

**MINUTES OF MEETING  
JULINGTON CREEK  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Julington Creek Community Development District was held on Tuesday, August 9, 2005 at the Bartram Trail Branch Library, 60 Davis Pond Boulevard, St. Johns County, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Susan Beaugrand	Chairman
Kathy Minnis	Vice Chairman
Al Abbatiello	Assistant Secretary
April Spears	Assistant Secretary
Brian Pincket	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Holly Donahue	Manager
Jonathan Johnson	Attorney
Matt Maggiore	Engineer
Stacie Hernandez	YMCA
Greg Coop	YMCA
John Zakoske	D.R. Horton
Sonia Rowley	Severn Trent Services (via telephone)
Craig Wrathell	Wrathell, Hart & Hunt
Several Residents	

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

Ms. Beaugrand called the meeting to order and called the roll

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of the Minutes of the July 12, 2005 Meeting**

Ms. Beaugrand stated each Board member received a copy of the July 12, 2005 minutes and requested any additions, corrections or deletions.

Mr. Abbatiello stated I have several corrections. On page four, in the fifth line from the bottom, the word *on* needs to be deleted and should read *for their multi-family development*. On page seven, the third line from the bottom should read *does not clash with Corps of Engineers or*

*Water Management District.* On page twelve the third line from the bottom should read *overall density of the project.*

Ms. Beaugrand stated I have a few changes also. The bottom of page six should read *before we spend the bonds.* On top of page seven, the third line down should read *the IRS imposes spend down limits.* On page eleven, the fourth paragraph should read *until August or September.* On page twenty-five, the second line up in the second full paragraph should read *your swim season ends this year.*

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Mr. Abbatiello with all in favor the minutes of the July 12, 2005 meeting were approved as amended.
---

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Continuation of Public Hearing to Consider the Adoption of the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006 (Resolution 2005-6) and Levy of Non Ad Valorem Assessments (Resolution 2005-7)**

Mr. Johnson stated Madam Chairman you may recall last month you opened your public hearing and reviewed the budget with a couple of questions. I think Severn Trent Services provided a draft intended to address those matters with Ms. Rowley from their accounting offices on speaker phone in the event you have any questions. As to continuing this to later in the month, we need to get this done in August so the tax roll prepared by England, Thims & Miller can be certified to the county. We have two resolutions that will do that once you are ready, so you many want to continue any discussion or any other remaining questions on the budget.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we had an issue regarding the O&M assessment number for the carryforward, if I remember correctly. Do you remember what the adjustment was on the budget in the agenda package last month to what it is now, Ms. Rowley?

Ms. Rowley responded the adjustment was to increase the assessments and to also increase the line item called the O&M assessments.

Ms. Beaugrand asked was that on the general fund?

Ms. Rowley responded yes.

Ms. Beaugrand asked did that make it consistent with how we had it budgeted in previous years?

Ms. Rowley responded yes.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the remainder of the adjustments were basically balancing out from adjusting that number. Is that correct?

Ms. Rowley responded yes, that is correct.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I think the other adjustment we made was changing what we had budgeted in the recreation fund for the web site, which was \$400. Were there any other adjustments, Ms. Rowley?

Ms. Rowley responded no.

Mr. Johnson stated if you turn to page five and look at the bottom line of the revenue and the assessments to be certified through the county for collections, Fiscal Year 2006 will be the same as Fiscal Year 2005 so you have some increases and adjustments within categories but the net amount you are certifying is the same, so the per unit assessment you are certifying is the same. There is no increase in the assessment.

Ms. Beaugrand asked does the Board have any other questions regarding the budget issue?

Mr. Johnson stated you can move to Resolution 2005-6, which is the Annual Appropriate Resolution. This resolution is in standard form consistent with what you used in previous years that will appropriate the revenues into the various funds, including general fund, recreation fund and debt service and will also authorize your District manager to certify the tax rolls with St. Johns County. The second resolution will actually deal with the assessment of the budget itself.

Ms. Minnis asked what is the total dollar amount under the appropriations?

Mr. Johnson responded if you look at page five of your budget it will be the gross assessment of \$1,366,167 for general and recreation. The debt service number will be pulled from your debt service schedule that was set when the bonds were sold.

Mr. Pincket asked isn't page five just the recreation fund budget number?

Mr. Johnson responded yes, you are correct. The general fund is on the bottom of page one, which is a gross assessment of \$321,347.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that number is the sum of \$321,347 and \$1,366,167.

Mr. Pincket asked will the capital projects fund number be zero in this resolution?

Mr. Johnson responded yes. There is no specific separate assessment in the capital projects fund.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor Resolution 2005-6, The Annual Appropriations Resolution of the Julington Creek Plantation Community Development District Relating to the Annual Appropriations and Adopting the Budget for the Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2005, and Ending September 30, 2006, was adopted.

Mr. Johnson stated Resolution 2005-7 is a resolution imposing the special assessment and certifying the rolls. Again this is in the same form we used in previous years and this is the resolution actually imposing the security for the budget and both of these will be transmitted to the county along with the roll.

On MOTION by Mr. Pincket seconded by Ms. Minnis with all in favor Resolution 2005-7, A Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the Julington Creek Plantation Community Development District Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll; Providing a Severability Clause; and Providing an Effective Date, was adopted.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Matters Related to New Recreation Facility**

Mr. Johnson stated we are still waiting on the certification of the legal descriptions on Mr. Basham's survey but with all the rain they have not had adequate time on the site to do that. This is for the Rayland parcel and a prerequisite to both proceeding with the due diligence as well as finalizing the land use change documents that will be filed with the county. Mr. Jenks and I are waiting on that information and Mr. Basham anticipates having them out there as soon as the site dries up in order for them to do that.

I think we want to take some time and dispel some of the confusion given the press clippings that have recently appeared. As I reported last month we were scheduled to go before St. Johns County Planning and Zoning this month and the County Commission some time early next month for approval of the current NOPC, which changes the land use designations on the parcel of land we purchased from D.R. Horton. I will address most of this to the audience, as it is more history for you. I believe there is some confusion in terms of what is wrapped up in that deal. There are two land use changes moving through the current NOPC documents on file. One is a set of changes dealing with the parcel of land, which we purchased from D.R. Horton and sits adjacent to the boundaries of the District. It is contiguous to another parcel of land we are purchasing from Rayland and will be the site of the new recreation center. Over the last two years we had a number of public hearings regarding this and some of you may have been there, but that is the process we followed, which is selection of the land, purchase of the D.R. Horton land and we are now in the process of closing on the Rayland parcel. There is a separate land use change proceeding as part of those documents and it relates to a parcel of land D.R. Horton owns. They always owned that parcel of land, the District has never owned it and there has never been a land swap. However, originally that parcel of land was slated for a YMCA recreation center. The deal with the YMCA fell through and they are seeking land use changes

on that property. I believe we have a representative of D.R. Horton here tonight. We want to be clear from our perspective and we are proceeding together. It has been a matter of great convenience to do so and D.R. Horton has been very helpful in moving that process through.

The County Commission, when it ultimately comes up for a vote, has the option of approving neither of those changes, approving both changes, or they may approve one and not the other. The agreement under which we purchased the land from D.R. Horton explicitly recognizes that in the event a piece of the land, whether it is theirs, or ours is not feasible and not practical for the Commission to approve then at the end of the day, one will proceed without the other. They are linked for convenience and not out of necessity. I will say that although we were originally scheduled to go together to the Planning and Zoning Commission on August 18, 2005 I received word from D.R. Horton they requested and have been granted an extension and are not proceeding on that basis. We asked them last week when the press clippings first came out that we get together and jointly host an evening with the community so people can come in, ask questions and respond to their concerns on either parcel. They agreed and are coordinating it through Commissioner Stevenson's office and I believe she plans to be present. We can notice this as a workshop so more than one Board member can attend and I think it will be helpful to have at least one Board member in attendance. We anticipate having a joint evening so you can ask questions about both parcels of land. They are proceeding together but they are very separate pieces of land. At that point it will be rescheduled in front of PGA and ultimately the County Commission. I believe that addresses some of the rumors and erroneous information you have been provided.

Mr. Zakoske stated I work for D.R. Horton and Ms. Beaugrand asked me to attend tonight because there has been some discussion regarding the land use change. I think Mr. Johnson summarized it pretty nicely. Once we heard there was some dissention in the

community we wanted to schedule a neighborhood meeting where everyone can come. The CDD meeting is really not the format but we want to make sure everybody who has a voice in it gets a chance so we can address everyone's concerns properly. The meeting is in the process of being scheduled and we want to invite everyone to attend.

Mr. Johnson stated we will need to provide public notice for the meeting.

Ms. Beaugrand stated putting in a public notice does not necessarily get the word out because not everyone reads the public notices in the newspaper. I know Ms. Stevenson is pretty conscientious about trying to get information out but I think we need to do more than just a public notice. We need to get an announcement put in the St. Johns Sun or something.

Mr. Abbatiello stated the St. Augustine Record did a front page spread on the recreation community center and I recommend we go to the same newspaper and have them do a front page paragraph in bold letters as to the public meeting. I think they owe it to the community to do so.

Ms. Beaugrand stated they did that after they saw the article in the St. Johns Sun because they called me. I think we need to make an effort to have it in both newspapers. The Times Union is more widely circulated and the St. Augustine Record is also very important.

Ms. Minnis asked can we have it posted here as well?

Mr. Abbatiello responded yes. I will have Mr. Timbol post it on the web site.

Mr. Johnson stated in terms of public comment, if you have questions on what the District is doing or on the recreation center, we want to take them in context of a Board meeting. If you have questions specific to D.R. Horton we want them addressed to Mr. Zakoske either outside the meeting or at the community workshop.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I have comment cards and if you have not turned one in please do so and we will get to you.

Ms. Alvarez stated I am a resident of Whispering Pines and I will be very affected by such a proposal of the condominium construction. You stated the combined proposal is just done for convenience. Can you please explain what the convenience means?

Mr. Johnson responded it means the documents prepared in the process are the same whether you do it for one piece of land or two, so rather than spend money twice we cooperated with D.R. Horton, in addition to their contribution of some money towards the new recreation center. They contributed much of the funds, which include the legal and engineering fees, for the preparation of those documents and filing with the county.

Ms. Alvarez stated basically there was a financial benefit coming out of it.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the financial benefit is to save money for all the residents. It is approximately a \$40,000 to \$50,000 cost for rezoning such as this so they offered to pay for it if we did a joint application, with that application being two different rezoning requests. There is no other benefit or complicity involved in it whatsoever other than the fact it is on the same application. They are helping all the residents by paying for it.

Ms. Alvarez asked were you all aware of what it implied for certain homeowners within the Plantation?

Ms. Beaugrand responded no. We did not know exactly what the project was. We knew they were talking about a multi-family project but we did not know any details of the project.

Ms. Alvarez asked when did you find out about this?

Mr. Johnson responded when the documents were filed was the first time we saw their proposal.

Ms. Alvarez asked do you know when they were filed?

Mr. Johnson responded I believe they were filed in April.

Ms. Alvarez stated I have documentation to support that. There were surveys done on the parcels as of September 2004. There were printouts on different parcels, including mine and my neighbors in Whispering Pines that will be affected by this design proposal. If you go forth and have a combined proposal, why isn't it ever mentioned in any newspaper or any local information concerning the CDD so at least we are aware of what is happening besides the new recreational facility?

Ms. Minnis responded because a reporter has never attended these meetings in the past four years that I am aware. This is the first time a reporter has attended.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I called the reporter to attend.

Ms. Minnis stated this is a public meeting that is noticed in the newspaper and we have been having these meetings for eight years.

Ms. Alvarez stated I agree with you totally on that point. I do not agree to always reading about the new pool and skate park. I am very excited about that and I think it will be great for the Plantation but there was never a mention of any other proposals.

Mr. Johnson stated we had some concern if filing separately one a few months ahead of the other might cause us some delay with the county moving through the process. The reason we are not publishing information about that is because what D.R. Horton does on its property is outside the purview of this Board.

Ms. Alvarez stated I agree but if you have a combined proposal and ask for approval from the Planning and Zoning Committee before it gets turned over to the commissioners, somewhere the homeowners needed to be aware and we never were.

Ms. Beaugrand stated it is not the CDD's responsibility to provide information on a developer's project. We do not have all the details of that project and it is up to the developer, the homebuilder or whoever is doing the project within the community to inform the public and

to provide the details. We have nothing to do with it other than the fact that our application is on the same application from a zoning perspective. Honestly, I have not looked into the project and I do not know if any of the other Board members have either. We are working on the business of the Community Development District and we are all residents looking out for the best interest of our community. We have nothing to do with the D.R. Horton project other than the application.

A resident stated I do not understand your role.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we are not a developer. D.R. Horton is the development company. We run the operation of the Community Development District on properties we own which include the pool facility, the park across the street from the pool facility, the basketball courts and management of the landscaping along State Road 13 and Racetrack Road. We collect the assessments from the homeowners and set the budgets, which is what we have been working on for the past three months. We run the CDD and the repayment of the bonds and the new recreation center. We do not run the development or the build-out of lots, homes, condominiums or anything else; that is not our role.

Ms. Parker stated I live in Whispering Pines and I have lived in three different developments in Julington Creek Plantation and all three of those will be affected if the townhomes go in. Julington Creek Elementary and Fruit Cove Middle School do not bus into my area and there are many subdivisions that are affected in that general radius. I am very concerned because of the traffic issue. I want to thank you for your time and I know you are looking out for the best interest of the community but I agree with Ms. Alvarez because I found out about this accidentally two weeks ago and before that nobody heard a single word regarding it. I think there is a problem when we are not informed about things happening in our own community.

Ms. Minnis stated a notice of public hearing for the PZA is the responsibility of St. Johns County. That unit of government oversees the PZA and this process and it is their responsibility to file a public notice, although public notices go in the St. Augustine Record.

Ms. Harms stated I moved to Whispering Pines three weeks ago. When you put your name on this application together with D.R. Horton, didn't you want to know what they were putting on that application if you are looking out for our best interest? Don't you think that was something you needed to do? It looks as though you did not want us to know about it. Mr. Abbatiello writes a column every month in the Julington Creek Plantation Press and it was never mentioned. I do not know how any of you were not aware of it since you attend these Board meetings and it looks suspect. You drive down Durbin Creek Boulevard, the public notices go up and everyone assumes it is for the pool. I feel that was the intent all along and that was why it was put on the joint application.

Mr. Abbatiello stated as Ms. Beaugrand said, we have no control over what goes on with D.R. Horton and their development. As we move forward with the pool planning it is all a matter of public record. When you go into a zoning process it is entirely D.R. Horton, the county, PZA and commissioner's responsibility to make that information known. I do not have room in my column to put every detail of what goes on in this community.

Mr. Johnson stated when the Board says they are looking out for the best interest of the community it is with respect to specific infrastructure, which includes the park, pool and landscaping. This District has a very limited purpose that is statutory chartered. The charter specifically states we are subject to St. Johns County's determinations in that regard and it lays out what powers this District, and therefore, this Board has. When the Board says that, they mean with respect to the specific items in our charter. We do not have the broad powers a homeowners association has, which advocates on behalf of the community. You have a

homeowners association here as well. We only have a specific limit in which we can exercise our responsibilities so when approached by D.R. Horton, and you can second guess the Board and all of us, in terms of convenience we did not get involved in their proposal work because having that information would let us neither oppose or support it. It was simply a matter of convenience in running the documents together; otherwise you have two sets of documents to go with two sets of money. That is the choice we made at the time.

Ms. Minnis asked when this development first went through the NOPC and the PZA as a DRI, wasn't it originally there for homes and when the YMCA came in they rezoned the land for recreation? When the YMCA did not get the funds needed to construct the building, D.R. Horton purchased Julington Creek and decided to revert back to the original use.

Mr. Johnson stated I do not know. I was not involved in it.

Ms. Minnis stated this has changed hands from 12 years ago and has gone through many developers so this is not something that just happened yesterday. It may have gone back to day one which was originally zoned for homes and we actually have fewer home sites than were originally designated for this DRI. Single-family homes were to be built first and multiple units were the final phase so this may be reverting back to the original DRI. This information is in the county records and someone on the County Planning and Zoning Board or in their development office may be able to answer that.

Ms. Harms stated I want to express my disappointment in not mentioning this in any of your articles. You were aware of this information and it looks to me as you deliberately left it out.

Ms. Spears stated there are two completely separate pieces of land. D.R. Horton owns one and one is owned by the CDD. Whether we went in jointly or separately, D.R. Horton was still trying to get that to be multi-family so by us sharing in the cost, we did not promote D.R.

Horton to do that, did not encourage them to do that and had no idea what they were doing but we knew it was a cost savings. I think it is important to understand that it is completely separate. The County Commission in St. Johns County, not Mr. Abbatiello or this Board, is responsible for the land D.R. Horton owns. If we are upset with anybody about not posting something in an article or in our community, I think it is with the county or the developer. Everyone who sits on this Board lives here and we all want what is best for the community. We are all doing the best we can to try to make all of this work. Nobody is trying to deceive anybody.

Mr. Harms stated it is obvious we did not understand what the CDD does until now. Who is in charge of the master plan of Julington Creek Plantation?

Ms. Beaugrand responded the Board of County Commissioners approved it and the State Department of Community Affairs approved it. That was developer driven by the original development company, which was Atlantic Gulf Communities.

Mr. Harms asked are they in charge of changing the master plan?

Ms. Beaugrand responded any change on the master plan will be done by whoever owns the property at the time. On our parcel we are responsible for making a change for an NOPC process. D.R. Horton owns Parcel 52 and is responsible for making application for those changes and then it has to go through the due process as set forth by the county.

Mr. Harms asked is this a restricted covenant community?

Ms. Beaugrand responded yes it is.

Mr. Harms asked who is in charge of the restricted covenant?

Ms. Beaugrand responded the Property Owners Association.

Mr. Harms asked does the restricted covenant have anything to do with the zoning?

Ms. Beaugrand responded no.

Ms. Minnis stated the questions need to go to St. Johns County.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the restricted covenants are to protect your property. It has nothing to do with zoning but with the type of vehicles you can have parked, fences, play sets, colors you can paint your house and those kinds of things.

Mr. Harms stated you can tell me I cannot put a purple swing set in my backyard but you can put a condo in my backyard.

Ms. Beaugrand stated those are two separate issues.

Mr. Harms stated the covenant implies it is protecting your property and I can understand the developer wants to make use of his property. We just bought a house and we did our due diligence and were told by May Management it will probably go back to single-family residences. We knew a recreational center was going back there and that is fine but having a condo in my backyard is a completely different story. Now that I know about the master plan and who is in charge of it and the covenants of the community, we need to get more involved and see how easy it is to change the zoning.

Ms. Beaugrand stated it is two different issues though. The Property Owners Association monitors the covenants and the county governs zoning issues.

Ms. Boyce stated I am trying to understand like the gentleman who just spoke. I am just coming into this process and I now need to become involved because I am not sure where it is all coming from. Is the Homeowners Association the people who speak from me to you?

Ms. Beaugrand responded no. The Property Owners Association manages the common area of the community, keeps the overall maintenance of the community up and maintains the covenants and restrictions Mr. Harms talked about a few minutes ago. It is up to all of us as property owners to be the watch guards of what is going on in our community. A perfect example is three years ago when they were approving Durbin Crossing and Aberdeen there was talk about putting a road through to connect with Durbin Creek Boulevard. We as residents

banned together and worked very hard to make sure that did not happen. No one else was able to do that but us and there was a huge number of people who got involved because of the grass roots effort started by Ms. Stevenson. It was a very positive outcome and we avoided having the road put in which would have a detrimental affect on the entire community. It is up to us to watch out for our properties and one way to do that is to attend the CDD meetings. We meet every month on the second Tuesday at 6:00 p.m.

For the next two years we will be very busy because of the recreation facility. It is our responsibility as residents to understand how our community works and to be informed. We can only go out and try to reach out to you so much. This is an unusual attendance tonight, typically we will have only five people attending on a monthly basis who understand what is going on and that has a lot to do with some of the confusion you have right now. Ms. Minnis and I attended these meetings for almost 10 years before we were ever on the Board because we wanted to know what people were doing with our property. You need to step out and get as informed as you can. We have 5,000 residents and I cannot get to everybody and Mr. Abbatiello cannot get to everybody. He does not have to write articles but he gives his time to write articles trying to get people informed and we are not going to catch every little tidbit that happens. It does not make us feel good that you are upset with us but we try to do our best and we are not trying to hide anything.

A residence stated it doesn't look like it has done us any good to come to this meeting.

Ms. Beaugrand stated if you attended these meetings you would know exactly what has been going on for the last three years.

A resident asked was this brought up at the last meeting?

Ms. Beaugrand responded we have talked about the recreation center probably in the majority of the meetings.

A resident asked as our representative and looking out for our best interest, did it never occur to you that when you supposedly found out about the rezoning of recreational land for multi-family condominiums across from the middle school on Durbin Creek Boulevard where all those beautiful trees are, it might not be something the residents wanted?

Ms. Beaugrand stated we knew they wanted to rezone it multi-family, that is it. There are other precedents in our development with multi-family units in this community. Quite frankly we did not know if they wanted to put five units, 25 units or 55 units there. That is their deal. We were simply trying to get through a rezoning process for our recreation center. I do not think any of us feels good that you are upset because we did a joint application when we were only trying to save time and money. I do not know how I can change your minds but that was the intent – saving money and saving time. If you want to believe we had some underhand in it there is nothing I can do to change that.

Mr. Johnson stated if you said we want to adopt a resolution opposing some particular land use change in the project I would tell you that is outside your statutory charter. The county conducts the hearings and decides what is the most appropriate use. We have a very limited set of powers by statute and we have nothing to do with land use zoning.

A resident asked by statute you mean Florida State law?

Mr. Johnson responded yes.

Ms. Minnis asked will you tell them the statutes that govern our law so they can go on the Internet and look?

A resident responded they can be found in the library.

Mr. Johnson stated there are several of them but the main charter for this District is set out in Chapter 190 of the Florida Statutes.

Ms. Minnis stated that tells what our limited governing power is and what our focus is. For the last five years all we heard is that the pool is overcrowded, the pool is dangerous and we need another pool. We thought a joint application might go more quickly through the NOPC rather than theirs getting put ahead of ours. Our goal was to get this pool built more quickly because of all the complaints regarding the pool. We have done that in the best way we know how and we are being criticized for something we were not aware of. It was in your best interest we did this because we thought it would help escalate the project to share the cost. That was cost we did not have to share. We could have spent the \$50,000 and when you wanted a new exercise bike or something here, we can just say sorry but we paid for the NOPC process. Somewhere along the way, someone is going to be unhappy.

Ms. McLaughlin stated I know you represent a great number of homes and Whispering Pines, which is affected, is a small fraction. Our work is going to be done by the Zoning Board and that is where we will have to fight. My concern is with respect to the deal you worked out with D.R. Horton, which presents the appearance that Julington Creek Plantation joined with D.R. Horton in the rezoning. I think joining the petition creates that appearance. When D.R. Horton bought that piece of property it was zoned recreation and I am sure they paid for it recognizing they were taking a chance on whether or not they were getting the rezoning and in turn, a land deal went through when they sold us a piece of property. Is there any way for you to clarify in the filings you are taking no position whatsoever with respect to the rezoning because there will be a large number of people in Whispering Pines and other developments that will be opposed to it?

Mr. Johnson responded within the purview of your statutory authority the most appropriate thing for you to do is to take that position. I think our plan has always been that when it comes up for public consideration we will be there in support of our component and D.R.

Horton will carry the water with respect to their component. We will not be involved to oppose those who are opposing D.R. Horton's position nor we will be advocating their position. We are simply there supporting our piece of it.

Ms. McLaughlin asked is it possible to clarify that for the Zoning Board so there is a letter on file so we have something to show when it becomes an issue? I think it is the appearance that people are upset with as if this has been adopted without it being a majority vote. You have this tough decision where you have to represent everybody with five of you figuring out what is best for everyone. Our concern is that it looks like we have all consulted and agreed and suddenly here are the few people affected upset.

Mr. Johnson responded I believe we had some of those communications with Ms. Stevenson as Commissioner in terms of what happens if you do one or another.

Ms. McLaughlin stated I am just asking for a letter to the Zoning Board that will be part of the file.

Ms. Beaugrand stated Mr. Johnson said it is out of our purview as an organization to take a position and writing a letter from the CDD is taking a position on that.

Ms. McLaughlin stated the position is that you take no position because it will harm us if that comes up to be assumed presumptively when the zoning matters go forward. All of us have standing to challenge the rezoning because we pay into the CDD; we have an interest in the land owned and in the development of the property around us. We have statutory standing so if we are going to be asserting that I think it will be helpful to note this is not going to block the fact it is a joint petition.

Mr. Johnson stated I do not think there is any problem with the District clarifying this. The Board has only taken positive action to authorize the filing of the petition with respect to our property and the other pieces have not come up before this Board.

Ms. McLaughlin stated when you filed the joint petition it looks as if you joined in both parts of it.

Mr. Cox stated I live in Silver Creek. It is up to us as residents to watch out for each other. You identified yourselves as residents and then we hear the Board is not responsible for that. When did this group, as residents, absolutely know that D.R. Horton wanted to build condos there?

Ms. Minnis responded I was not aware until I walked in today.

Mr. Cox asked how about everybody else? I am getting mixed answers because some seem to know and some claim not to know.

Ms. Beaugrand responded multi-family zoning is one of three things – apartments, condominiums or townhomes. It is presumptive to assume with that kind of zoning request that one of those three uses will take place. I cannot tell you the date because I do not know the exact date.

Mr. Cox stated it is safe to say most of you on this side of the table obviously knew way before anyone on the other side. If you take the CDD equation out of it, as a fellow resident if I lived in Silver Creek and found out this was possibly rezoned to multi-family it is not my responsibility, but if it is up to residents to watch out for each other, whether I am on the CDD, the HOA or I just live on the corner, at some point you want to put this information out. This gentleman has the ability to write the paper and he says he cannot write everything. I think this needs to be at the top of the list. You say you were just trying to save some money and piggyback on them but you have taken a responsibility at that point because you got involved and made a decision.

Ms. Minnis stated when I moved here I did research to find out what the development plan was and I knew multi-family homes were going to be built in the end. You can go down to

the county and it is on file. I chose to build where I built because they were not going to be in that area and I made the choice by doing my homework.

Mr. Cox asked were you not motivated to share that information with anyone else?

Ms. Minnis responded I found out tonight they were condos. I had no idea.

Ms. Tevlin stated I am one of the very few people who have been attending these meetings since I moved here in 2003. I believe before Distinguished Realty was in their office it was the Julington Creek Plantation Management office and I received a map of the master plan of Julington Creek and probably you received one of them as well. It listed what was going to go in here so you may have seen when you moved here there was zoning for that with the possibility that might go in there someday.

Ms. Buczkowski stated my issue has to do with the wetlands. All the wetlands in our neighborhood have been sodded and mowed and ours still has chunks of concrete. Is that maintained by the CDD? Who takes care of the wetlands?

Ms. Beaugrand responded the common area is maintained by the POA. The developer is responsible for developing and initial landscape of the area but then the common areas are turned over to the POA for maintenance.

Ms. Buczkowski asked whom do I go to find out about the concrete?

Ms. Beaugrand responded I recommend May Management. They are the Property Owners Association management company.

Ms. Buczkowski asked doesn't the CDD take care of the common areas?

Ms. Beaugrand responded we maintain the landscaping on State Road 13 and Racetrack Road and the CDD owns the properties in the pool area, park and basketball courts.

Ms. Minnis stated they were developed out of the bonds we issued with respect to Chapter 190, which is our limited form of government.

Ms. Beaugrand stated some of these issues do not pertain to our meeting. We have nothing to do with park assessments. That is the POA's responsibility.

Mr. Clark stated we paid for a school bus structure to be built before school started and the kids are still standing in the rain. Also, what about the playground, water fountain and trash can?

Ms. Beaugrand stated again that is not a CDD responsibility either. The playgrounds, water fountains and trash cans may be us depending on the location.

Mr. Clark stated across from the pool. We were there today with our kids and had to load our trash up because someone took the trash cans. There is nowhere to get a drink of water unless you bring it.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the original developer did not originally place water there so that is why there is no water fountain. There are plans to fix the parking lot and build a restroom facility at which time we will add water. That is something we plan on doing along with the remainder of the recreation improvements we have planned.

Ms. Minnis stated we chose that method to save money again rather than have two separate projects.

Ms. Hernandez stated we have trash cans there and if they were gone they were probably being emptied at that time.

Mr. Clark stated they are usually chained there but they were gone.

Ms. Hernandez stated they are not chained.

Mr. Clark stated when we were there last week there was a chain around one to the wall.

Ms. Beaugrand asked can you check on that Ms. Hernandez?

Ms. Hernandez responded absolutely.

Ms. Beaugrand stated you are also concerned about the dirt parking lot at the pool. That is also in our plan to fix.

Mr. Huff stated I live in Pine Chase and lived here since 1998. Will the landscaping on State Road 13 up to Fruit Cove Middle School heading east be improved in the future?

Ms. Beaugrand responded we are responsible for the landscaping from State Road 13 up to Bishop Estates near Fruit Cove Middle School. When the original developer made the landscape plans the county approved them based on the fact that the CDD pay for the maintenance and management of the maintenance of the landscaping on an ongoing basis. We have done that as a part of our budget on an annual basis and we manage the landscaping management contract for that property, along with State Road 13 up to the main entrance. When the county did the four-laning from Bishop Estates Road/Durbin Creek Boulevard to the east they did the landscape management plan. They asked us to do a higher level of landscaping but said the CDD needed to pay for it. We pay \$135,000 to \$150,000 a year to do the landscaping so we did not feel it was in the best interest of the community to spend another \$50,000 to \$100,000 to maintain that landscaping. The same thing happened when they four-laned State Road 13 from our entrance down towards River Oaks Plantation, which is also part of our DRI. That would have doubled our annual maintenance costs with cutting, watering, sprinkler maintenance, parts repair, etc. and we did not feel it was good use of the residents' money. As a result, they modified the landscape plan to put in the trees and they do the typical mowing schedule per the county. I urge everyone to call the county to complain if it is not being done frequently enough, especially during this time of year.

Mr. Zakoske stated I am with D.R. Horton and we want to address everyone's concerns. When we bought Julington Creek Plantation we were entitled to build 1,000 units more than are actually built in the project. The entire community was designed to handle much more

residential development than is actually being proposed and built. There are numerous parcels where we built fewer units than we are entitled to. That parcel is almost entirely surrounded by wetlands, which will not be affected by the development. Many residents have raised concerns about the tree level. These are issues that need to be discussed more fully at a neighborhood meeting where we can have our development team and our experts present to answer any questions or concerns. It is important to make the point it was proposed for recreation and is currently recreation with the massive recreational center underway, which D.R. Horton has contributed to financially as well. I do not know if the residents are aware of that. We agreed to contribute \$500,000. Essentially when we purchased the property we knew there were some concerns regarding the size of the pool. We bought the land in January 2002 around the time people started complaining about the pool and we wanted to make sure those concerns were addressed. We looked at the idea of possibly building our own pool on this parcel but then when the CDD wanted to go forth building a larger pool, which benefit the values of everyone in the community including ourselves, we agreed to support them in that effort. As a result, this property was no longer needed for the YMCA, which was no longer able to get their deal done around the same time so it became available for a very small portion of the large number of excess units available in Julington Creek to be built there. Of course it has to go through public hearing and public comment for all the residents to have their chance. We are a community-oriented builder and we are out here for the long haul. We are not some fly by night company that is going away tomorrow. I think most people will agree that our property values have gone up more quickly and/or if anyone else has done a better job than D.R. Horton in looking out for the residents of the community as a whole. We feel the addition of the new recreation center is something that will add value and benefit the entire community, including ourselves and is the reason we agreed to support it.

A resident asked in all sincerity how do we tell somebody the condos in their backyard, so to speak, are a benefit?

Mr. Zakoske responded I believe the best forum to address this is at a meeting where the developer team will be available. We heard concerns from commission members and St. Johns County Housing Agency that there is not enough affordable housing in St. Johns County for teachers, firefighters and police officers.

A resident asked how many units will there be?

Mr. Zakoske responded 48 units. It is a relatively small amount and I think the best thing is that when we have a meeting and people actually see what we are proposing to do, we will be able to mitigate everyone's concerns.

Mr. Pincket asked if D.R. Horton's request for rezoning that parcel is denied, is D.R. Horton withdrawing the contribution to the recreational facility? Is it tied to D.R. Horton getting rezoning on its facility?

Mr. Johnson responded they are not tied together.

Mr. Pincket stated the CDD will receive the \$500,000 even if D.R. Horton does not receive rezoning of its piece of property.

Mr. Johnson stated your investment banker, Mr. Bulleit of Prager, Sealy & Co. is here and they have taken an initial look at the numbers we talked about last month regarding the timing. They indicate they may be able to underwrite the deals as early as mid to late fall. Obviously that all depends upon the timing of not only this land use change but the land use changes on the Rayland parcel, as well as our environmental detail on the Rayland parcel.

Mr. Bulleit stated we were the underwriter in 2002 when we refunded the recreational revenue bonds to provide savings to the District in terms of the outstanding debt from 1996 and 1997. If you recall, when we refunded those bonds there was an additional amount of savings

available that the Board, along with the residents at the time, decided to keep those available revenues to fund the recreational facilities in the future. The estimated amount is \$645,000 a year in excess funds that are available to bond to pay for the recreational facility. The good news is that the \$645,000 is more than enough to finance the potential project I have seen in the budget of \$7,381,000.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I want to clarify that number is a pure estimate at this point.

Mr. Bulleit stated for this purpose we monitored the transaction and the capacity to ensure in the event the District Board goes forward with the financing there is sufficient revenues we reserved in 2002 to pay for the facility. We were collecting \$645,000 annually in additional funds. If there were no available funds on reserve that would create significant excess monies, approximately \$150,000 to pay O&M. In other words, if we had no money we were going to use what the Board currently has existing, we would still be able to finance that amount of recreation facility and have approximately \$150,000 to pay for O&M of operations. If the \$771,000 we saw in the budget is the figure available they are existing reserves used to pay down the amount of money we need to borrow. That will provide an excess of approximately \$210,000 in O&M if that is what is in the budget. I think that has actually happened in the last two years since we were collecting \$650,000 annually and now we believe the reserve is somewhere in the \$2,000,000 range. If \$2,000,000 is available to offset the \$7,381,000 we only need \$5,300,000 to finance the remainder of the recreation facility and that leaves approximately \$306,000 available to pay operation and maintenance. Presuming that number is more than sufficient to pay operation and maintenance there is excess capacity to either add to the recreation facility or reduce the assessments.

Mr. Johnson stated based on the preliminary look at the numbers, the goal articulated by the Board approximately a year and one-half ago of financing the facility without impacting the

current level of assessments were well within the target with perhaps some additional savings that may offset the increased maintenance costs.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I think the goal was to affect the assessments by less than \$100 per year, hoping to have that as a cap on how much to raise our assessments in order to build the recreation facility and operate and maintain both the existing facilities, as well as the new one. We also took much longer to get to this point so we accrued more cash from the assessments we collected over the last few years. We thought we would only have a year or so and we ended up having three years of capital reserves.

Mr. Bulleit stated that is \$640,000 a year and interest rates are actually at their lowest level in 30 years so it actually multiplies the impact. In that perspective we are in very good shape.

Ms. Minnis asked for a point of clarification, do you know where the \$100 figure came from?

Ms. Beaugrand responded we did a workshop where we ran through a number of different scenarios with the help of Prager, Sealy & Co. and England, Thims & Miller. The concern was not really being able to have our hands around the O&M side of it because it is kind of an unknown. We know the debt service costs will be based on certain assumptions from an interest rate point of view, we knew how much money we were potentially going to spend and how much in assessments we collected because there is a fair amount of property owners. The question was really how much the expense was going to be and the goal was estimated at the maximum of \$100, depending on where all those different factors came in.

Ms. Minnis stated I remembered we tried not to go above \$100 to keep the assessment down.

Ms. Beaugrand stated last month we talked a little about the timing and with the benefit of the current interest rate market and from a long-term standpoint, it is very low. The key, as far as I am concerned, is to ensure we quantify the uplands on the Rayland parcel before we do anything because if we find out we do not have enough or cannot get enough based on this rainy season, we may have to cut back to the smaller project if it does not work out in that perspective. We do not want to go to the level of underwriting all the bonds and having excess bonds then go through the expense of issuing the higher number when we only need the lower number. While we want to take advantage of the interest rate, we need to make sure we are where we need to be before we do that.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Consideration of Annual Contract with Nanak's Landscaping**

Mr. Johnson stated at your July 12, 2005 meeting the Board approved an extension of the Nanak's contract for an additional year so I am not sure if further Board action is necessary. I brought a few copies of the agreement in case anyone wants to see it there are a number of maps and attachments.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we had one comment card on this topic. Ms. Boyce did you still have a comment?

Ms. Boyce responded I was not sure what you were going to talk about. Is Nanak's Landscaping currently doing the landscaping?

Ms. Beaugrand responded they do the landscaping for the entire community, both for the POA as well as the CDD.

Ms. Boyce stated I watched them putting down the new mulch as I was driving down Flora Branch Boulevard. Several people also commented on the quality of their work. I know there are limited funds for keeping up the community but in some places, like Plantation Island,

the front looks beautiful and I do not know if they pay extra fees to keep it like that. I come from a small community in South Florida and I paid an exorbitant amount of money for my homeowners association. We have many homes here and the amount we pay to the association is very small considering the size of the community and so many common areas that need to be kept up. In driving around the community I think the work is mediocre.

Ms. Beaugrand stated all the common areas are maintained by the POA and I think it is beneficial for them to hear your comments so you may want to give May Management a call to get some feedback. I know they have Board meetings as well but I do not know the exact day and time of their next one.

Ms. Minnis stated our contract with Nanak's is for State Road 13, the landscaping out front, the medians and Racetrack Road down to Fruit Cove School and they were already contracted by the POA when we were having problems with our maintenance contract. We went through a series of requests for proposals through England, Thims & Miller. This was based on estimates Ms. Hernandez gave us on sprinkler maintenance along Racetrack Road because when cars park there we end up paying for the damage. We picked Nanak's for the value, quality and price overall. We choose to stay with them because of our limited nature of what we have to do and they perform a sufficient job and we can cancel the contract if we are unhappy with their level of service.

Ms. Boyce stated landscaping is an issue no matter what community you live in and I understand it is extremely difficult but it is an eyesore when cars parking along Racetrack Road destroy the landscaping.

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Other Business – Options on District Management Services**

Mr. Johnson stated as you requested at your last meeting I contacted several District management companies and requested proposals. We received two in my office last week before the meeting and I provided those to you. One is from Governmental Management Services here in Jacksonville and the other is from Wrathell, Hart & Hunt also in Florida. We also requested one from Rizzetta & Co. and have not received it. I spoke to Mr. Rizzetta today at another meeting and he indicated he thought it had been submitted. They sent the proposal to England, Thims & Miller and there is one copy here now but it was only received today.

Ms. Minnis stated one of these companies sent me an unsolicited email to my work email address and it blocked by email because of the size of the document. I do not know how they got my work email address but I have a clue.

Mr. Johnson stated if that email address is on file at the District office with your contact information anyone can obtain it.

Ms. Minnis asked is it the policy of the District office to give out our email addresses?

Mr. Johnson responded if requested they are obligated by law to provide the information. It is not exempt information.

Mr. Abbatiello stated the Supervisor of Elections records those as elected officers on their web site.

Mr. Johnson stated you are not obligated to list your work email in those records and if you want to have an alternative email address you may. If it is listed they have an obligation to disclose it.

Mr. Wrathell stated my firm is the guilty party. We only intended to send information on our firm and did not intend to cause any issues with regard to the emails and I apologize.

Mr. Johnson stated you have three proposals and an existing contract with Severn Trent Services, which provides it may be terminated upon 60 days notice with no cause required. In

evaluating your decision to proceed you may decide to give notice tonight or you may not. There is no statutory process you are required to follow in order to obtain a management company. I believe we have all the companies who are active in this part of the state so it really is up to you and your level of satisfaction on how you want to proceed.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I want to add that Severn Trent Services did not submit a proposal. We have three proposals and the scope of services for all three are primarily the same as what we have on an ongoing basis with Severn Trent Services. The differences come in the area of cost and experience. Ms. Hernandez can give us an update on what she has been seeing from a management perspective.

Ms. Hernandez stated over the past six months there have been many changes within Severn Trent Services and their staffing. It took a lot of work on our behalf of double-checking to ensure they were doing the appropriate coding and renaming of certain areas. It raised many concerns because we do not have on hand knowledge of the finances and the coding is incorrect. Some bills were paid twice and other bills were not paid. Over the past six months we had to look through all the financials and there were plenty of phone calls back and forth.

Ms. Minnis stated I do not have three proposals.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I know. We just received the one from Rizzetta & Company because it was faxed to England, Thims & Miller and Mr. Maggiore brought it with him to the meeting tonight. The difference in the proposals other than from the experience perspective is the fee structure. The Rizzetta & Company proposal is \$60,000 per year, Governmental Management Services proposal is \$55,000 per year and the Wrattchel, Hart & Hunt proposal is \$59,000 per year. I want some feedback from the Board as to how you want to approach the process. You may want to take more time to review the proposals and address it next month with the companies making presentations.

Ms. Minnis stated it is the first time I am seeing the Rizzetta & Company proposal. When we put this notice for proposal out, how did we do it?

Mr. Johnson responded we did not put a notice for proposals out and we are not required to do that. I simply called the companies active in the area and asked them to submit proposals.

Ms. Donahue stated I apologize for Severn Trent Services for not submitting a proposal. If upper management had known about it they would have sent one.

Ms. Beaugrand stated they were here last month when we thought about making the change.

Ms. Minnis asked are we limited to these three proposals? Is there anyone else we want to consider?

Ms. Beaugrand responded no.

Mr. Johnson stated there are other companies who are more active in other areas of the state. There is a company called Special District Services who works predominantly in Southeast Florida. It is not a firm I recommend and I do not recommend them to any of my clients but I can obtain a proposal from them if you like. District Management Services is based out of Tampa and works in Tampa, Pasco and Southwest Florida. I am not aware of them doing anything in this market. Beyond these other two there really is not anyone else out there that I am aware of. The field has always been fairly specialized and for a long time there were just two, then three and now five.

Ms. Minnis stated I want to do my own research on these three companies and discuss it at the next meeting.

Mr. Johnson asked do you want me to make the opportunity available for them to come to the next Board meeting and address the Board?

Ms. Beaugrand responded yes. I think that it is a good idea. We want to focus on experience and other districts they manage at this point. I may make some phone calls getting references from districts they currently manage. Governmental Management Services gave us a list of references but they only listed a developer and a CDD and I want to see some local districts they manage. The same goes for the other two companies.

Mr. Johnson stated we will obtain that from each of the three companies so you have it in your package and available before the next meeting.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I have no problem if Severn Trent Services wants to submit a proposal.

Ms. Donahue stated thank you and I will find out where it landed.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Staff Reports**

**A. Attorney – Letter from the Clerk of the Circuit Court Regarding Impact Fee**

Mr. Johnson stated there is an informational item in your agenda package. It is the latest report from the Clerk of the Circuit Court itemizing the impact fee credits received for the District's account. The total for this quarter was \$86,920.51.

**B. Engineer**

Ms. Beaugrand stated Mr. Maggiore brought the assessment rolls. Those need to go in our official files, correct?

Mr. Johnson responded yes. I think if you get with Ms. Hernandez to ensure there is a set in the local files and Severn Trent Services will have a copy in their files.

Mr. Pincket asked what is the cutoff date for the assessment roll? Is there a specific date?

Mr. Johnson responded it varies around the state. It is really how current the county stays and their updating of the tax roll. St. Johns County is pretty far behind compared to some other counties. I do not know for sure but that roll probably reflects homeownership as of

January 1<sup>st</sup> or sometime shortly thereafter. We request the roll in early May or June as part of your budget process and they begin the process of preparing it. It is pragmatically possible that it may have been up through approximately that date but my prior experience indicates it is probably from the early part of the year.

**C. Recreation Facility Manager**

Ms. Hernandez asked will these assessments give me clarification on the CDD business members?

Mr. Johnson responded no. I talked to our financial consultant, Rizzetta & Company, about that and they are in the process of putting together some information and will come back to the Board in a public hearing format with a report.

**D. Manager – Meeting Schedule for Fiscal Year 2006**

Ms. Donahue stated the new meeting schedule for Fiscal Year 2006 is in your agenda package.

Ms. Beaugrand asked is this scheduled for every second Tuesday? I did not check to make sure.

Ms. Donahue responded I didn't either. It is every month and it looks like it is the second Tuesday but I will be happy to check.

Ms. Beaugrand asked have we already made reservations at the library for those dates?

Ms. Donahue responded no, that I have not done.

Ms. Beaugrand asked can you re-verify both of those items?

Ms. Donahue responded usually once this is approved we do the scheduling.

Ms. Minnis stated if we are not sure this is the second Tuesday of every month we cannot approve it yet because this goes into a legal notice in the newspaper.

Mr. Johnson stated you are not required to take action upon this until the end of the fiscal year so you can defer this a month until Ms. Donahue verifies the dates and ensures the meeting location is available.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Audience Comments**

A resident asked is there a web site or some type of posting within the community of the minutes of the CDD meetings and homeowners meetings?

Ms. Beaugrand responded yes. We are in the process of creating a web site for the CDD.

Mr. Johnson stated hard copies are available. The District has some filing cabinets in Ms. Hernandez's office so you can get copies of the minutes.

A resident stated I live in the community and I am also the editor and general manager of the St. Johns Sun. I wanted to let you know that I came here tonight because I wanted to hear what was being discussed. I am also here because I heard you got some erroneous information from the paper and part of my job is to make sure we correct that information. The words "land swap" were in a headline in the index of our last issue and based on Mr. Johnson's explanation I now know that was incorrect. I want to let you know I will correct that information and not in the normal way newspapers generally do by placing it in a little space that says we made a mistake. I will write about the subject and put it in there.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I appreciate that.

Mr. Schock asked do the sidewalks fall under the CDD or is a county issue?

Ms. Beaugrand responded a county issue.

Mr. Schock asked is there a timeframe on the recreation center?

Ms. Beaugrand responded it is difficult to put a time schedule on it when you have rezoning and permitting issues. We have to deal with the Water Management District, the St. Johns County Corps of Engineers and we are at the mercy of their timetables. What we want to

see and what may end up being the case may be two different things. We want to get it under construction as soon as we feasibly can for many different reasons. It is out of our control to a certain extent and we have been delayed over the last year and one-half getting a contract in place with Rayland for additional land so we can build a larger facility.

Mr. Schock asked when the survey went out approximately a year and one-half ago to vote on different ideas, is the idea that was approved still what we are looking at? Has that changed at all or have the assessments gone up? According to the financial statements I do not think it has.

Ms. Beaugrand responded no. We did that survey in 2002 and I think there were 3,900 homeowners.

Ms. Behrmann stated we sent out 2,100 surveys at that time and received approximately 987 responses. The next survey regarding the \$100 assessment went out to more residents because we had more homeowners at that time.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we did that survey in 2002 and then devised the conceptual plan from the responses of those surveys. We are holding a workshop meeting on August 16<sup>th</sup> at this location to discuss primarily the skate park, pool and tennis courts. This is to get feedback and we want residents to help us. There are many master swimmers in the community and with the swim team we need to know where the developer went wrong with the development of our existing pool. It is beautiful but there are some shortcomings. We want to make sure we do enough homework to avoid that with this new pool because too much money is involved to not do it right.

A resident asked do you have any idea of when your public hearing will take place?

Mr. Zakoske responded I do not know the date.

Ms. Beaugrand responded D.R. Horton is going to have a meeting with residents before that point anyway.

Mr. Zakoske stated we asked the county to postpone our hearing so we can address all the concerns of the residents.

Ms. Beaugrand asked I believe that decision was just made, correct?

Mr. Zakoske responded we decided that in the last few days, I believe.

A resident stated the residents' conversations are what I am talking about.

Mr. Zakoske stated we have not set a date for that yet because we are coordinating it with the CDD and Commissioner Stevenson.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Supervisor's Requests**

Ms. Beaugrand stated Mr. Abbatiello had to leave but he distributed to each of us the web site information. Mr. Timbol is here and he worked with us, graciously donating quite a lot of his time in setting up our web site.

Mr. Timbol stated Mr. Abbatiello has been working with me on the final web site as a mechanism to communicate the proceedings of the CDD and also the place we can electronically post the past minutes and other information of general interest supporting the CDD mission. It is a fairly simple web site and currently in initial review by the Board members essentially having the first draft. It really is presented to the Board for review for comments in regard to the design, content and other features you may want. It is pretty much ready to go as is but waiting for your input. It basically has three areas – the home page, your CDD at work page, which has information regarding the CDD, links to the statutes and community information and then there is a contact page for supervisor information with email addresses and so forth plus Plantation Club information which talks about pool rules and other news relating to the Plantation Club. Obviously when the new facility comes up we will feature new facility information. I believe in

30 to 45 days we will have it launched and we will have a notice in the newspaper whenever it is possible.

Ms. Spears asked do we have a domain name?

Mr. Timbol responded yes. It is JCPCDD.ORG. It is a domain owned by the CDD and registered accordingly.

Ms. Beaugrand asked are you looking for immediate input or input by the next meeting? What did you and Mr. Abbatiello discuss?

Mr. Timbol responded whatever your timeframe is. Mr. Abbatiello has given me electronic minutes from past meetings and they will be posted this week. We can essentially put whatever you want on there. It is an information site based on other simple web sites and it is more informational than transactual.

Ms. Minnis asked will you have links to our emails in here?

Mr. Timbol responded it can be forwarded to an email of your choice or it can be a separate post box where you can check in on your own. One of the features you have with your web site is your own CDD mailbox. You can have them all forwarded or you can have a separate email address. It is up to you on how you want to do it.

Ms. Beaugrand stated last month Ms. Spears brought up the suggestion to have something regarding the update of what is happening with the new recreation center.

Mr. Timbol stated that can be done.

Ms. Beaugrand stated it can be incorporated in the Plantation Club section because that is the logical place to look. I think this is good. We have been dealing with this for six months now and I think it is time to move forward.

Mr. Timbol stated it is essentially designed as you go.

Ms. Tevlin asked is there a place to put a definition of the CDD and what their responsibilities are?

Mr. Timbol responded there is a quick fact section that will be part of your CDD at work. If you want to take a look at it you can go to JCPCDD.ORG right now. Mr. Abbatiello is working on the text narrative for the quick facts. In other words, what is the CDD, what does it do, what is the POA, what does the YMCA do, etc?

Ms. Beaugrand stated we have the funds budgeted at this point so a motion is appropriate.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor the Board approved the web site.

Ms. Beaugrand stated go to it Mr. Timbol. Thank you for all your hard work, we really appreciate it.

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of Financial Statements, Pay Requests and Invoices**

Ms. Beaugrand stated behind Tab X in your agenda package we have the approval of pay requests 102 through 108 for the recreation, capital improvement fund.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Mr. Pincket with all in favor Pay Requests No. 102 through 108 for the Recreation, Capital Improvement Fund were approved.

Ms. Beaugrand stated you also have the check details and based on Ms. Hernandez's comments you need to know this is an incomplete listing of the check register. This month there was a number of invoices left out, which Ms. Donahue will make every effort to get corrected when she returns to the office tomorrow. In our next agenda package you will see an amount of invoices that will include items that went through in July as well as August so do not be concerned if you see duplications.

Mr. Johnson stated I think there are two invoices in those runs that need to be paid out of the recreation, capital improvement fund. I believe check number 50127 to Hopping, Green & Sams is the invoice Mr. Pincket pulled some months ago from that list and resubmitted it after his review. Your approval needs to pay that one from that fund rather than the general fund. Similarly on your next run, check number 50142 to Pappas, Metcalf and Jenks also is recreation, capital improvement fund.

Ms. Beaugrand asked did those get posted incorrectly then if they are on this check run?

Ms. Donahue stated I will have to check on that.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Mr. Pincket with all in favor Check Requests No. 50120 through 50159, excluding 50127 to Hopping, Green and Sams and 50142 to Pappas, Metcalf & Jenks, which comes out of the recreation fund, were approved.

**ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

There being no further business,

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Mr. Pincket with all in favor the meeting was adjourned.

---

Brian Pincket  
Assistant Secretary

---

Susan Beaugrand  
Chairman