cost check from  
261 outside vendors but both CDD #1 and CDD #2 must agree. Mr. Brougham felt it would be a sin  
262 and create undue angst to have the community's security parceled out and not be worth any  
263 monetary savings. He does not understand why the District would want to consider a change, as  
264 there have been no significant complaints about security or the cost. Mr. Brougham felt that if  
265 residents were upset, they would be attending the meetings. He voiced his opinion that the  
266 community is happy with the current security contractor and cost is not an important factor. Mr.  
267 Brougham felt that, if the Board moves in the direction it appears to be going, it will be a terrible  
268 waste of time and a mistake.

269

270 **On MOTION by Mr. Brougham and seconded by Mr. Slater,**  
271 **with Mr. Brougham and Mr. Slater in favor and Mr. Schutt,**  
272 **Mr. Bergmoser and Mr. Curland dissenting, renewal of**  
273 **Security Services Personnel Agreement with The Foundation,**  
274 **was not approved. (Motion failed 2-3)**

275  
276  
277 Discussion ensued regarding a sealed bid or informal RFP process. Mr. Adams indicated  
278 that either process can hold a pre-bid meeting. The main difference relates to the advertising, bid  
279 opening and pre-bid meeting requirements for the sealed bid process. The informal RFP process  
280 involves selecting specific vendors, providing the necessary information and inviting them to  
281 submit an informal proposal; there would not be a formal bid opening.

282 Mr. Pires clarified that, based on the previous motion, if the Board takes no further  
283 action, the current agreement will not be renewed.

284 In response to Mr. Brougham's question, Mr. Pires confirmed that, given the required  
285 notice, the Board must take action no later than the October meeting, if it wishes to renew its  
286 contract with The Foundation. Mr. Brougham voiced his opinion that the Board must make a  
287 decision at the September meeting. Mr. Brougham stated that a list of repercussions must be  
288 provided to the Board, at the next meeting, regarding what happens if a vendor other than the  
289 current contractor is selected, as CDD #2 already approved renewal of the contract with The  
290 Foundation. In response to a comment, Mr. Brougham agreed that he is making an editorial  
291 comment, as he is not happy about this.

292 Mr. Pires reminded the Board to not discuss this with any potential security vendors and,  
293 if contacted by a vendor, the Board Member must make full disclosure. Given that directive, a  
294 Board Member commented that no one should speak to Mr. Albeit or Mr. DiNardo. Mr.  
295 Brougham disagreed, stating that The Foundation is not participating and should be considered  
296 District employees.

297  
298 **On MOTION by Mr. Schutt and seconded by Mr. Curland,**  
299 **with Mr. Schutt, Mr. Curland, Mr. Bergmoser and Mr. Slater**  
300 **in favor and Mr. Brougham dissenting, proceeding with an**  
301 **informal RFP process for security services, was approved.**  
302 **(Motion passed 4-1)**



305 Mr. Pires stated that the Board can approve contact with a vendor; therefore, routine  
306 contact with the existing vendor is appropriate.

307 Mr. Albeit asked Mr. Adams if he should submit a new budget for CDD #2's security  
308 services.

309  
310 **NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS** **Consideration of Fiscal Year 2011 Audit**

311  
312 Mr. Adams noted that the audit included is the original one and the revised audit is not  
313 yet available. He reported that, based on a discussion and confirmation that was received from  
314 the bankruptcy attorney, the auditor is comfortable with reviewing and addressing numbers in the  
315 audit pertaining to amounts due in the current year, relating to certain bonds. As a result of  
316 removing some of the due amounts, the auditors will remove or modify the deteriorating  
317 condition language. Mr. Adams hopes to include the new audit in the next agenda.

318  
319 **TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS** **Approval of July 25, 2012 Regular**  
320 **Meeting Minutes**

321  
322 Mr. Brougham presented the July 25, 2012 Regular Meeting Minutes and asked for any  
323 additions, deletions or corrections.

324 The following changes were made:

325 Line 193: Change "rules and procedures" to "Rules of Procedures"

326 Lines 240, 243 and 244: Change "Linton" to "Lytton"

327 Line 244: Insert "program" after "watch"

328 Line 322: Change to "with Mr. Curland, Mr. Slater, Mr. Schutt and Mr. Bergmoser in  
329 favor"

330 Line 325: Change "3-2" to "4-1"

331  
332 **On MOTION by Mr. Bergmoser and seconded by Mr.**  
333 **Curland, with all in favor, the July 25, 2012 Regular Meeting**  
334 **Minutes, as amended, were approved.**

335  
336  
337 **ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS** **Other Business**

338  
339 There being no other business, the next item followed.

340 **TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS** **Staff Reports**

341

342 **a. Attorney**

343 Mr. Pires reported that he drafted a memo regarding the pros, cons and liabilities related  
344 to lake conveyance. He will provide it to Mr. Cole and it will be ready to discuss at the next  
345 meeting.

346 Mr. Brougham asked him to elaborate, as the directive at the last meeting was to provide  
347 a summary of risks, liabilities, positives or negatives. Mr. Pires concurred, adding that he is also  
348 explaining the different forms of interests versus the fee-simple ownership, from ownership,  
349 liability and permitting perspectives. Mr. Brougham asked the current direction. Mr. Pires  
350 stated that the lakes will be conveyed in fee-simple ownership to the District.

351 Mr. Pires confirmed that there are no deadlines for conveyance of the lakes.

352 **b. Manager**353 **i. Unaudited Financial Statements as of July 31, 2012**

354 Mr. Brougham presented the Unaudited Financial Statements as of July 31, 2012. He  
355 inquired as to why a balance still appears for fund 2 and asked if checks were cut. Mr. Adams  
356 indicated that the checks were cut last week and will be reflected on the August financials. Mr.  
357 Brougham noted that bank fees of \$62 were incurred, due to the delay, and asked if they will be  
358 deducted from Management's fee.

359 Regarding the bond fund balance and amortization pages, Mr. Brougham asked that they  
360 only be provided quarterly. Mr. Adams indicated that those items tie into the balance sheet;  
361 therefore, Management prefers to include them on the unaudited financials. Additionally, the  
362 financials are posted on the website, as part of the agenda package, so they should be included.

363 Mr. Brougham asked the progress in rebidding insurance. Mr. Adams did not have  
364 information but confirmed that Management is moving forward to obtain bids. Mr. Adams  
365 stated that PGIT is no longer insuring any CDDs.

366 **ii. Fiscal Year 2013 Proposed Meeting Schedule**

367 This item was not addressed.

368 **c. Operations Manager**

369 Ms. Crismond presented the Monthly Field Operations Status Report. She recalled that,  
370 at last month's meeting, the Board voted against expending \$500 on littoral plants. Ms.

371 Crismond indicated that she received a large number of emails, which is why she is bringing it  
372 up again. The area was replanted on August 8, at the contractor’s expense.

373 Ms. Crismond indicated that the fountains are scheduled for installation on Monday. She  
374 clarified the proposals presented at the last meeting, stating that the Board approved Bentley  
375 Electric’s \$9,000 proposal. Once the motors were pulled, it was determined that the south  
376 fountain’s casings and light fixtures were completely covered with barnacles, requiring total  
377 replacement at an additional cost of \$2,200, \$400 for the casing and \$225 for each light. Ms.  
378 Crismond presented pictures of the conditions of the fountains when they were removed from the  
379 lakes

380 Ms. Crismond stated that Management is in the process of obtaining an additional cost  
381 estimate for the annual tree-trimming program and is expecting a proposal by Friday.

382 Regarding landscape renovations, Ms. Crismond reported that she met with the original  
383 landscape architect assigned to this community and reviewed the buffer areas along the Parkway.  
384 The landscape architect submitted a proposal for \$7,700, which includes his design services,  
385 including plans and Collier County approvals.

386 In response to a question, Mr. Adams indicated that approximately \$55,000 remains in  
387 the landscape budget. Ms. Crismond noted that she spent another \$12,000 that has not yet  
388 posted. The landscape plan would include three (3) phases plus a design to replant the South  
389 bulk head landscape area abutting 951.

390 Regarding the Mahogany Bend lift station, Ms. Crismond indicated that the county  
391 notified Mr. Cole that the double gate system and landscaping is not sufficient and did not  
392 approve the gate installation, as submitted. Mr. Cole explained that the county is retrofitting all  
393 lift stations to include fencing. Mr. Cole recalled previously being approved to install double  
394 gates and landscaping; however, the county now requires the District to install a fence enclosure.

395 Mr. Brougham voiced his understanding that shielding the lift stations is the District’s  
396 desire, not the county. Mr. Cole replied affirmatively, stating that when the lift stations were  
397 approved, there was no fencing requirement. Mr. Brougham asked if the county is now saying  
398 that the District must fence and double-gate the area, if it wants to install plants. Ms. Crismond  
399 noted that the area was already planted; the request was to install double gates, for access. Mr.  
400 Pires clarified that the plants are not on the county’s property.



424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432 \_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair/Vice Chair

**FIDDLER'S CREEK  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT #1  
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS  
UNAUDITED  
AUGUST 31, 2012**

**FIDDLER'S CREEK  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT #1  
BALANCE SHEET  
GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS  
AUGUST 31, 2012**

	General 001	General 002	Debt Service Series 1999	Debt Service Series 2002	Debt Service Series 2005	Debt Service Series 2006	Capital Projects Series 2005	Total Governmental Funds
<b>ASSETS</b>								
Operating account								
SunTrust	\$ 43,025	\$ 7,457	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,482
Federated	499,535	-	-	-	-	-	-	499,535
Broward Bank of Commerce - MMA	249,001	-	-	-	-	-	-	249,001
Finemark - MMA	249,072	-	-	-	-	-	-	249,072
Community Bank of Broward	39	-	-	-	-	-	-	39
BB& T - Savings	672	-	-	-	-	-	-	672
Investments								
Revenue	-	-	571,047	-	-	413,593	-	984,640
Reserve - series A	-	-	513,417	1,885	71	352,536	-	867,909
Reserve - series B	-	-	160,528	9,406	-	-	-	169,934
Prepayment - series A	-	-	10,686	-	-	5,067	-	15,753
Prepayment - series B	-	-	284	39	-	-	-	323
Rebate	-	-	-	-	-	782	-	782
Debt service	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	13
Remedial expenditure	-	-	-	18,624	5,192	-	-	23,816
Optional redemption	-	-	2,582	-	-	1,492	-	4,074
Construction	-	-	-	-	-	-	12,195	12,195
Due from other funds	371,211	-	32,739	-	-	21,961	-	425,911
Due from Developer	106,533	-	-	1,958,676	2,066,816	-	-	4,132,025
Unsold certificates receivable	6,899	-	4,019	-	-	2,697	-	13,615
Deposits	5,125	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,125
Total Assets	<u>\$ 1,531,112</u>	<u>\$ 7,457</u>	<u>\$ 1,295,302</u>	<u>\$ 1,988,643</u>	<u>\$ 2,072,079</u>	<u>\$ 798,128</u>	<u>\$ 12,195</u>	<u>\$ 7,704,916</u>
<b>LIABILITIES &amp; FUND BALANCES</b>								
<b>Liabilities:</b>								
Accounts payable	\$ 13,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,918	\$ 25,418
Debt service payable	-	-	-	1,214,794	-	-	-	1,214,794
Due to other funds								
General fund 001	-	5,074	-	7,500	296,636	-	62,001	371,211
Debt service fund series 1999	32,725	15	-	-	-	-	-	32,740
Debt service fund series 2006	21,960	-	-	-	-	-	-	21,960
Deferred Revenue	113,432	-	4,019	1,958,676	2,066,816	2,697	-	4,145,640
Total liabilities	<u>181,617</u>	<u>5,089</u>	<u>4,019</u>	<u>3,180,970</u>	<u>2,363,452</u>	<u>2,697</u>	<u>73,919</u>	<u>5,811,763</u>
<b>Fund balances:</b>								
Reserved for:								
Debt service	-	-	1,291,283	(1,192,327)	(291,373)	795,431	-	603,014
Capital projects	-	-	-	-	-	-	(61,724)	(61,724)
Unreserved, undesignated	1,349,495	2,368	-	-	-	-	-	1,351,863
Total fund balances	<u>1,349,495</u>	<u>2,368</u>	<u>1,291,283</u>	<u>(1,192,327)</u>	<u>(291,373)</u>	<u>795,431</u>	<u>(61,724)</u>	<u>1,893,153</u>
Total liabilities and fund balance	<u>\$ 1,531,112</u>	<u>\$ 7,457</u>	<u>\$ 1,295,302</u>	<u>\$ 1,988,643</u>	<u>\$ 2,072,079</u>	<u>\$ 798,128</u>	<u>\$ 12,195</u>	<u>\$ 7,704,916</u>

**FIDDLER'S CREEK  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT #1  
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES,  
AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES  
GENERAL FUND 001  
FOR THE PERIOD ENDED AUGUST 31, 2012**

	Current Month	Year To Date	Budget	% of Budget
<b>REVENUES</b>				
Assessment levy	\$ 5	\$ 1,806,646	\$ 1,770,262	102%
Developer assessment	-	479,598	639,197	75%
Prior year assessments	-	260,485	-	N/A
Interest	127	987	2,000	49%
Miscellaneous	-	15,822	7,000	226%
Total revenues	<u>132</u>	<u>2,563,538</u>	<u>2,418,459</u>	106%
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>				
<b>Administrative</b>				
Supervisors	1,077	14,210	12,918	110%
Management	4,847	53,327	58,175	92%
Assessment roll preparation	-	24,500	25,000	98%
Accounting services	1,583	17,414	18,997	92%
Audit	-	17,600	15,100	117%
Legal	-	28,331	110,000	26%
Legal - bankruptcy	-	47,107	-	N/A
Engineering	4,273	41,092	15,000	274%
Telephone	48	526	574	92%
Postage	162	1,366	3,000	46%
Insurance	-	28,106	16,193	174%
Printing and binding	48	526	574	92%
Legal advertising	-	3,513	2,000	176%
Office supplies and expenses	179	865	750	115%
Annual district filing fee	-	175	175	100%
Trustee	-	13,524	15,500	87%
Arbitrage rebate calculation	-	2,400	4,000	60%
Contingencies	84	1,987	1,500	132%
Dissemination agent	911	10,017	10,928	92%
Total administrative	<u>13,212</u>	<u>306,586</u>	<u>310,384</u>	99%
<b>Field management</b>				
Field management services	2,102	23,117	25,218	92%
Total field management	<u>2,102</u>	<u>23,117</u>	<u>25,218</u>	92%
<b>Water management maintenance</b>				
Other contractual	12,848	309,997	401,789	77%
Fountains	698	34,990	47,500	74%
Total water management maintenance	<u>13,546</u>	<u>344,987</u>	<u>449,289</u>	77%
<b>Street lighting</b>				
Contractual services	-	4,929	18,000	27%
Electricity	2,656	30,778	34,000	91%
Holiday lighting program	-	11,000	12,000	92%
Miscellaneous	-	-	1,500	0%
Total street lighting	<u>2,656</u>	<u>46,707</u>	<u>65,500</u>	71%



**FIDDLER'S CREEK  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT #1  
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES,  
AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES  
GENERAL FUND 001  
FOR THE PERIOD ENDED AUGUST 31, 2012**

	Current Month	Year To Date	Budget	% of Budget
<b>Landscaping</b>				
Other contractual - landscape maintenance	40,505	540,653	880,000	61%
Improvements and renovations	495	19,060	75,000	25%
Contingencies	-	-	25,000	0%
Total landscaping	<u>41,000</u>	<u>559,713</u>	<u>980,000</u>	57%
<b>Access control</b>				
Contractual services	23,829	283,190	291,850	97%
Rentals and leases	54	14,429	17,090	84%
Fuel	1,057	11,507	10,358	111%
Repairs and maintenance - parts	751	6,972	5,179	135%
Repairs and maintenance - gatehouse	640	12,386	17,263	72%
Insurance	-	847	4,696	18%
Operating supplies	2,671	34,757	27,621	126%
Total access control	<u>29,002</u>	<u>364,088</u>	<u>374,057</u>	97%
<b>Roadway</b>				
Contractual services	399	3,990	6,500	61%
Roadway maintenance	-	32,059	40,000	80%
Total roadway	<u>399</u>	<u>36,049</u>	<u>46,500</u>	78%
<b>Irrigation supply</b>				
Electricity	22	219	750	29%
Repairs and maintenance	105	1,163	1,500	78%
Supply system	8,545	112,442	93,221	121%
Total irrigation supply	<u>8,672</u>	<u>113,824</u>	<u>95,471</u>	119%
<b>Parks &amp; recreation</b>				
Repairs and maintenance	-	-	7,500	0%
Total parks & recreation	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>7,500</u>	0%
<b>Other fees &amp; charges</b>				
Property appraiser	-	26,987	27,660	98%
Tax collector	-	35,663	36,880	97%
Total other fees & charges	<u>-</u>	<u>62,650</u>	<u>64,540</u>	97%
Total expenditures	<u>110,589</u>	<u>1,857,721</u>	<u>2,418,459</u>	77%
Excess/(deficiency) of revenues over/(under) expenditures	(110,457)	705,817	-	
<b>OTHER FINANCING SOURCES/(USES)</b>				
Transfers in	-	63,278	-	N/A
Total other financing sources/(uses)	<u>-</u>	<u>63,278</u>	<u>-</u>	N/A
Net change in fund balances	<u>(110,457)</u>	<u>769,095</u>	<u>-</u>	
Fund balances - beginning	1,459,952	580,400	547,492	
Fund balances - ending	<u>\$ 1,349,495</u>	<u>\$ 1,349,495</u>	<u>\$ 547,492</u>	

**FIDDLER'S CREEK  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT #1  
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES,  
AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES  
GENERAL FUND 002  
FOR THE PERIOD ENDED AUGUST 31, 2012**

	Current Month	Year To Date	Budget	% of Budget
<b>REVENUES</b>				
Developer assessment	\$ -	\$ 9,080	\$ -	N/A
Prior year assessments	-	46,319	-	N/A
Interest	1	6	-	N/A
Total revenues	<u>1</u>	<u>55,405</u>	<u>-</u>	N/A
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>				
Bank charges	62	684		N/A
Refund of Wilma assessment	<u>35,027</u>	<u>35,027</u>	-	N/A
Total debt service	<u>35,089</u>	<u>35,711</u>	<u>-</u>	N/A
Excess/(deficiency) of revenues over/(under) expenditures	(35,088)	19,694	-	
Fund balances - beginning	37,456	(17,326)		
Fund balances - ending	<u>\$ 2,368</u>	<u>\$ 2,368</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	

**FIDDLER'S CREEK  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT #1  
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES,  
AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES  
DEBT SERVICE FUND SERIES 1999  
FOR THE PERIOD ENDED AUGUST 31, 2012**

	Current Month	Year To Date	Budget	% of Budget
<b>REVENUES</b>				
Assessment levy	\$ 2	\$ 1,075,812	\$ 1,032,626	104%
Prior year assessments	-	320,393	-	N/A
Interest income	17	96	-	N/A
Total revenues	<u>19</u>	<u>1,396,301</u>	<u>1,032,626</u>	135%
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>				
<b>Debt service</b>				
Principal A	-	435,000	435,000	100%
Principal B	-	125,000	125,000	100%
Interest A	-	338,988	338,988	100%
Interest B	-	95,990	95,990	100%
Total debt service	<u>-</u>	<u>994,978</u>	<u>994,978</u>	100%
<b>Other fees &amp; charges</b>				
Property appraiser	-	15,743	16,135	98%
Tax collector	-	20,777	21,513	97%
Total other fees & charges	<u>-</u>	<u>36,520</u>	<u>37,648</u>	97%
Total expenditures	<u>-</u>	<u>1,031,498</u>	<u>1,032,626</u>	100%
Excess/(deficiency) of revenues over/(under) expenditures	19	364,803	-	
Fund balances - beginning	<u>1,291,264</u>	<u>926,480</u>	<u>986,828</u>	
Fund balances - ending	<u>\$ 1,291,283</u>	<u>\$ 1,291,283</u>	<u>\$ 986,828</u>	

**FIDDLER'S CREEK  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT #1  
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES,  
AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES  
DEBT SERVICE FUND SERIES 2002  
FOR THE PERIOD ENDED AUGUST 31, 2012**

	Current Month	Year To Date	Budget	% of Budget
<b>REVENUES</b>				
Developer assessment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,215,512	0%
Interest	1	7	-	N/A
Total revenues	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1,215,512</u>	0%
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>				
<b>Debt service</b>				
Principal A	-	-	180,000	0%
Principal B	-	-	100,000	0%
Interest A	-	-	621,156	0%
Interest B	-	-	314,356	0%
Total debt service	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1,215,512</u>	0%
Excess/(deficiency) of revenues over/(under) expenditures	1	7	-	
<b>OTHER FINANCING SOURCES/(USES)</b>				
Transfer out	-	(9,880)	-	N/A
Total other financing sources/(uses)	<u>-</u>	<u>(9,880)</u>	<u>-</u>	N/A
Net change in fund balances	1	(9,873)	-	
Fund balances - beginning	(1,192,328)	(1,182,454)	274,067	
Fund balances - ending	<u>\$ (1,192,327)</u>	<u>\$ (1,192,327)</u>	<u>\$ 274,067</u>	

**FIDDLER'S CREEK  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT #1  
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES,  
AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES  
DEBT SERVICE FUND SERIES 2005  
FOR THE PERIOD ENDED AUGUST 31, 2012**

	Current Month	Year To Date	Budget	% of Budget
<b>REVENUES</b>				
Special assessment: off-roll	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 911,600	0%
Interest	1	2	-	N/A
Total revenues	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>911,600</u>	0%
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>				
<b>Debt service</b>				
Principal	-	-	185,000	0%
Interest	-	-	726,600	0%
Total debt service	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>911,600</u>	0%
Total expenditures	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>911,600</u>	0%
Excess/(deficiency) of revenues over/(under) expenditures	1	2	-	
<b>OTHER FINANCING SOURCES/(USES)</b>				
Transfer out	-	(50,396)	-	N/A
Total other financing sources/(uses)	<u>-</u>	<u>(50,396)</u>	<u>-</u>	N/A
Net change in fund balances	1	(50,394)	-	
Fund balances - beginning	(291,373)	(240,978)	(16,099)	
Fund balances - ending	<u>\$ (291,373)</u>	<u>\$ (291,373)</u>	<u>\$ (16,099)</u>	

**FIDDLER'S CREEK  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT #1  
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES,  
AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES  
DEBT SERVICE FUND SERIES 2006  
FOR THE PERIOD ENDED AUGUST 31, 2012**

	Current Month	Year To Date	Budget	% of Budget
<b>REVENUES</b>				
Assessment levy	\$ 1	\$ 712,457	\$ 692,067	103%
Prior year assessments	-	150,386	-	N/A
Assessment prepayments	-	5,977	-	N/A
Interest income	10	63	-	N/A
Total revenues	<u>11</u>	<u>868,883</u>	<u>692,067</u>	126%
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>				
<b>Debt service</b>				
Principal	-	500,000	500,000	100%
Interest	-	166,986	166,835	100%
Principal prepayment	-	5,000	-	N/A
Total debt service	<u>-</u>	<u>671,986</u>	<u>666,835</u>	101%
<b>Other fees &amp; charges</b>				
Property appraiser	-	10,551	10,814	98%
Tax collector	-	13,941	14,418	97%
Total other fees & charges	<u>-</u>	<u>24,492</u>	<u>25,232</u>	97%
Total expenditures	<u>-</u>	<u>696,478</u>	<u>692,067</u>	101%
Excess/(deficiency) of revenues over/(under) expenditures	11	172,405	-	
Fund balances - beginning	795,420	623,026	668,289	
Fund balances - ending	<u>\$ 795,431</u>	<u>\$ 795,431</u>	<u>\$ 668,289</u>	

**FIDDLER'S CREEK  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT #1  
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES,  
AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES  
CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND SERIES 2005  
FOR THE PERIOD ENDED AUGUST 31, 2012**

	Current Month	Year To Date
<b>REVENUES</b>		
Interest	\$ -	\$ 4
Total revenues	-	4
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>		
Capital outlay	2,720	25,452
Total expenditures	2,720	25,452
Excess/(deficiency) of revenues over/(under) expenditures	(2,720)	(25,448)
<b>OTHER FINANCING SOURCES/(USES)</b>		
Transfers out	-	(3,002)
Total other financing sources/(uses)	-	(3,002)
Net change in fund balances	(2,720)	(28,450)
Fund balances - beginning	(59,004)	(33,274)
Fund balances - ending	\$ (61,724)	\$ (61,724)

**Fiddler's Creek**

Community Development District #1

Series 1999 A

\$9,305,000

**Amortization Schedule**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Principal</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Total P+I</b>
11/01/2011	\$ -	-	\$ 169,493.75	\$ 169,493.75
05/01/2012	435,000.00	5.875%	169,493.75	604,493.75
11/01/2012	-	-	156,715.63	156,715.63
05/01/2013	465,000.00	5.875%	156,715.63	621,715.63
11/01/2013	-	-	143,056.25	143,056.25
05/01/2014	490,000.00	5.875%	143,056.25	633,056.25
11/01/2014	-	-	128,662.50	128,662.50
05/01/2015	520,000.00	5.875%	128,662.50	648,662.50
11/01/2015	-	-	113,387.50	113,387.50
05/01/2016	555,000.00	5.875%	113,387.50	668,387.50
11/01/2016	-	-	97,084.38	97,084.38
05/01/2017	585,000.00	5.875%	97,084.38	682,084.38
11/01/2017	-	-	79,900.00	79,900.00
05/01/2018	620,000.00	5.875%	79,900.00	699,900.00
11/01/2018	-	-	61,687.50	61,687.50
05/01/2019	660,000.00	5.875%	61,687.50	721,687.50
11/01/2019	-	-	42,300.00	42,300.00
05/01/2020	700,000.00	5.875%	42,300.00	742,300.00
11/01/2020	-	-	21,737.50	21,737.50
05/01/2021	740,000.00	5.875%	21,737.50	761,737.50
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 5,770,000.00</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$ 2,028,050.02</b>	<b>\$ 7,798,050.02</b>



**Fiddler's Creek**

Community Development District #1

Series 1999 B

\$7,940,000

**Amortization Schedule**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Principal</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Total P+I</b>
11/01/2011	\$ -	-	\$ 47,995.00	\$ 47,995.00
05/01/2012	125,000.00	5.800%	47,995.00	172,995.00
11/01/2012	-	-	44,370.00	44,370.00
05/01/2013	135,000.00	5.800%	44,370.00	179,370.00
11/01/2013	-	-	40,455.00	40,455.00
05/01/2014	140,000.00	5.800%	40,455.00	180,455.00
11/01/2014	-	-	36,395.00	36,395.00
05/01/2015	150,000.00	5.800%	36,395.00	186,395.00
11/01/2015	-	-	32,045.00	32,045.00
05/01/2016	160,000.00	5.800%	32,045.00	192,045.00
11/01/2016	-	-	27,405.00	27,405.00
05/01/2017	165,000.00	5.800%	27,405.00	192,405.00
11/01/2017	-	-	22,620.00	22,620.00
05/01/2018	180,000.00	5.800%	22,620.00	202,620.00
11/01/2018	-	-	17,400.00	17,400.00
05/01/2019	190,000.00	5.800%	17,400.00	207,400.00
11/01/2019	-	-	11,890.00	11,890.00
05/01/2020	200,000.00	5.800%	11,890.00	211,890.00
11/01/2020	-	-	6,090.00	6,090.00
05/01/2021	210,000.00	5.800%	6,090.00	216,090.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,655,000.00</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$ 573,330.00</b>	<b>\$ 2,228,330.00</b>

**Fiddler's Creek**

Community Development District #1

Series 2002 A

\$10,120,000

**Amortization Schedule**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Principal</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Total P+I</b>
05/01/2010	\$ 160,000.00	6.875%	\$ 321,921.88	\$ 481,921.88
11/01/2010	-	-	316,421.88	316,421.88
05/01/2011	170,000.00	6.875%	316,421.88	486,421.88
11/01/2011	-	-	310,578.13	310,578.13
05/01/2012	180,000.00	6.875%	310,578.13	490,578.13
11/01/2012	-	-	304,390.63	304,390.63
05/01/2013	195,000.00	6.875%	304,390.63	499,390.63
11/01/2013	-	-	297,687.50	297,687.50
05/01/2014	210,000.00	6.875%	297,687.50	507,687.50
11/01/2014	-	-	290,468.75	290,468.75
05/01/2015	225,000.00	6.875%	290,468.75	515,468.75
11/01/2015	-	-	282,734.38	282,734.38
05/01/2016	240,000.00	6.875%	282,734.38	522,734.38
11/01/2016	-	-	274,484.38	274,484.38
05/01/2017	255,000.00	6.875%	274,484.38	529,484.38
11/01/2017	-	-	265,718.75	265,718.75
05/01/2018	275,000.00	6.875%	265,718.75	540,718.75
11/01/2018	-	-	256,265.63	256,265.63
05/01/2019	295,000.00	6.875%	256,265.63	551,265.63
11/01/2019	-	-	246,125.00	246,125.00
05/01/2020	315,000.00	6.875%	246,125.00	561,125.00
11/01/2020	-	-	235,296.88	235,296.88
05/01/2021	340,000.00	6.875%	235,296.88	575,296.88
11/01/2021	-	-	223,609.38	223,609.38
05/01/2022	360,000.00	6.875%	223,609.38	583,609.38
11/01/2022	-	-	211,234.38	211,234.38
05/01/2023	385,000.00	6.875%	211,234.38	596,234.38
11/01/2023	-	-	198,000.00	198,000.00
05/01/2024	415,000.00	6.875%	198,000.00	613,000.00
11/01/2024	-	-	183,734.38	183,734.38
05/01/2025	445,000.00	6.875%	183,734.38	628,734.38
11/01/2025	-	-	168,437.50	168,437.50
05/01/2026	475,000.00	6.875%	168,437.50	643,437.50
11/01/2026	-	-	152,109.38	152,109.38
05/01/2027	510,000.00	6.875%	152,109.38	662,109.38
11/01/2027	-	-	134,578.13	134,578.13
05/01/2028	545,000.00	6.875%	134,578.13	679,578.13
11/01/2028	-	-	115,843.75	115,843.75
05/01/2029	585,000.00	6.875%	115,843.75	700,843.75

**Fiddler's Creek**

Community Development District #1

Series 2002 A

\$10,120,000

**Amortization Schedule**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Principal</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Total P+I</b>
11/01/2029	-	-	95,734.38	95,734.38
05/01/2030	625,000.00	6.875%	95,734.38	720,734.38
11/01/2030	-	-	74,250.00	74,250.00
05/01/2031	670,000.00	6.875%	74,250.00	744,250.00
11/01/2031	-	-	51,218.75	51,218.75
05/01/2032	720,000.00	6.875%	51,218.75	771,218.75
11/01/2032	-	-	26,468.75	26,468.75
05/01/2033	770,000.00	6.875%	26,468.75	796,468.75
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 9,365,000.00</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$ 9,752,703.26</b>	<b>\$ 19,117,703.26</b>

**Fiddler's Creek**

Community Development District #1

Series 2002 B

\$5,330,000

**Amortization Schedule**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Principal</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Total P+I</b>
05/01/2010	\$ 85,000.00	6.625%	\$ 162,975.00	\$ 247,975.00
11/01/2010	-	-	160,159.38	160,159.38
05/01/2011	90,000.00	6.625%	160,159.38	250,159.38
11/01/2011	-	-	157,178.13	157,178.13
05/01/2012	100,000.00	6.625%	157,178.13	257,178.13
11/01/2012	-	-	153,865.63	153,865.63
05/01/2013	105,000.00	6.625%	153,865.63	258,865.63
11/01/2013	-	-	150,387.50	150,387.50
05/01/2014	115,000.00	6.625%	150,387.50	265,387.50
11/01/2014	-	-	146,578.13	146,578.13
05/01/2015	120,000.00	6.625%	146,578.13	266,578.13
11/01/2015	-	-	142,603.13	142,603.13
05/01/2016	130,000.00	6.625%	142,603.13	272,603.13
11/01/2016	-	-	138,296.88	138,296.88
05/01/2017	135,000.00	6.625%	138,296.88	273,296.88
11/01/2017	-	-	133,825.00	133,825.00
05/01/2018	145,000.00	6.625%	133,825.00	278,825.00
11/01/2018	-	-	129,021.88	129,021.88
05/01/2019	155,000.00	6.625%	129,021.88	284,021.88
11/01/2019	-	-	123,887.50	123,887.50
05/01/2020	170,000.00	6.625%	123,887.50	293,887.50
11/01/2020	-	-	118,256.25	118,256.25
05/01/2021	180,000.00	6.625%	118,256.25	298,256.25
11/01/2021	-	-	112,293.75	112,293.75
05/01/2022	190,000.00	6.625%	112,293.75	302,293.75
11/01/2022	-	-	106,000.00	106,000.00
05/01/2023	205,000.00	6.625%	106,000.00	311,000.00
11/01/2023	-	-	99,209.38	99,209.38
05/01/2024	220,000.00	6.625%	99,209.38	319,209.38
11/01/2024	-	-	91,921.88	91,921.88
05/01/2025	235,000.00	6.625%	91,921.88	326,921.88
11/01/2025	-	-	84,137.50	84,137.50
05/01/2026	250,000.00	6.625%	84,137.50	334,137.50
11/01/2026	-	-	75,856.25	75,856.25
05/01/2027	265,000.00	6.625%	75,856.25	340,856.25
11/01/2027	-	-	67,078.13	67,078.13
05/01/2028	285,000.00	6.625%	67,078.13	352,078.13
11/01/2028	-	-	57,637.50	57,637.50
05/01/2029	305,000.00	6.625%	57,637.50	362,637.50

**Fiddler's Creek**

Community Development District #1

Series 2002 B

\$5,330,000

**Amortization Schedule**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Principal</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Total P+I</b>
11/01/2029	-	-	47,534.38	47,534.38
05/01/2030	325,000.00	6.625%	47,534.38	372,534.38
11/01/2030	-	-	36,768.75	36,768.75
05/01/2031	345,000.00	6.625%	36,768.75	381,768.75
11/01/2031	-	-	25,340.63	25,340.63
05/01/2032	370,000.00	6.625%	25,340.63	395,340.63
11/01/2032	-	-	13,084.38	13,084.38
05/01/2033	395,000.00	6.625%	13,084.38	408,084.38
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 4,920,000.00</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$ 4,904,818.88</b>	<b>\$ 9,824,818.88</b>

**Fiddler's Creek**

Community Development District #1

Series 2005

\$18,095,000

**Amortization Schedule**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Principal</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Total P+I</b>
05/01/2011	\$ 255,000.00	6.000%	\$ 370,950.00	\$ 625,950.00
11/01/2011	-	-	363,300.00	363,300.00
05/01/2012	185,000.00	6.000%	363,300.00	548,300.00
11/01/2012	-	-	357,750.00	357,750.00
05/01/2013	195,000.00	6.000%	357,750.00	552,750.00
11/01/2013	-	-	351,900.00	351,900.00
05/01/2014	210,000.00	6.000%	351,900.00	561,900.00
11/01/2014	-	-	345,600.00	345,600.00
05/01/2015	220,000.00	6.000%	345,600.00	565,600.00
11/01/2015	-	-	339,000.00	339,000.00
05/01/2016	235,000.00	6.000%	339,000.00	574,000.00
11/01/2016	-	-	331,950.00	331,950.00
05/01/2017	250,000.00	6.000%	331,950.00	581,950.00
11/01/2017	-	-	324,450.00	324,450.00
05/01/2018	265,000.00	6.000%	324,450.00	589,450.00
11/01/2018	-	-	316,500.00	316,500.00
05/01/2019	280,000.00	6.000%	316,500.00	596,500.00
11/01/2019	-	-	308,100.00	308,100.00
05/01/2020	300,000.00	6.000%	308,100.00	608,100.00
11/01/2020	-	-	299,100.00	299,100.00
05/01/2021	315,000.00	6.000%	299,100.00	614,100.00
11/01/2021	-	-	289,650.00	289,650.00
05/01/2022	335,000.00	6.000%	289,650.00	624,650.00
11/01/2022	-	-	279,600.00	279,600.00
05/01/2023	355,000.00	6.000%	279,600.00	634,600.00
11/01/2023	-	-	268,950.00	268,950.00
05/01/2024	380,000.00	6.000%	268,950.00	648,950.00
11/01/2024	-	-	257,550.00	257,550.00
05/01/2025	405,000.00	6.000%	257,550.00	662,550.00
11/01/2025	-	-	245,400.00	245,400.00
05/01/2026	430,000.00	6.000%	245,400.00	675,400.00
11/01/2026	-	-	232,500.00	232,500.00
05/01/2027	455,000.00	6.000%	232,500.00	687,500.00
11/01/2027	-	-	218,850.00	218,850.00
05/01/2028	480,000.00	6.000%	218,850.00	698,850.00
11/01/2028	-	-	204,450.00	204,450.00
05/01/2029	510,000.00	6.000%	204,450.00	714,450.00

**Fiddler's Creek**

Community Development District #1

Series 2005

\$18,095,000

**Amortization Schedule**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Principal</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Total P+I</b>
11/01/2029	-	-	189,150.00	189,150.00
05/01/2030	545,000.00	6.000%	189,150.00	734,150.00
11/01/2030	-	-	172,800.00	172,800.00
05/01/2031	580,000.00	6.000%	172,800.00	752,800.00
11/01/2031	-	-	155,400.00	155,400.00
05/01/2032	615,000.00	6.000%	155,400.00	770,400.00
11/01/2032	-	-	136,950.00	136,950.00
05/01/2033	650,000.00	6.000%	136,950.00	786,950.00
11/01/2033	-	-	117,450.00	117,450.00
05/01/2034	690,000.00	6.000%	117,450.00	807,450.00
11/01/2034	-	-	96,750.00	96,750.00
05/01/2035	735,000.00	6.000%	96,750.00	831,750.00
11/01/2035	-	-	74,700.00	74,700.00
05/01/2036	780,000.00	6.000%	74,700.00	854,700.00
11/01/2036	-	-	51,300.00	51,300.00
05/01/2037	830,000.00	6.000%	51,300.00	881,300.00
11/01/2037	-	-	26,400.00	26,400.00
05/01/2038	880,000.00	6.000%	26,400.00	906,400.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 12,365,000.00</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$ 13,081,950.00</b>	<b>\$ 25,446,950.00</b>

**Fiddler's Creek**

Community Development District #1

Series 2006

\$6,570,000

**Amortization Schedule**

<b>Date</b>		<b>Principal</b>	<b>Rate</b>		<b>Interest</b>		<b>Total P+I</b>
11/01/2011	\$	-	-	\$	83,949.37	\$	83,949.37
05/01/2012		500,000.00	4.200%		82,886.04		582,886.04
11/01/2012		-	-		73,162.62		73,162.62
05/01/2013		520,000.00	4.200%		72,100.48		592,100.48
11/01/2013		-	-		62,353.32		62,353.32
05/01/2014		545,000.00	4.200%		61,336.68		606,336.68
11/01/2014		-	-		50,814.25		50,814.25
05/01/2015		565,000.00	4.200%		49,985.75		614,985.75
11/01/2015		-	-		38,851.73		38,851.73
05/01/2016		590,000.00	4.200%		38,359.62		628,359.62
11/01/2016		-	-		26,287.87		26,287.87
05/01/2017		615,000.00	4.200%		25,906.23		640,906.23
11/01/2017		-	-		13,338.74		13,338.74
05/01/2018		630,000.00	4.200%		13,121.26		643,121.26
Total	\$	3,965,000.00	-	\$	692,453.96	\$	4,657,453.96



# Fiddler's Creek Community Development District #1

<b>FISCAL YEAR 2013 PROPOSED MEETING SCHEDULE</b>			
<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Potential Discussion Focus</b>
1	Wednesday, October 24, 2012	8:00 AM	Regular Meeting
2	Wednesday, November 28, 2012	8:00 AM	Regular Meeting
3	Wednesday, December 19, 2012	8:00 AM	Regular Meeting
4	Wednesday, January 23, 2013	8:00 AM	Regular Meeting
5	Wednesday, February 27, 2013	8:00 AM	Regular Meeting
6	Wednesday, March 27, 2013	8:00 AM	Regular Meeting
7	Wednesday, April 24, 2013	8:00 AM	Regular Meeting
8	Wednesday, May 22, 2013	8:00 AM	<b>Approve Fiscal Year 2014 Proposed Budget</b>
9	Wednesday, June 26, 2013	8:00 AM	Regular Meeting
10	Wednesday, July 24, 2013	8:00 AM	Regular Meeting
11	Wednesday, August 28, 2013	8:00 AM	<b>Adopt Fiscal Year 2014 Final Budget</b>
12	Wednesday, September 25, 2013	8:00 AM	Regular Meeting

Meeting Location: **Fiddler's Creek Club and Spa, 3470 Club Center Boulevard, Naples, Florida 34114**