MINUTES OF MEETING
FIDDLER'S CREEK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT #1 AND FIDDLER'S CREEK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT #2

The Boards of Supervisors of the Fiddler's Creek Community Development District #1 and Fiddler's Creek Community Development District #2 held a Joint Workshop on **Thursday, May 29, 2014,** at **9:00 a.m.,** at the **Fiddler's Creek Club and Spa, 3470 Club Center Boulevard, Naples, Florida 34114.**

Present for Fiddler's Creek Community Development District #1 were:

Phillip Brougham	Chair
Gerald Bergmoser	Vice Chair
Richard Peterson	Assistant Secretary
Robert Slater	Assistant Secretary
James Curland	Assistant Secretary

Present for Fiddler's Creek Community Development District #2 were:

James Robertson	Chair
Elliot Miller	Vice Chair
Victoria DiNardo	Assistant Secretary
Joseph Mayer	Assistant Secretary
Gretchen Scott	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Chuck Adams	District Manager
Cleo Crismond	Assistant Regional Manager
Terry Cole	District Engineer
Tony Pires	District Counsel
Tony DiNardo	Developer
Mike Charbonneau	The Foundation
Scott Roether	President, TEM Systems, Inc.

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS **Call to Order/Roll Call**

Mr. Adams called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m., and noted, for the record, that all Supervisors were present, in person, for Fiddler's Creek CDD #1 and Fiddler's Creek CDD #2.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS **Presentation on Analytical Cameras**

Mr. DiNardo clarified that, rather than the term, "analytical cameras", he preferred to call this an enhancement to the present safety system. He explained that the recommended modifications will be made by Mr. Scott Roether, president of TEM Systems, Inc., (TEM), who has been working on security and gate systems for communities for many years.

Mr. Roether stated that he will discuss visitor management, which is already in place, as well as a CCTV upgrade and additional enhancements to the analytics. Mr. Roether explained that the system has multiple components including, GateHouse Access Visitation Management software and Galaxy access control, which the Districts already have. The third component is exacqVision video management, which is an IT based network system. The fourth component is SiteLogic, for video analytics. All of the components are integrated.

Mr. Roether provided a background of his company and indicated that 75% of their market is gated communities; however, the company also provides private residential and corporate security, design service and installation. Mr. Roether noted that TEM has worked in Fiddler's Creek for over ten years.

With regard to Galaxy, Mr. Roether indicated that the owner of the company was originally involved with the Department of Defense (DOD), so their access control panels, etc., were made to DOD specs. Galaxy is a locally based, privately held company that provides 24/7 support and has a good dealer network.

Mr. Roether stated that TEM is a systems integrator, providing security solutions based upon the needs of their customers.

Mr. Roether advised that exacqVision is real-time video management; multiple servers in multiple locations may be used, whether local or national. Exacq was founded in 2002 and is based in Indianapolis, Indiana.

With regard to IP benefits, Mr. Roether explained that the Districts currently have an analog camera system, which is not as clear. He explained that IP stands for internet protocol, which is, basically, a network. The cameras run on a network and can be set up throughout an area. As long as they are on a network, the cameras can go back to one location.

Referring to a demonstration, Mr. Roether stated that greater clarity is provided by an IP camera, which works on megapixels. Most analog cameras are about 500,000 pixels, while IP cameras are three million to five million pixels, which provide much greater detail.

Mr. Roether explained that fewer IP cameras are necessary to provide the same amount of coverage of a large area. With the software, Fisheye or panoramic cameras can zoom in and angle, allowing one camera to take the place of four.

Mr. Roether referred to a photo of a multi-imaging camera, which was a 180-degree camera that is actually four cameras in one. He noted that the four views, at the top, give a panoramic view. Multistreaming is also possible, whereby two additional streams of video can be added to the same camera, to concentrate on a particular area. With regard to the fundamentals, Mr. Roether explained that the Exacq system has simple architecture; it charges by license and the user interfaces with Windows, Linux, Mac, etc. The software focuses on three tabs and has great compatibility; almost all cameras can be used.

Mr. Roether stated that the mobile app is free and it looks similar to an iPad.

Mr. Roether noted that SiteLogic provides analytics. It was developed following 911 and the software is used at the World Trade Center. Analytics within the software can be used to provide triggers. Under "Operations", the system has video management, access control, perimeter and the local CCTV, which are integrated into one solution.

Mr. Roether demonstrated that, when a car is in a particular zone, it is seen at the main guard house but is also tracked by a zoom camera. As the car moves from one zone to the next, the PTZ continues to monitor it. Alarms can be sent to the video management system to provide events, alerts, etc.

Mr. Roether explained that thermal cameras work off of the heat that radiates. They do not require light and are not affected by the weather. They are good to use for people, objects, incidents, etc., and have no limitations.

Mr. Roether compared a photo taken by a competitor to one taken by SiteLogic, which removes much of the "graying" and produces a clearer picture.

Mr. Roether discussed "situational awareness". He referred to a scenario where a harbor was being watched. He explained that many cameras record when they detect motion and the viewer does not want the camera to record as a result of the water; therefore, through analytics, the motion triggered by the water can be removed. The boats are being monitored and it is okay for them to travel back and forth; however, if a boat enters a certain area, an alert is generated.

Mr. Roether stated that, whether it is a marina, driveway or unsecured area, the camera will provide the information. From the satellite view, a trigger is generated so that, if the rover is viewing his tablet, he can see where an incident is occurring.

Mr. Roether indicated that the cost will be less for this system because fewer cameras are required. He pointed out the main server, the video, cameras, SiteLogic and analytic cameras and explained how the alarm is triggered and the roving security officer is alerted.

Mr. Roether reviewed the recommended additional security upgrades. He noted that, currently, all cameras are analog. They will be replaced with IP and network cameras: three to five-million pixel cameras will be utilized, based upon the application and goals of the Districts. When the system is assembled, it will provide the best solution for the application.

Mr. Roether showed a screenshot of a five-million pixel camera and a coinciding shot from an analog camera, of the same view. The analog camera system required two cameras for this particular view; whereas, only one IP camera was required. Greater clarity and detail were provided by the IP camera.

Mr. Roether explained that analog cameras do not show what an individual sees. The existing cameras lose depth perception when they have width perception; therefore, if a license plate is viewed, the camera must zoom in, to that spot. A minimum of two cameras will be required to view the gate area.

Mr. Roether showed the main guardhouse and the enhancements. He pointed out the guest view, the view of the tags and overviews of what takes place at the main gate.

Mr. Roether explained that, from the thermal analytic standpoint, TEM can set up various rules within an area, such as an alert when someone enters the community by foot.

Mr. Roether noted that cameras will be installed at Championship Gate to capture the guest view, the overview and the plates. He stressed the importance of having the camera active. At Sandpiper, the same views will be captured.

Mr. Roether stated that, if some enters the termination point of Fiddler's Creek Parkway, the view can be captured.

With regard to the three pump houses, Mr. Roether pointed out that Pump Houses 1 and 2 have alarms. Cellular technology will be used so that, if an alarm goes off in one of the pump houses, it will go to the main guardhouse. Another thermal camera will be installed at the back gate to capture anyone that enters, especially at night.

With regard to the gatehouse, Mr. Roether commented that the web interface will allow the Districts to add an (inaudible) your visitors, as well as the auto information. The Districts manage their own guest list. The link will be tied to the Fiddler's Creek website and everyone will have a user name and login. Auto and guest information can be provided and passwords can be changed.

Regarding the guest list, different access levels can be assigned. An activation date and an expiration date can be added, as well.

Mr. Roether noted that passes may be eliminated. Various privilege levels can be assigned, new guests may be added and their dates can be entered. He pointed out that the system may be customized.

Mr. Roether discussed visual verification for those entering after hours. When someone enters and inputs their credentials, the officer can verify their identity. The name, photo and type of vehicle can be provided to the officer, for verification, and the person can be stopped. He stressed that the key is prevention.

Mr. Brougham pointed out that someone cannot be stopped from entering the community; there is a distinction.

Mr. Roether stated that the enhancements being presented will provide a level of security above everyone else's.

Mr. DiNardo stated that each area identified by Mr. Roether will have security cameras, which must be linked to a central server or computer. Since the CDDs already have optical fiber, the developer will work with Comcast to install optical fiber at all locations. Once the system is set up, if a particular village wants to design something or do something specific, they can bring the design to the developer. The village must pay for the cameras and they will have the ability to plug into the centralized system.

Mr. DiNardo advised that The Foundation has a cost and the Districts have a cost, which will be identifiable by the area.

Mr. Miller pointed out that some residents are not computer literate and others would rather maintain the existing system. Mr. Roether stated that this is a common situation among many associations. The current system will remain in place; the components are an enhancement to the system. As long as there is internet access, the system can be utilized.

Mr. Slater pointed out that one of the biggest problems in the community is the trailers. He indicated that the system will have a lot of information; the question is what will be done with all of the information.

Mr. DiNardo stated that the key is that the system is plugged into the roving patrol. "We are not making Fort Knox." If someone enters the community by piggybacking on someone else, an alarm will go off and the roving patrol can follow up to see if anything suspicious is taking place or if the person is doing something wrong.

Mr. DiNardo explained that there are two concepts, traffic management and alarms. People can react to an alarm. There will be no traffic management, which is why someone must be at the gate. Mr. DiNardo stated that if a car goes through the area where Fiddler's Creek Parkway ends, the roving patrol will go to that location and, if it appears suspicious, the police will be called. This is where the procedures change with the safety patrol; they will receive information to react to.

Mr. DiNardo recalled that, in the beginning, he was advised that the construction workers were speeding throughout the community. Once a police officer was on site, more tickets went to residents than to construction workers. The cameras will provide data.

Mr. Mayer noted that the road is a public right-of-way, from the front gate to the back gate, at Sandpiper Drive, and information will be obtained from anyone entering the gate. Mr. DiNardo confirmed that the cameras will have the license plate number, photograph and name. If a person enters into the community more than once, the roving patrol can follow him. He advised that the proposal is for a system based on IP and thermal cameras, as well as the concept of analytics, which is a software and computer package. Once the system is installed, enhancements can be made. For example, a camera may be installed at an intersection, if drivers are not stopping.

Mr. Brougham stated that one of the key features of the proposal is the alarm for areas such as Sandpiper Drive, US 41 and certain areas of the community that do not have a presence. Those areas are candidates for cameras, to serve as an alert that someone is entering the community. Mr. Brougham pointed out that, on a normal basis, the same procedural controls will remain in place at the gates but they will be backed up with cameras. A guard will be in place 24/7, at the main gate and six days per week, 12 hours per day, at Championship Drive and

Sandpiper Drive to control people coming in. The system, as it is being presented, is not going to remove the guards or lock people out; it will provide data, should an event occur.

Mr. DiNardo discussed Championship gate, where people enter the community on bicycles. He stated that, if thermal cameras are installed at the gate, the roving patrol will follow anyone suspicious.

Mr. Brougham emphasized that the current procedures are not being replaced; data and alarms are being enhanced. Mr. DiNardo indicated that the two concepts to be added to the current procedures include placing the gate system on the web, which will provide access to the residents, via computer, and visual identification. Visual identification will enhance security procedures when data is provided. Thermal cameras will be installed in isolated areas. If a village wants to add something to the system, they can.

Mr. Brougham asked if the alerts will be sent to the control room or to the rover. Mr. DiNardo advised that alerts can be sent wherever the Boards want them to go; they are emails. All patrol members will have iPhones, iPads or computers and will receive an email that contains a link. Procedures will be in place to determine who receives the links. The roving patrol can log in and view the cameras or receive an email. There will always be a backup system. The email will trigger an alarm.

A Board Member asked how "hackable" the system is and what will happen if the rover receives alerts for two different locations. Mr. DiNardo advised that procedures will be established. If there is no history of a situation occurring, it is not an issue. If the data shows 15 penetrations at one time, an analysis will be performed and a solution will be devised. The system will present the facts that decisions will be based on.

With regard to hackability, Mr. Roether indicated that the system will be controlled by a network administrator, which is the same as adding another computer to a system. The administrator will control firewalls, etc. Mr. DiNardo pointed out that the system is based on optical fibers that are specifically identified to connect the components. The only component on the web will be Galaxy. Mr. Brougham indicated that the homeowner, or anyone else, has outside access, via a password. Internally, the components are connected by fiber optics but there is an internet link. He suggested putting firewalls on the internet.

Mr. DiNardo was asked if the system will have enough capacity for the associations to add cameras. Mr. DiNardo replied affirmatively. He noted that the cost will depend on the type

of camera. Thermal cameras with 16-meter vision are approximately $7,500; 90-meter vision cameras are about $13,000; 120-meter vision cameras are about $15,000, for the camera alone. Since the cameras use software, a technician must install them and their fee is $1,600 per person, per day, in addition to reimbursement for travel, food, etc. Mr. DiNardo noted that, if surrounding communities want to install cameras, the cost will be shared.

Mr. DiNardo explained that Fiddler's Creek has its own natural advantages. It is almost a peninsula. Once the commercial areas are developed and the system is installed, the Districts can require enhanced thermal cameras but the technology is required to go along with it. Mr. DiNardo advised that there are over 2,000 units under the control of builders. The pace will increase, geometrically, because the market conditions are changing; therefore, the developer wants to enhance the system now.

In response to a question regarding the ability to see someone hiding in the vegetation, Mr. Roether replied no. He stated that the physical layout determines the potential solutions.

Mr. DiNardo stressed that he was not there to design any of the villages; he was proposing a solution to the gates that will become the standard for the community. Data can be acquired to assist with making decisions regarding security.

A resident inquired about the effect of weather on thermal cameras. Mr. Roether reiterated that thermal cameras work off of heat that radiates. They do not require light and are not affected by the weather, which is why this solution came about.

With regard to a hurricane, Mr. DiNardo indicated that, by law, the gates go up. People evacuate but the cameras are still recording; everyone entering and exiting the gates will be photographed. If someone is robbed, they will be identified by the picture or license plates. The servers will be located in a hurricane resistant building that has its own generators.

Mr. Miller inquired about an annual software license fee. Mr. DiNardo stated that there is one fee for the entire system that is incorporated in the pricing. Individual villages must purchase the hardware.

In response to a question regarding a potential break-in, Mr. DiNardo stated that, if the robber comes through the gates, the system will show the car, a photo of the person driving, as well as passengers, along with the license plate number. The data is kept for 30 days.

Mr. DiNardo stated that the current security system consists of the TEM gatehouse, Galaxy, which interfaces with the cameras and records who enters and exits, and the roving

patrol. There is no integration. The data is saved for 30 days and is on video, not IP. Mr. Roether pointed out that the biggest difference is the clarity.

Mr. Robertson asked if there is a limit regarding the total number of cameras that can be added to the system. Mr. Roether explained that it depends upon the type of camera being used. A standard server might accommodate 64 IP cameras. Once the maximum number is reached, another server may be added. Mr. Roether commented that, as technology changes, new features will be offered.

Ms. DiNardo asked if the rate of movement can be calculated. Mr. DiNardo indicated that it can be calculated mathematically.

Mr. Miller asked if there are economies of scale, if more than one village wants to make a purchase. Mr. Roether stated that there generally are and they come from him.

Mr. DiNardo distributed a document with the preliminary cost and the breakdown. He explained that CCTV equipment refers to the IP cameras, which is the enhancement of the analog cameras. The cost is estimated at $204,000 and includes the installation of three thermal cameras in the Club and Spa building.

Mr. DiNardo stated that the breakdown is based on specific identification, to include CDD #1 and CDD #2, the Capital Acquisition Fund, which is the developer's fund and the Club and Spa, which will pay for its own cameras.

For CDD #1, Mr. DiNardo explained that the cost for the main guardhouse is $38,100 and Championship is $34,600, for a total of $72,700. For CDD #2, Sandpiper is $25,100, the termination point on Fiddler's Creek Parkway is $11,100 and the gate around the irrigation lake, which provides access to the pump house, is $14,100, for a total of $50,300. The computer servers and money that the developer will have to pay Comcast comes to $40,000; there is an initial fee of $3,000 for the gatehouse web modular, a five-year annual fee of $895 for the web and software, which will be paid by The Foundation, and the Visual Enhancement Software is $7,000. The Developer's Acquisition Fund will pay $50,000 and will cover any other costs for the optical fiber system. Mr. DiNardo stated that the three thermal cameras for the Club and Spa will be approximately $31,000. He indicated that these are not the final numbers; it is the proposed allocation.

Mr. Miller asked if The Foundation will receive an insurance savings from the enhancements. Mr. DiNardo stated that he is dealing with property insurance and an alarm was

already installed on the building. He explained that, if someone enters the pool area after it closes, the thermal camera will send an alarm and the roving patrol will respond.

Mr. Brougham stated that the Districts will not make any decisions today. He expressed his appreciation to Mr. DiNardo for breaking out the equipment costs specific to District location. Mr. Brougham pointed out that, currently, all costs associated with security are shared on a prorata basis. Although the main gatehouse at Championship Drive is shown as a cost specific to CDD #1, the whole community benefits from security at the gates.

Mr. Brougham stated that, for clarity, the equipment breakdown is for the costs associated with the proposed equipment by site location; however, cost-sharing deliberations will be discussed between the two Districts and, if they decide to move forward, the Districts have the option of cost sharing on a prorata basis or however the Districts decide.

In response to a question, Mr. DiNardo advised that there is an annual fee for the website, which will be paid by The Foundation but there will also be repair and maintenance fees, which are not fixed fees.

With regard to repairs, Mr. Roether stated that the newer, more expensive equipment will be repaired because it makes sense but the monitors and less expensive items will be replaced.

Ms. DiNardo inquired about the life expectancy of the cameras. Mr. Roether indicated that the cameras should last five to ten years. The manufacturer's warranty is for one year.

With regard to the time frame for fiber optic installation, Mr. DiNardo advised that he will have a conversation with Comcast.

It was noted that the annual fee for the IP cameras is $150 per camera. Mr. Roether stated that he will look into a multi-year license fee.

Mr. DiNardo advised that the alternative of individual servers for each location would increase the cost by about $7,000, per location.

Mr. Brougham requested a cost projection for each District, for the next meeting, in order to initiate discussions.

The Board thanked Mr. DiNardo for his presentation.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS **Adjournment**

The workshop adjourned at 10:20 a.m.

FIDDLER'S CREEK CDD #1 AND
FIDDLER'S CREEK CDD #2

May 29, 2014

FOR FIDDLER'S CREEK #1:

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chair/Vice Chair

FOR FIDDLER'S CREEK #2:

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chair/Vice Chair

FIDDLER'S CREEK CDD #1 AND
FIDDLER'S CREEK CDD #2

May 29, 2014

FOR FIDDLER'S CREEK #1:

_____
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

_____
Chair/Vice Chair

FOR FIDDLER'S CREEK #2:

_____
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

_____
Chair/Vice Chair