

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

A Regular Meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Fiddler's Creek Community Development District #1 was held on **Wednesday, July 20, 2016 at 8:00 a.m.**, at the **Fiddler's Creek Club and Spa, 3470 Club Center Boulevard, Naples, Florida 34114.**

Present at the meeting were:

Phil Brougham	Chair
Richard Peterson	Vice Chair
Robert Slater	Assistant Secretary
Charles Turner	Assistant Secretary
Gerald Bergmoser	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Chuck Adams	District Manager
Cleo Crismond	Assistant Regional Manager
Terry Cole	District Engineer
Tony Pires (<i>via telephone</i>)	District Counsel
Matt Flores	Woodward, Pires & Lombardo
Carrie Robinson (<i>via telephone</i>)	Special Counsel
Rochelle McIntosh (<i>via telephone</i>)	Grau and Associates
Ron Albeit	The Foundation
Joe Vaccaro	Resident
Shannon Benedetti	Resident

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Call to Order/Roll Call

Mr. Adams called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m., and noted, for the record, that all Supervisors were present, in person.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments: Non-Agenda Items (3 minutes per speaker)

Mr. Joe Vaccaro, a resident, stated that, on Mulberry, two gates were to be installed and a large section of the wall was down and he assumed that it would be replaced. He asked if the cost for the wall was included in the budget for the gates. Mr. Brougham stated that wall repair was not in the gate budget.

Ms. Crismond explained that, when Staff inspected the length of the exposed buffer, numerous areas were about to fall; therefore, there was no choice but to schedule the replacement of all posts and panels in disrepair. Wall repairs and gate installation was expected to be completed this week. In response to Mr. Vaccaro's question, Ms. Crismond stated that the wall repair was \$24,000, including the new posts.

Mr. Brougham commented that "the Wall" would be discussed during the Ninth Order of Business.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**Presentation of Audited Basic Financial Report for Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2015, Prepared by Grau and Associates**

Ms. Rochelle McIntosh, of Grau and Associates, presented the Annual Financial Report for Fiscal Year ended September 30, 2015. In the "Independent Auditor's Report", on Page 1, based on testing, the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects and the auditor's opinion was an unmodified, or clean opinion, for Fiscal Year 2015. Regarding the "Balance Sheet Governmental Funds" on Page 9, the "Total fund balance" reflected \$1.6 million, with all funds, with the exception of "Capital projects", reporting a positive fund balance. Pages 11 and 12, the "Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balances" reflected a positive overall fund balance. The only item of note was the "Net change in fund balances" of (\$692,208). If District operations remain the same in Fiscal Year 2016, there would be nearly no fund balance. Ms. McIntosh explained the deficiency in Fiscal Year 2015 was nearly equivalent to the "Fund balance – ending" but, if the operations remain relatively the same, the District would run out of fund balance in the General Fund in Fiscal Year 2016. Regarding the "Fund Balance – Budget and Actual – General Fund" on Page 25, the actual "Expenditures" exceeded the budgeted appropriations, mainly as a result of unanticipated "Capital outlay" items.

Mr. Brougham clarified that those funds were initially attributed to the traffic signal project and half of those funds were reimbursed from CDD #2.

Regarding "Internal Control Over Financial Reporting", on Pages 27 and 28, Ms. McIntosh explained that no material deficiencies or significant weaknesses in internal control were detected in the audit for Fiscal Year 2015; however, the auditors must report a finding for the actual budget appropriations. Page 29 reflected the auditor's opinion that the District

complied with the requirements of Section 218.415, Florida Statutes, in accordance with Rule 10.556(10) of the Auditor General of the State of Florida.

Mr. Brougham expressed displeasure on behalf of himself and the Board for the tardiness of the audit. There was no material excuse for the delay, this year and last. The report was due to the State in June and he found it unacceptable that it was received in July. Ms. McIntosh apologized and explained that the report was due and filed with the State by June 30. Mr. Brougham agreed but the Audit was not approved by the Board prior to the filing.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Consideration of Resolution 2016-8,
Accepting the Audited Basic Financial
Report for the Fiscal Year Ended
September 30, 2015**

On MOTION by Mr. Bergmoser and seconded by Mr. Peterson, with all in favor, Resolution 2016-8, Accepting the Audited Basic Financial Statements for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2015, as presented, was adopted.

Mr. Peterson asked how the report could be filed for the June 30 deadline without Board approval. Mr. Adams explained that the audit was finalized post the June meeting, and filed with the State, as required, for the June 30, 2016 deadline. There was no requirement for the Board to accept the audit prior to its filing, though it was customary and preferred.

Mr. Peterson wanted to know if the Board could hold payment for the late audit. Mr. Brougham stated that, for future audits, he would like a new request for proposals (RFP) for auditing services and a stipulation should be added stating that the completed audit must be presented no later than May 1 to include a financial penalty.

Mr. Adams stated that, Staff would research the legality of such a provision. Mr. Pires concurred that the statute must be reviewed and suggested that, at the next meeting, the Board could appoint itself as the Audit Selection Committee. In order to request the RFPs, at the next meeting, the Board must first appoint itself as the Audit Selection Committee. Mr. Adams planned that for the August meeting, and to provide submittals in September, with the Board considering ranking and awarding to the #1 ranked firm. The District would enter into an agreement and the firm would be ready to begin in September.

Mr. Brougham asked what redress the Board would have if a financial penalty was not allowed for non-performance. Mr. Pires would research the statutes.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Special Counsel Update

Ms. Carrie Robinson stated that, as previously discussed, hearings were being scheduled with respect to the punitive damages issues, which Counsel would take part in.

****Ms. Robinson left the meeting at 8:14 a.m.****

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Developer's Report

Mr. Brougham stated that a letter was sent to Mr. DiNardo with regard to the white signs in the front but did not yet receive a response. Mr. Albeit stated that the signs were being redesigned.

Mr. Peterson asked why the District should pay for an enhancement to the signs given that the signage detracts from the beauty of the entrance.

Mr. Adams commented that this issue would be discussed as part of the revised Capital Reinvestment Plan. The 951 entry renovation project, was deferred at the developer's request. The developer has ideas for the entryway area but the project was at least one year away. The District and the developer plan to work together. The project is for entry renovation, from State Road 951 to the gatehouse.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Engineer's Report

Mr. Cole distributed the sidewalk repair inspection report, which included a map and sampling of photos. The photos provided examples of lips between paver blocks and the sidewalk, recessed utility boxes and valves with a lip; if a lip is 1/2" or greater, it must be evenly ground down.

Mr. Brougham referenced one of the photos, which showed pavers on Cherry Oaks, abutting concrete sidewalk, with a lip. Several years ago, there was a similar issue on Mulberry, where pavers in a driveway sunk below the sidewalk and provided the same trip hazard. Prior to formal inspection and subsequent repair, Mr. Brougham wanted clarification regarding responsibility to repair in situations between privately owned pavers and public sidewalks. Mr.

Pires asked Mr. Cole to send the material and asked if Mr. Cole had a causal opinion on the matter. Mr. Cole responded that the pavers sunk and believed that to be the case, most of the time.

Mr. Brougham stated that, before work begins, next year, there must be clearly defined, mutual responsibilities, should a situation occur.

Mr. Cole stated that the cost of sidewalk repair was approximately \$3,500 each time an area is inspected, cutting back on reporting requirements, presenting minimal pictures and marking repair locations on maps, for contractors. An address requiring repair could be marked on a map to avoid painting sidewalks orange. One picture showed where a stripe was painted next to the utility box to mark the repair. The report would be prepared and submitted to Ms. Crismond, to obtain pricing. Another recommendation was to perform the inspections annually.

Mr. Pires suggested ascertaining the insurance carrier's perspective on whether to perform inspections on an annual or semi-annual basis. Mr. Adams stated that, a few months ago, he discussed the issue with Mr. Mark Grimmel, of Egis, who advised that a thorough annual review would be sufficient. Mr. Pires believed that the carrier's guidance was helpful and goes along with Mr. Cole's recommendations.

Mr. Brougham wanted it well documented in the public record or policies, that the District has implemented annual inspections, should an accident occur in the future.

Mr. Peterson asked if, it was reasonable that, in the scenario where two pieces of concrete abut each other, one should be raised or the other ground down. Mr. Adams referred to the photo shown by Mr. Cole, which was an example of simple grinding. In most cases it was easier and more cost effective to grind, rather than to lift the sidewalk.

Mr. Pires confirmed that he was clear on homeowner's legal responsibilities.

Mr. Brougham asked Management to inspect the pavers under park benches throughout the community, which require repair.

Mr. Cole stated that lake erosion repairs for Lake #7, Lake #15 and other small lakes, were ongoing. Mr. Slater asked if the repairs were on hold due to high water levels. Mr. Cole responded the base bags were being filled but he was not sure about the timing of filling the top bags and cutting them.

Mr. Brougham stated that, for the record, an email was sent yesterday, to Mr. Pires, regarding the three lakes near State Road 951 that, according to the Property Appraiser, were not

yet turned over to the District. Mr. Brougham understood that all lakes were conveyed to the District months ago. Mr. Cole explained that, at that time, the developer chose not to convey the lakes because of the possibility of future modifications to the lakes, due, in part, to road realignment and development of the commercial tracts.

Mr. Slater asked who was responsible for repairing the deteriorating road pavement on Fiddler's Creek Parkway. Mr. Cole responded that the CDD was responsible and believed that Mr. Adams would address the issue in the Capital Reinvestment Plan. In previous discussions, budgets for repairs and timeframes for phases were provided.

Mr. Brougham explained that Fiddler's Creek Parkway is a public road owned by the District, who provides public access and maintenance. Deteriorating CDD roadway sections would be repaired.

Mr. Cole stated that, in the previous year, three or four areas were identified and patched and he would continue to monitor the roads until a resurfacing project is approved.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Discussion: Belle Meade Maintenance and Reporting Activities**

Mr. Pires stated the purpose of the July 13 Memorandum was based on questions from the previous meeting regarding the District's obligations for inspection, submittal of monitoring reports and maintenance activities for the Belle Meade Preserve. In Mr. Pires' opinion, monitoring reports were no longer needed for agency submission. However, maintenance must continue in perpetuity, to ensure that no exotic species encroachment occurred from the banks of the surrounding State lands, which are not managed as well. The District retains Tyrrell, Hall & Associates, Inc. (THA), to provide semi-annual inspections and provide written reports to the Board and Management. At that time, the District would make a decision about whether to issue work orders to the contractor performing wetland maintenance activities.

Mr. Brougham stated that Mr. Pires' memo suggested that the District reduce the budget amount, in total, from \$75,000 for CDD's 1 and 2, to \$50,000, and continue semi-annual inspections by THA, at a yearly cost \$3,400, and for the District to have a contract with LakeMasters to perform remedial maintenance, on an as needed basis.

Mr. Adams recommended continuing the same level of maintenance, which was a quarterly minimum. LakeMasters tended to be on-site, monthly, during the dry season, due to

ease of access. The program was successful and the 2016 Report, by THA, noted 100% control of noxious and invasive species, a difficult achievement. As a result, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) was expected to release the five-year monitoring requirement. Going forward, a semi-annual review and minimal report of THA's observations would be considered prudent. As noted in the budget, expected costs for each of the two Districts were \$45,000 in maintenance and \$3,400 for the semi-annual monitoring. This effort was a development ordered requirement attached to the District's ability to pull permits to develop and build houses in the community.

Mr. Bergmoser confirmed that the \$75,000 budgeted amount was not spent each year, only in the first two years.

Mr. Pires noted that Mr. Adams's recommendation was different from the July 13, 2016 Memorandum and felt that the record should be clear and suggested that Mr. Adams modify when maintenance activities were scheduled. Mr. Adams stated that maintenance should remain as it is, in the current lake and wetland maintenance contract, and corrected his statement that should occur on an "as needed" basis. Regular maintenance was proven to be very successful and should remain the same.

Mr. Pires wanted the record to reflect that the recommendation was modified, as indicated by Mr. Adams. Mr. Adams stated that the memo would be modified for the file.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Update: 10-Year Capital Reinvestment Plan**

******Mr. Pires left the meeting at 8:39 a.m.******

Mr. Adams presented the updated 10-Year Capital Reinvestment Plan. As discussed earlier, one of the key revisions was to defer the Fiddler's Creek Parkway entryway monuments, landscaping, decorative fountains and lighting for one year, as requested by the developer. Gatehouses, roof replacement, facelift and update would be moved to coincide with the first year of Parkway improvements.

Mr. Adams stated that the developer was considering a new scheme for the area coming in from State Road 951, which was felt to be an efficient solution to performing all related projects in a similar time frame. Additionally, the Plan identified Phase 1 of the roadway resurfacing project, at costs originally identified by Mr. Cole. Mr. Adams assumed that Phase 1 took into account the renovation from State Road 951 to the gatehouse, which may be absorbed

by road realignment; therefore, the District may not have to perform all the road resurfacing. It would be a Capital Outlay Realignment program, possibly funded by the developer, with the CDD participating in a landscape and monument package.

Mr. Brougham stated that the Plan showed a certain amount each year, by project. The project would begin in the year indicated and it would be funded through a loan. The cost would be added to the budget, resulting in the assessment over the period shown to repay the loan. Mr. Adams clarified that the number of years identified the anticipated term, at a 4¼% interest rate.

Mr. Brougham stated that the projects would be financed by a loan, not a line of credit and asked if Mr. Adams was confident that the CDD could secure the loan. Mr. Adams explained that the projects required term loans. A bond was not feasible because of the \$150,000 to \$200,000 cost of issuance (COI), no matter the bond amount.

Mr. Brougham read the project list and estimate for each project.

With regard to "FC parkway entry monuments, landscaping, decorative fountains and lighting", Mr. Peterson asked how the \$1 million figure was derived. Mr. Adams explained that it was a subjective number. Mr. Peterson asked if the Board was responsible for establishing what would be done. Mr. Adams stated that the Board works with the developer, as a partnership. The developer brings experience, expertise and resources to these types of projects. When it comes to who finances the projects, certain items, such as realignment of the roadway coming in are viewed as a benefit to the developer; because it benefits the retail parcels. Landscaping, relocating landscaping and hard scape related to the realignment would be part of that. Landscaping and monument renovation along State Road 951 would be viewed as a benefit to the District and, therefore, would be a CDD cost.

Mr. Peterson asked, since the entryway area was common property, were these shared expenses with CDD #2. Mr. Adams stated no. Currently, the only shared items were irrigation and access control. In his experience, Fiddler's Creek was the only District who chose sharable items. Mr. Peterson asked that the Board consider addressing the issue because it was common sense that the entryway to the entire development was a communal responsibility.

Mr. Brougham had no objections to engaging in that discussion, including the developer. He stated if that scenario ever transpired, all entrances would be included and must be considered. The District might be better off managing the State Road 951 entrance, as it may be

less costly to residents, allowing CDD #2 to undertake the future U.S. 41 entrance project expenditure.

Mr. Peterson suggested that the U.S. 41 entrance could be up to five years away; however, State Road 951 is the primary, most prominent entrance. CDD #1 residents currently pay for operation and enhancements out of the budget and felt it was time to address it. Mr. Brougham explained that the CDD was not paying anything out of the General Fund to maintain the entrance monuments; they were built with construction funds many years ago, from bond money. The CDD only maintains the landscape and fountains in the area.

Mr. Brougham stated that Mr. Peterson's idea merited some discussion with CDD #2. Mr. DiNardo told the Board, at a previous meeting, that the developer's and District's architects would work jointly to develop plans for the new entryway project. As plans are developed and evolve, he believed that the developer would solicit input and opinion from the Board; which Mr. Brougham considered to be a "partnership", particularly if costs would be shared with the developer.

Mr. Turner asked if the 2018 figure of \$137.21 in Phase 1, "Roadway Resurfacing", was the prorated amount between on-roll and off-roll, or just on-roll. Mr. Adams stated the figure referred to on-roll and off-roll, with all Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs) participating. Mr. Turner clarified that the figure was to pay off the loan.

Mr. Peterson could not recall if the reconfigured parkway plans included moving the gatehouse position. Mr. Brougham stated the gatehouse did not move. Mr. Peterson stated that the gatehouse could be renovated, regardless of what happened with the road.

Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Charbonneau, about a recent leak and mold, and asked if the project should be deferred one year, or addressed in Fiscal Year 2017. Mr. Adams stated it was a one-year project, which could be moved to Fiscal Year 2017.

Discussion ensued and the Board felt that it was appropriate to refurbish the gatehouse in Fiscal Year 2018.

Mr. Brougham asked why it cost under \$400,000 to replace posts "Wall post replacement along Mulberry" and opined he would never vote to spend that amount to install new posts to a poorly designed fence. Mr. Brougham distributed information about a hurricane proof vinyl fence with a lifetime warranty, which could be made to look like a stone façade. The 8' x 8' fence segment, which included posts, cost \$498, installed. There is 2,800' from the end of the

wall at Pepper Tree and Mulberry to the end of the wall at Mulberry. The estimated cost to replace the fence on Mulberry was approximately \$175,000. Mr. Brougham stated that this fence was one option and felt that alternatives should be researched to avoid repeating past mistakes.

Mr. Slater suggested adding the item to next month's agenda.

Mr. Brougham agreed and felt that developer input was important. An expert could be located that would be mutually supported by the developer and the CDD. If a fence expert was invited to a meeting, to provide alternatives to the stone wall, maybe Mr. DiNardo would attend and work with the Board toward a better alternative.

Upon further discussion, the Board decided to schedule a presentation by an expert in September, after the August budget meeting.

Mr. Brougham asked Management to request Mr. DiNardo's active participation in the September meeting, where a neutral party would supply options on aging fence replacement.

Mr. Albeit recalled that Mr. DiNardo invited a presenter to a meeting with Access Control and for a new computer system; it was a joint meeting between the CDDs and the developer. Mr. Brougham believed it was a legitimate request and agreed that inviting CDD #2 to the presentation was a good idea.

Mr. Slater asked to consider the presentation in August or October, because he would not be in town for the September meeting. Mr. Brougham agreed that October was fine, as the issue was not urgent.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion: Cash Flow Analysis

Mr. Adams presented a Cash Flow Analysis. The "Total Assets", on Page 1, reflected just under \$1.4 million, although the figure of \$130,375, in the "Due from other funds" line item, could not be depended upon to be a liquid, available revenue source because it is due from the "Capital projects" fund, which has no money. The true balance in "Total Assets" is closer to \$1.27 million. Based on the District's annual budget of \$2.86 million, the "burn rate", per month, was approximately \$238,000.

Mr. Brougham questioned the line item under "Assets", "Due from Fiddler's Creek CDD #2", in the amount of \$212,882 and, under "Revenues", the amount of \$185,581 under "Intergovernmental". Mr. Adams stated that CDD #1 received \$233,000 via check from CDD

#2's Capital Projects Fund for their portion of the traffic signal. The prorated 50% of the total cost was based on the invoices provided by Mr. Cole, and certified as correct; however, Mr. Cole did not have the accounting for the beginning part of the project, three or four years ago. Some costs were paid directly from the "General Funds" of both Districts, pro-rated 50%. There were up front engineering and design, permitting and wetland impact costs and, as a result, CDD #2 paid \$47,000 from their General Fund; therefore, the portion to be removed from the Capital Projects Fund is reduced to \$185,000. The amount posted was the amount that CDD #1 was entitled to, under "Revenues", which was \$185,581. The Trustee was asked to reissue two checks. The checks would total the original amount but CDD #1 would receive \$185,581. The difference would be deposited in CDD #2's General Fund because CDD #2 paid \$47,000 from their General Fund that was committed to come from the Capital Projects Fund.

Mr. Brougham noted that \$185,000 was recognized as "Revenue". Next month, "Due from Fiddler's Creek CDD #2" would disappear.

Mr. Turner stated that the "Finemark – ICS" line item, in the amount of \$367,064, would increase by \$185,581, once the funds were recognized. Mr. Adams explained that the funds were currently recognized as "in hand", not deposited.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Continued Discussion: Proposed Budgets
for Fiscal Year 2016/2017**

Mr. Brougham stated that current District assessments were \$1,577.55 per ERU, an increase of \$77.55 over assessments from Fiscal Year 2016. For the record, Mr. Brougham provided a brief history of District assessments because they changed in the past three years, primarily as a result of ERU adjustments, due to the replat of Marsh Cove and several other tracts. In Fiscal Year 2014, CDD #1 had 1,959 ERUs. In Fiscal Year 2015, the number increased to 2,213; that year, there was a larger base to spread the assessments over, resulting in lowered assessments. Fiscal Year 2016 reflected 1,987 units, a 226 reduction from the previous fiscal year. Fiscal Year 2017 proposed 1,910 ERUs, a further reduction of 77.00 ERUs. The size of the lots increased, which reduced the number of units.

Mr. Turner asked if the modification was due to single-family homes replacing multi-family units in the plans. Mr. Adams explained that current market trend leaned toward single-family homes.

In response to a question, Mr. Adams stated that this scenario considered the agreement with the developer to reduce the ERUs on the commercial property, in Fiscal Year 2016.

Mr. Brougham stated that, while the budget would not be adopted until the Public Hearing, Notices must be sent to the District's homeowners advising of the assessment increase. The proposed assessments are usually increased, marginally, to provide a cushion between now and August, should anything change. Mr. Adams suggested that the assessment increase to \$1,580, provided no other changes occur.

On MOTION by Mr. Brougham and seconded by Mr. Turner, with all in favor, authorization for Staff to send notices to all CDD #1 residents advising of the proposed budget on-roll assessment, in a not-to-exceed amount of \$1,580, was approved.

Mr. Turner asked why the budget for the "Supply system", under "Irrigation supply", was reduced by 6½%, from \$132,000 to \$125,400, yet the system was aging. Mr. Adams stated that the decrease was due to the reduction in electricity costs, year-over-year. When a Board Member pointed out that "Electricity" was a separate line item, Mr. Adams explained that they were separate items, that this electricity powered the pump station.

Mr. Brougham believed the figure was reduced because CDD #2's percentage increased. Mr. Turner stated there was an agreement that if any breaks occur in the system, under CDD #1, CDD #1 would pay 100%.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Update: Qualified Candidates for
November 8, 2016 General Election**

Mr. Brougham stated that the following Seats were up for election on November 8, 2016.

- A. **Seat 3**
 - **Richard Petersen [incumbent]**
 - **Joseph "Joe" Schmitt**
- B. **Seat 4**
 - **Robert E. Slater [incumbent - unopposed]**
- C. **Seat 5**
 - **Phillip E. Brougham [incumbent]**

- **James C. Robertson**

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Acceptance of Unaudited Financial Statements as of June 30, 2016

Mr. Adams presented the Unaudited Financial Statements as of June 30, 2016; there were no questions or red flags. The prorated budget, year-to-date, was 75%. Cumulatively, the District was at 66%. Expenditures noted were for wall repairs.

Mr. Adams was asked why "Repairs and maintenance" was only \$1,000, under "Irrigation supply". Mr. Adams explained that the "Repairs and maintenance" referred to Controller Clocks and related equipment. The larger numbered projects were located under "Supply systems". The District's Controllers were covered under insurance.

FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of June 22, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes

Mr. Brougham presented the June 22, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes and asked for any additions, deletions or corrections.

The following changes were made:

Line 126: Remove "offer and"

Lines 127-8: Insert "." after Defenses

Lines 127-8: Remove "appealing the decision in the case by the end of the week"

Line 339: Change "\$250" to "\$250,000"

Line 345: Replace "leaving" with "delaying"

Line 479: Change "Allison" to "Alyson"

On MOTION by Mr. Brougham and seconded by Mr. Peterson, with all in favor, the June 22, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes, as amended, were approved.

FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Action Items

Mr. Brougham reported that the date change from 16/22/16 to 6/22/16 was required for Item 13.

Mr. Cole reported that Item 20 was ongoing.

Item 21 would be removed.

SIXTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

Mr. Brougham remarked that the big County backflow protection devices located near the end of Club Center Drive and Cherry Oaks Trail look terrible, as do the four barrier posts on either corner and asked who was responsible for their maintenance. Mr. Cole responded that the backflows were the responsibility of Cherry Oaks, which serves the southern condos across the street from the backflows.

Ms. Shannon Benedetti, a resident, stated that there was a backflow across from Club Center, across from the entrance belonging to Cherry Oaks. Every year, for five years, the backflow was tested and recertified by Imperial. Mr. Brougham clarified that he was speaking about the appearance. Ms. Benedetti suggested that Mr. Vaccaro follow up on the backflow devices.

Mr. Brougham recommended that the District pay to install shielding landscaping, on three sides, around the backflow. Ms. Crismond would secure proposals for the project.

Mr. Brougham suggested that the District offer plans to improve the empty land in the same vicinity. Ms. Crismond would secure proposals for that project, as well. Mr. Albeit did not realize the plot was District land and agreed to receive proposals.

SEVENTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. District Counsel

There being no report, the next item followed.

B. District Manager

There being no report, the next item followed.

i. NEXT MEETING DATE: August 24, 2016 at 8:00 A.M.

The next meeting will be held on August 24, 2016 at 8:00 a.m.

C. Operations Manager

Mr. Brougham asked Management to remove and replace the “ugly bougainvillea” from the fourth spire.

EIGHTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisors’ Requests

Mr. Brougham confirmed that Mr. Flores was clear about the Cotton Green issues. Mr. Flores stated that the palm tree at the entrance to Montreux was dead. Ms. Crismond advised that the tree was alive.

Mr. Brougham stated that Audience Comments should be added to the agenda, in the future.

NINETEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS


Adjournment

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned.

On MOTION by Mr. Brougham and seconded by Mr. Peterson, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at approximately 9:26 a.m.

[SIGNATURES APPEAR ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE]


Secretary/Assistant Secretary


Chair/Vice Chair