

**MINUTES OF MEETING
TSR
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

The Board of Supervisors of the TSR Community Development District held multiple Public Hearings and a Regular Meeting on September 8, 2021, at 5:00 p.m., at Cunningham Park, 12131 Rangeland Boulevard, Odessa, Florida 33556.

Present were:

| | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Mike Liquori | Chair |
| Matt Call | Vice Chair |
| Mary Comella | Assistant Secretary |
| Jason Silber | Assistant Secretary |
| Tim Green (via telephone) | Assistant Secretary |

Also present were:

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Chuck Adams | District Manager |
| Cleo Adams | Assistant District Manager |
| Alyssa Willson | District Counsel |
| Brian Wilkes (via telephone) | District Engineer |
| Renee Hlebak | WTS Starkey Ranch Lifestyle Director |
| Alex Murphy | WTS Starkey Ranch Operations Director |
| Mark Yahn | SunScape Consulting, Inc. (SCI) |
| Jason West | Down to Earth Landscape & Irrigation (DTE) |
| Gary Hawkins | Down to Earth Landscape & Irrigation (DTE) |
| Drew Miller | Esplanade HOA Board Member & Taylor Morrison Employee |

Residents present in person were:

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Leah Louzon | David Cox | Bob Wood | Robin Regland |
| Mike Hughes | Alberto Cassola | Linda Cassola | Roger Holman |
| Dave Deenihan | Ray Celisa | Robbie Wallis | Jack Leason |
| Bill Schumacher | Javier Valdez | Ben Devivo | Jim Ciadella |
| Devon Higher | John Baca | Maria Weiser | Kurt Naser |
| Drew Miller | Linda Reed | Linda Deenihan | Matt Mohr |
| Roberto Carvajal | Elena Devor | Roger Holman | Jamie Duncan |
| Bob Fluen | Mike Hudak | Karen _____ | Other Residents |

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Call to Order/Roll Call

Mr. Adams called the meeting to order at 5:07 p.m. Supervisors Liquori, Call, Comella and Silber were present, in person. Supervisor Green was attending via telephone.

Mr. Liquori thanked the homeowners for attending and invited them to attend future meetings. He noted that budget discussions were held in prior meetings and that most attending were from Esplanade, because those assessments were increasing. He stated that the Board determined that all homeowners receive the same benefits and; therefore, could not justify continuing to have the Esplanade property owner assessments be at 75% equivalency. He also acknowledged reading homeowner emails that were submitted to Management wherein concerns were raised about Esplanade assessments increasing; however, none of the comments provided any solid justification as to how Esplanade property owners receive any less benefit than anyone else in the community. He recommended that, during public comments, homeowners provide suggestions of ways to reduce the budget.

Mr. Silber noted that the homeowner emails suggested that the Esplanade community does not have a representative on the Board, which he felt was untrue, as the Board Members are equally responsible to provide for all of the neighborhoods, to the best of their ability. He pointed out that residents from all neighborhoods have the ability to run for a seat on the Board, through the County Supervisor of Elections Office.

Mr. Call reiterated Mr. Liquori's request for homeowners to provide suggestions of ways to reduce the overall budget, during public comments.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments [3 minutes per person]

The following is a summation of public comments and corresponding response.

➤ **Question:** A resident asked if Starkey Ranch was a neighborhood Board as someone in the HOA said it was not. **Response:** Two homeowners currently hold a seat on the Board; two other Developer seats will transition to homeowners in November 2022.

Discussion ensued regarding Florida Statutes and criteria required to transition to the General Election process.

➤ **Landscape Maintenance Question:** Resident David Cox asked who to contact to gain leverage to get the Developer to maintain the common area at the Bonfire Whitfield Preserve and asked why are they not being maintained like the rest of the communities.

Response: Mr. Cox was directed to contact the major Developer, as that parcel has not been turned over to the CDD yet. It was noted that, before the CDD would accept conveyance, the Developer would be required to bring it up to the CDD's standards.

Esplanade Resident Robin Regland asked if the boundaries include the common areas and why they were not being maintained like the rest of the communities.

Response: It was noted that the HOA maintains certain areas deemed private property.

➤ **Roadside Maintenance Question:** Resident Bob Wood asked who is responsible for maintaining the road side of the fence, on Lake Blanche to the park, which has not been mowed or maintained since the school opened, and the lot behind the library. He asked if the CDD, school or library is responsible.

➤ **Landscape Consulting Firm Question:** Resident Mike Hughes asked for the scope of work performed by the Landscape Consulting firm.

Response: Mr. Adams introduced Mr. Yahn with SCI who manages Down-to-Earth (DTE).

Mr. Yahn discussed his experience, noted that his firm wrote the landscape program for the property in 2016 and prepared the Request for Proposals (RFP). He explained the services provided to the CDD and the frequency. He stated that, as regular herbicides cannot be used, Management and DTE are making every effort to keep the weeds away and noted that some materials are mistaken for weeds. He toured the community and observed that areas are looking much better. He discussed the landscape staffing shortage due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Mr. Yahn introduced DTE representatives in attendance.

Residents were asked to email questions and concerns to Mr. and Mrs. Adams and submit work orders through the CDD website. It was noted that the link is included in the Welcome Center emails.

Resident Roger Holman asked when the SunScapes account was competitively bid. Ms. Comella dissented the assessment increase across the Board.

Ms. Comella voiced her opinion that it was prior board actions and going back on it would be unfair, although she felt it was not appropriate. Ms. Willson clarified that there was no agreement; it was just the prior Board, in 2016, adopting the assessment allocation.

Referring to a public records request, Mr. Adams stated he researched the documents and could only find a mention of this from the 2015 minutes, during the annual budget process. The SunScapes contract is negotiated every year. Ms. Comella discussed touring the community and observing SunScapes' detailed process.

Resident Dave Deenihan asked for clarification of detailed services costs. He felt that pool resurfacing should be under warranty. He asked about the cost of off-duty police officers.

Resident Ray Celisa asked how budget items are put in place. Response: The Fiscal Year 2022 budget will be adopted tonight and that draft budgets have been discussed since June; further discussions will occur during the budget adoption.

Resident Robbie Wallis asked if the current Board Members were on the Board when the 25% reduction was put in place. Response: There was no “agreement”, the reduction occurred when the budget was previously established and, at that time, that Board believed it was fair for that particular year.

Resident Jack Leason observed that the sod aesthetic at the back gate, off 54, differed from other communities. Response: The area will be replaced with another material this year.

Resident Bill Schumacher asked about the expected final build-out of Starkey Ranch. It was noted that there would be 2,598 residences; the number remaining was unknown. Mr. Schumacher asked if Lake Blanch Road would be completed when the school opens. Response: Lake Blanch Road would be completed and include a traffic signal; it would be deemed a County road located outside the CDD boundaries.

Mr. Holman asked if the CDD is complying with Florida Statue 190.033, 190-035(3) related to bids required, fees and rental charges to minimal rental requirements. Mr. Adams and Ms. Willson replied affirmatively.

A resident asked when the wood bridge on Rangeland Road would be repaired. It was noted that the contractor has gone through two cycles of board replacement and the work was being done in piece meal until construction is completed, then alternative products would be selected. The resident asked if homeowners can receive a rebate by returning their Starkey Ranch identification cards that they do not use. Response: Since the CDD funded the facilities, it cannot prohibit access.

Resident Devon Higher asked if the CDD can use the Welcome Center for office space and whether the Board can approve the overall budget but not each line item, while they continue negotiations with the homeowners. Response: The CDD does not own the Welcome Center and the budget is conceptual.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**Public Hearing on Adoption of Fiscal Year
2021/2022 Budget****A. Proof/Affidavit of Publication**

The affidavit of publication was included for informational purposes.

B. Consideration of Resolution 2021-08, Relating to the Annual Appropriations and Adopting the Budgets for the Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2021, and Ending September 30, 2022; Authorizing Budget Amendments; and Providing an Effective Date

Mr. Adams stated that the proposed Fiscal Year 2022 was the same version presented at the last meeting. He highlighted previous changes to line items and explained the reason for the adjustments. Discussion ensued regarding obtaining subsequent proposals for Landscape Arbor Care and concerns that the scopes of work were not the same. Mrs. Adams confirmed that the scopes are the same; thereby, the proposed amount would be reduced. Mr. Adams noted the earliest the CDD can refinance bonds is in 2025; however, interested property owners can pay off their portion of the debt service assessment in full by contacting Mr. Adams' office.

Mr. Adams opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Willson, at Mr. Call's request, responded to the following questions:

- Is there flexibility to use unused funds between the budget line items? Answer: Yes, the Resolution states, which the CDD typically entertains throughout the year, that funds that are not used in one budget item or are under budget can be used in other budget line items; however, this requires preparing a budget amendment at the end of the fiscal year.
- Is there the ability to extend this budget adoption process? Answer: The District is unable to extend the process, due to certain Florida Statutes and Paso County requirements, which note that the budget must be adopted by the end of the month.

Mr. Adams stated that the CDD properly advertised the Public Hearings and sent the required Notices to the homeowners regarding the assessment increase.

The following is a summation of approximately two hours of homeowner public comments, addressed by category and correlated response. The public comments were primarily from Esplanade residents objecting to the assessment increase

- **Methodology:** Resident Alberto Cassola, who currently owns a home in Starkey Ranch and another in Esplanade, asked what changed between 2016, when that Board approved the Methodology Report where Esplanade's assessment levels were 25% less because they received less benefits since they are assessed for using other amenities. He asked what allows this Board to change the Methodology resulting in assessment levels increasing.

Mr. Cassola exceeded his three-minute public comment time limit; however, the Board agreed to allow him to continue, as he was speaking on behalf of most homeowners, which might shorten the number of public comments.

Resident Ben Devivo asked why the Methodology for Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Methodology can change when the debt service side could not. Answer: Mr. Adams stated the Board has the latitude to accept the same Methodology used for the bonds for O&M or a different Methodology. Ms. Willson clarified that the debt assessment side was done as a series of Master Improvements and the debt assessments were levied and adopted on each on an issuance by issuance basis, after the circuit court validation, and is secured by all of the various debt-related Trust Indentures and another Agreement is in place with the bond holders, which cannot be changed.

Resident Kurt Naser asked what caused the Methodology that existed for over five years to change. He wanted to know the reason for the urgency and expressed his disagreement with comments stating that costs should be spread over a five-year period.

Resident Jim Ciadella thanked Ms. Comella for understanding the original agreement. He quoted the July meeting minutes, which stated Esplanade homeowners have their own amenities and pay a separate assessment, which has not changed. He recommended that the Board implement significant increases over two or three years but homeowners responded that there is no agreement in place.

Answer: Mr. Silber stated that the 75% was implemented as a means to keep fees low to help sell homes in the community. He suggested the Board consider raising it to 90% this year and 100% next year, which would require adjusting the budget without changing assessments. He felt that whatever decision was made in 2016, is negated by the Board's decision to bring it up to 100% this year, as the Boards believe it is the fairest decision, unless homeowners can present an argument as to how any Esplanade resident receives less service or less benefit from the CDD than any other resident of Starkey Ranch.

Ms. Willson referred to the Statutory requirements that require Management to send Mailed Notices and noted that the Board, in any year, has the option as to what items to include in the budget and how to reexamine the allocation. Mr. Silber stated, having to subsidize costs, it made more sense to be unfair to the smaller group. A resident asked if his comment would be in the minutes. Mr. Silber replied sure.

➤ **Conflict of Interest:** Mr. Cassola voiced his opinion that the timing of changing the Methodology may be considered a conflict of interest and asked the Board to reconsider this increase and instead reallocate funds to offset costs.

Mr. Devivo referred to Rule 1.1 of the restated Rules of Procedure, dated January 8, 2020, and expressed his opinion that the Board Member suggestion to increase Esplanade's assessments to reduce others' assessments was a conflict of interest.

Ms. Willson stated that the Conflict of Interest provision in the Rules of Procedure mirrors Florida Statutes Chapter 112 and is only relevant if an individual Board Member receives a special, private gain or loss, which they would not, as this is community wide; she provided examples of a conflict of interest.

Mr. Naser voiced his opinion that the Board created their own decision, the Starkey Ranch Landowner has a conflict of interest or the appearance of self-gain and that the Board purposely timed this meeting during a holiday week, when homeowners would be away.

➤ **Public Records Requests:** Esplanade Resident Maria Weiser read portions of the July 14, 2021 meeting minutes regarding Mr. Silber questioning Esplanade property owners' fees being less than other property owners in other communities. She made an official public records request for any and all Agreements between the Master Association and the CDD and Esplanade. As the CDD maintains landscaping in all common areas except Esplanade, she expected the CDD to take on those responsibilities. She felt that several other budget lines items needed further justification before finalizing the budget.

➤ **Appeal/Request Public Records:** Mr. Devivo asked for instructions for the Esplanade substation to submit a community-wide formal appeal, not individually, and have a verbatim record of the proceedings, testimony and necessary evidence made available for them to proceed with an appeal.

Mr. Devivo was instructed to submit a letter of protest, including homeowner signatures, to Mr. Adams to enter into public record. Esplanade residents would have to determine whether to hire an attorney to challenge the CDD Board's actions.

Inaudible cross talk ensued between homeowners.

Mr. Naser thanked Ms. Comella for understanding the concept of operating the organization in good faith and stated that Mr. Adams assured him that his and his wife's written objections were forwarded to the Board.

Mr. Naser asked how to obtain the appeal materials referenced in Mr. Adams' August 19, 2021 letter.

➤ **Suggestions For Reducing Assessment Levels:** Esplanade HOA Board Member and Taylor Morrison employee, Drew Miller, stated that homeowners had an opportunity to attend these budget meetings and did not. He suggested the Board table the \$200,000 capital improvement expense for sod on Lake Blanche for one year and reallocate those funds towards the \$300 over and above Esplanade's increase and raise everyone's assessments \$300 to take care of the rest of the capital improvements. This would allow the Esplanade homeowners time to discuss with the Board how to pro-rate expenses next year.

A resident took issue with Mr. Miller's suggestion and questioned why the rest of the homeowners should suffer to save the Esplanade residents who are not paying their fair share.

A resident asked if the Board has the ability to bring Esplanade O&M assessments up to where it was last year or if it has to match up to \$307. Ms. Willson stated that the Equalizing Board can, after considering public comments, change the assessment allocation; however, the amount cannot exceed what was listed in the Mailed Notice.

➤ **Engage Third Party:** Resident John Baca suggested the Board engage a third-party firm to review the budget and provide an analysis of the expenditures for each facility.

➤ **Esplanade Roads:** Resident Linda Reed asked if the CDD pays for the public roads in Starkey Ranch. Ms. Willson explained that the public roads in Starkey Ranch were constructed by the Developer and are either transitioned to the CDD and then to the County or directly from the Developer to the County. She discussed the process and timeline of the County accepting maintenance once the maintenance bond is released, which is about two to three years, and another Agreement in place in which the CDD has the option to maintain the roadways beyond the County's standard specifications.

Ms. Reed asked why Esplanade homeowners should pay to maintain Starkey Ranch public roads, although Ms. Willson as District Counsel, noted these are policy considerations, not necessarily legal in nature. A Board Member stated there is no roadway maintenance expense in the CDD budget. Discussion ensued regarding assessing public and private roads, Esplanade homeowners giving up access to Starkey's amenities, non-resident user fees, when and what caused the decision to implement the reduction to 75% for Esplanade homeowners and what caused the reversal.

Mr. Celisa commented and posed questions as follows:

- Is it only the persons attending in person who can vote on the budget? Since just Board Members can vote on the budget, he voiced his opinion that was not right and that the Board could do better.
- He expressed his opinion that the Public Hearing was improperly advertised and believed there would be a lot more homeowners in attendance if notifications were posted on the Boulevard.
- **Office Rental:** Mr. Celisa asked when the Developer will sell or rent the Welcome Center. Answer: Mr. Call referred to the last meeting minutes, which stated the Developer was preparing a lease to submit to Ms. Willson, who was designated, along with Mr. Silber, to negotiate the lease with the Developer. He discussed how the building would be used in the future and stated that the Developer had not charged for its use until now. The Developer has no interest in selling the property at this time; \$80,000 is the cost to rent the entire building as the Developer had no interest in the CDD's request to sublease a portion for office space or allow it to be subleased to other tenants.

Resident Linda Deenihan stated she was offended by the comment that the Developer was doing the CDD a favor by allowing it to use the Welcome Center at no cost over these years, since the homeowners purchasing the homes covered those costs. She asked what the Developer planned to do with the Welcome Center. Response: The CDD has not made a decision on whether to proceed with leasing the Welcome Center.

- **Pool Resurfacing:** Mr. Celisa asked the Board to obtain warranty information for all the pools, since, in his opinion, the CDD Board does not get to specify with the development of these amenities.
- **Off Duty Patrol:** Mr. Celisa asked who will determine when the patrols are to be used. He suggested increasing their presence during child-related events, such as on Halloween weekend. Answer: Off-duty Florida Highway Patrol officers select their schedules, as the Pasco County Sherriff's office does not have sufficient manpower to patrol the County as a whole.
- **Neighborhood Signs:** Resident Matt Mohr asked Mr. Call for the status of his request for the Developer to install "namesake" signs in Homestead Park. Answer: Mr. Call stated he would follow up with a response.

Mr. Adams closed the Public Hearing.

- **Reducing Budget:** A Board Member stated, as a result of public comments, he was now in favor of reducing certain line items, while ramping up Esplanade's costs. Ms. Willson stated

that, as the Board provided several factors for changing the Esplanade assessment allocation to 100% at the prior meeting, legally, the Board would have to come to a determination to support the assessment allocation that is approved tonight and that it is deemed reasonably apportioned.

Discussion ensued regarding having to justify a gradual increase in Esplanade's assessments and the need to comply with Florida Statutes to prevent others challenging.

Resident Roberto Carvajal asked for clarification about staying with the decision to raise Esplanade's assessments to 100%, if reducing budget expenses could offset the Esplanade homeowners' significant increase.

Mr. Adams suggested reducing expenses and softening the assessment increase for Esplanade and the same for everyone else; however, it would result in less revenue. Ms. Willson clarified that the Board previously stated that the assessment allocation should be 100%, across the board, but potentially preferring to roll that out over a number of years to gradually increase is not something the Board can do without providing justification. Mr. Adams stated that Methodologies could change for O&M assessments.

Discussion ensued between unidentified residents, Board Members and Ms. Willson about reducing sod costs not being sufficient to reduce assessments across the Board, accusations that the Board is making this decision arbitrarily and the prior Board making a deal that has been long standing.

Mr. Leason expressed his opinion that the Board did not do its due diligence in researching why the prior Board implemented a 25% discount for Esplanade before arbitrarily changing it to 100%. He suggested reducing Office Rental costs, which he believed is not a valid expense until a lease is executed. Mr. Adams confirmed that he researched the reason the 25% discount was given and it was mentioned in several meeting minutes.

Discussion ensued regarding last year's O&M assessment. Mr. Call provided options, including converting back to last year's Methodology, keeping it at 100% and reducing the overall budget and going forward in future years the budget would be what it is or adopting the budget presented today.

▪ **Public Comments resumed.**

The following is a compilation of unidentified residents' opinions and comments:

- Costs are causing them to move from the area.

- Fair, equitable use is not possible as Esplanade and Starkey Ranch activities are scheduled on the same day.
- The Board should consider charging usage fees based on the size of the home.
- Upgrading and changing the character of the community is causing the budget to increase
- The Developer should be asked to pay to re-marcite the pool.

Mr. Adams, the Board and homeowners discussed which budget line items to reduce and upcoming tree and plant projects. It was noted that Mr. Hawkins donated \$20,000 in sod.

The Board discussed adjusting various budget line items to reduce O&M assessments. The following changes were made to the proposed Fiscal Year 2022 budget:

Page 2, "Landscape Arbor Care": Change "115,500" to "99,000"

Page 2, "Mulch": Change "180,000 to "155,000"

Page 2, "Sod": Change "200,000" to "100,000"

Page 3, "Office rental": Change "80,000" to "60,000"

Page 3, "Office expenses": Change "8,950" to "6,713"

Page 3, "Office utilities": Change "8,850" to "6,638:

Page 3, "Office copy machine": Change "6,500" to "4,875"

Page 3, "Cable/internet/telephone/software": Change "16,546" to "10,000"

Page 3, "Special events": Change "20,000" to "0"

Page 3, "Contingency": Change "50,000" to "20,000"

Page 3, "Capital outlay": Change "110,300" to "90,000"

The final changes to the proposed Fiscal Year 2022 budget would decrease the "Net increase/(decrease) of fund balance" from "143,143" to "68,145" and decrease the O&M portion of the on-roll assessments from \$1,627.30 to \$1,496.05.

Mr. Adams presented Resolution 2021-08.

On MOTION by Mr. Call and seconded by Ms. Comella, with all in favor, Resolution 2021-08, Relating to the Annual Appropriations and Adopting the Budgets for the Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2021, and Ending September 30, 2022, as amended to result in the O&M portion of the on-roll assessments to be \$1,496.05; and Authorizing Budget Amendments; and Providing an Effective Date, was adopted.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Hearing to Hear Comments and Objections on the Imposition of Maintenance and Operation Assessments to Fund the Budget for Fiscal Year 2021/2022, Pursuant to Florida Law

A. Proof/Affidavit of Publication

B. Mailed Notice(s) to Property Owners

These items were included for informational purposes.

C. Consideration of Resolution 2021-09, Making a Determination of Benefit and Imposing Special Assessments for Fiscal Year 2021/2022; Providing for the Collection and Enforcement of Special Assessments, Including but Not Limited To Penalties and Interest Thereon; Certifying an Assessment Roll; Providing for Amendments to the Assessment Roll; Providing a Severability Clause; and Providing an Effective Date

Mr. Adams presented Resolution 2021-09.

Mr. Adams opened the Public Hearing.

No members of the public spoke.

Mr. Adams closed the Public Hearing.

On MOTION by Mr. Liquori and seconded by Mr. Call, with all in favor, Resolution 2021-09, Making a Determination of Benefit and Imposing Special Assessments for Fiscal Year 2021/2022; Providing for the Collection and Enforcement of Special Assessments, Including but Not Limited To Penalties and Interest Thereon; Certifying an Assessment Roll; Providing for Amendments to the Assessment Roll; Providing a Severability Clause; and Providing an Effective Date, was adopted.

The meeting recessed at 9:11 p.m., and reconvened at 9:20 p.m.

Mr. Green left the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion: FY 2021 Landscape Work Orders Summary

- **Landscaping Cost Analysis**

The Fifth and Eighth Orders of Business were presented simultaneously.

Mrs. Adams presented spreadsheets comprised of Landscape Work Orders and the Starkey Ranch September Enhancement Opportunities proposals for sod and tree replacement, and noted \$15,538 remained in the plant replacement budget.

Mr. Adams reviewed the Unaudited Financial Statements as of July 31, 2021 and confirmed there were sufficient funds to proceed with the recommendation to approve DTE invoices #9181, #9182 and #15141 and authorize use of miscellaneous funds to offset costs. The projects would commence in October.

On MOTION by Mr. Call and seconded by Mr. Silber, with all in favor, Down to Earth Proposals #9181 and #9182 to install Zoysia sod, in the amounts of \$3,430 and \$11,550, respectively, and Proposal #15141 to install ground tree stake kits, in the amount of \$3,040, for a combined not-to-exceed total of \$18,020 in Fiscal Year 2021, was approved.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion: Follow up on Traffic Request from Prior Meeting

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion: Lake Blanche Continued Parking Issues

Mr. Adams stated that people are starting to disregard the signs again and the Sheriff is trying to enforce illegal parking. JC residents observed several people parking all over the lake bank and median to “catch and release” fish. A Board Member recalled that, at the last meeting, the CDD was asked to install blanket “No Roadside Parking” signs at each entrance; otherwise, they cannot enforce the policy. He observed several cars parked for months without moving. POA Staff was asked to contact Pasco County to obtain appropriate language and report back at the next meeting.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion/Consideration: Tree Replacement/Turf Replacement Proposals

This item was presented during the Fifth Order of Business.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Continued Discussion: DTE Landscaping Deficiencies

Mr. Yahn reported that DTE and the on-site team are doing a great job overcoming a lot of the mowing and irrigation deficiencies that were identified last month, in spite of COVID-related staffing shortages and the weather conditions.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Continued Discussion: Rental of Welcome Center

Mr. Call stated that the Developer just received the lease from their Attorney and, upon review, it would be transmitted to Ms. Willson.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Acceptance of Unaudited Financial Statements as of July 31, 2021

This item was presented during the Fifth Order of Business. The financials were accepted.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of August 11, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes

Mr. Adams presented the August 11, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes. The following changes were made:

Line 110: Change “off Lake Blanche Road” to “, and plans for Lake Blanche Road to connect to Starkey Boulevard”

Line 111: Insert “to extend Lake Blanche Road to connect to Starkey Boulevard.” after “months”

Line 147: Change “the” to “District”

Line 148: Change “on CDD” to “on Developer”

On MOTION by Mr. Liquori and seconded by Ms. Comella, with all in favor, the August 11, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes, as amended, were approved.

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Action & Completed Items

Mr. Adams presented the Action & Completed Items List.

Items 4, 5, 8 and 12 were completed.

Item 6: Mr. Adams would work with Mr. Wilks tomorrow to ensure donating the parcel east of Publix is in the correct format. Ms. Willson stated there should be no tax liability, assuming it is used for a public governmental purpose; however, this would need to be reviewed with Real Estate Counsel.

FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. District Counsel: *Hopping Green & Sams, P.A.*

There was nothing further to report.

B. District Engineer: *Heidt Design, LLC*

There was no report.

C. District Manager: *Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC*

- **NEXT MEETING DATE: October 13, 2021 at 5:00 p.m.**

- **QUORUM CHECK**

The next meeting will be held on October 13, 2021.

D. Lifestyle Director & Amenity Manager: *WTS International*

I. Discussion/Consideration: *Kompan Playground Equipment Proposals*

Ms. Hlebak stated that, after assessing the equipment, Kompan submitted proposals that included costs with or without installation. The warranty is covered if it is installed to their specifications and the option to piece purchase equipment that is needed was an option. She and the vendor recommended purchasing one springer and whole parts. She stated that the playground is mostly used in the cooler months, which are coming up.

Discussion ensued regarding the current condition, frequency of when items are replaced and extremely high material and freight costs. The Board agreed with a suggestion of approving \$6,000, plus freight costs but Ms. Willson recommended reviewing the Master Agreement and warranty terms and ensuring they are kept together, before proceeding with the purchase.

▪ Consideration of *Whitfield Park Pool Resurfacing and Repair Quotes*

This item, previously Item 14DIII, was presented out of order.

a. Clear-Tech Pools

b. Challenger Pools

c. Exterior Escapes

Ms. Hlebak distributed a breakdown of the proposals and explained the urgency to complete the work to remain in compliance. She differentiated the scope of work in each proposal. Certain vendors omitted pricing for the heater, as they felt the cost did not warrant the outcome, and Challenger Pools formally changed its name to Cody Pools. She and the Board discussed each proposal.

Ms. Hlebak was asked to obtain commercial references from Clear-Tech Pools and Cody Pools, confirm the ability to include a five-year labor and materials warranty, confirm the project timeline of six to eight weeks and to find out if Clear-Tech Pools will adjust its proposal.

Ms. Willson recommended including a Form of Agreement with the contract to ensure that indemnity, E-verification and warranty information is covered.

MOTION by Mr. Liquori and seconded by Ms. Comella, with all in favor, authorizing 1) Ms. Hlebak to negotiate for the best price on the upgraded pool finish, 2) Ms. Willson to prepare contracts with Clear-Tech Pools and Challenger Pools, ensuring as five-year labor and material warranty and 3) Mr. Call to execute the contract to resurface and repair the Whitfield Park Pool, subject to warranty terms, in a not-to-exceed amount of \$60,000, was approved.

Ms. Hlebak presented the WTS Monthly Summary Report. She reported that two new staff members were hired to assist the Facilities Specialist.

Regarding the prior motion, Ms. Willson clarified that, if contact negotiations are agreed upon with the specific terms, authority was given to Mr. Call, as Vice Chair, to execute the contract, to prevent the appearance of the Chair and Vice Chair working together outside of a Board meeting.

II. Consideration of Starkey Ranch Security Camera Quotes

- a. **Securiteam (Original Quote for Whitfield Park CCTV)**
- b. **Securiteam (Revise Quotes for Homestead Park, Cunningham Park and Whitfield Park)**
- c. **EI Security**
- d. **4-Alarms Inc. (Surveillance System for Homestead Park Pool)**
- e. **SMART Solutions (Pool Camera Upgrade for Homestead Park, Cunningham Park and Whitfield Park)**

Ms. Hlebak distributed a breakdown of the proposals and differentiated the product materials, scope of work and warranty for each proposal. 4-Alarms agreed that the Cunningham Park cameras were in great condition but could not guarantee they would be compatible and could be on the same system for all three parks.

In response to a request for his technological expertise, Mr. Silber provided input on each quote. Ms. Hlebak and Mr. Silber recommended engaging SMARTSolutions; however, Mr. Silber wanted assurance of the ability to have room access to the DVRs. He felt that Cunningham Park could remain on the current system and stated the Board can consider engaging them to be responsible for its operation, instead of Securiteam, later on.

On MOTION by Mr. Silber and seconded by Mr. Call, with all in favor, authorizing 1) Ms. Hlebak to obtain updated SMARTSolutions proposal revision #2 to install pool cameras at Whitfield and Homestead Park, subject to changing warranty to one-year for parts and labor, and 2) amending the locations to Whitfield and Homestead Park, as stated, was approved.

- III. Consideration of Whitfield Park Pool Resurfacing and Repair Quotes**
- a. Clear-Tech Pools**
 - b. Challenger Pools**
 - c. Exterior Escapes**

This item was presented following Item 14DI.

E. Operations Manager: *Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC*

There was nothing to report.

FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisors' Requests

Mr. Call asked if Staff needed official direction to purchase and install pine straw. Mrs. Adams replied no. Mr. Adams stated it will be finalized via the same protocol as last year; installation occurs in November.

SIXTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

On MOTION by Mr. Call and seconded by Ms. Comella, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 10:25 p.m.


Secretary/Assistant Secretary


Chair/Vice Chair