

MINUTES OF MEETING
JULINGTON CREEK PLANTATION
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The continued meeting of July 8, 2008 of the Board of Supervisors of the Julington Creek Plantation Community Development District was reconvened Tuesday, July 22, 2008 at 6:00 p.m. at the Community Development District Administrative Offices, 950 Davis Pond Boulevard, St. Johns, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Kathleen P. Minnis	Vice Chairman
April Spears	Supervisor
Del Dosch	Supervisor
Brian Pincket	Supervisor

Also present were:

James Oliver	District Manager
Wes Haber	District Counsel by telephone
Matt Maggiore	District Engineer
Mike Lucas	Basham & Lucas Design Group
Stacie Hernandez	Julington Creek CDD

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Ms. Minnis called the meeting to order.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Construction Business – Davis Pond Storm Drainage PCO #39

Ms. Minnis stated the second order of business is construction business Davis Pond storm drainage PCO 39.

Mr. Maggiore stated this is a change to the storm drain system as designed to accommodate an existing storm inlet that is located in the parking lot of this building, 950 Davis Pond. Essentially, our original design did not accommodate that inlet and this design picks up the water from that inlet and routes it to the stormwater pond as it is permitted to go. This is

essentially work that you would have to have done, it was omitted from the original design that needs to be included.

Mr. Pincket joined the meeting at this time.

Ms. Minnis asked can you recap that for Brian?

Mr. Maggiore stated this includes a change to the storm drain system design to accommodate an existing stormwater inlet that is located in the parking lot of this building, 950 Davis Pond. That existing inlet drains through the new parking lot site to a stormwater pond and our initial design did not include picking up that inlet. This revision provides for routing the stormwater from that inlet to the pond as it is permitted to do. This is essentially work that should have been included in the original design and was omitted.

Mr. Pincket stated the inlet is already in the parking lot, it is already draining to the retention pond.

Mr. Maggiore responded correct.

Mr. Pincket stated with the changes you are recognizing the inlet in the plans and having water drain from the parking lot into that?

Mr. Maggiore responded correct. The construction of the new parking lot takes out the existing storm drain system in that area so we would have cut off this existing inlet that is located in the parking lot. There is only one inlet for this whole building.

Mr. Pincket asked where was your design draining this parking lot?

Mr. Maggiore responded it wasn't.

Ms. Minnis stated it is permitted but missed in the design.

Mr. Maggiore stated this building is permitted to go to that pond as is the new parking lot and as is the parking lot for the existing facility. It is all permitted to go that way but our design of the new parking lot basically just cut this one off, it didn't continue to route that to the pond.

Mr. Pincket asked what was your thought process in terms of where the water was going to drain?

Mr. Maggiore responded there wasn't. That was missed.

Ms. Minnis stated this has to be done to continue.

Mr. Maggiore responded correct. This is work that we would have done. The design should have probably been exactly this way the whole time. There is no other way to handle that

inlet. This parking lot is lower than the new parking lot will be and in relation to the pond this inlet basically has to be routed the way we have shown it on the revised drawing.

Ms. Minnis asked if it is higher it is still going to flow property?

Mr. Maggiore responded correct.

Ms. Minnis stated all of this cost is to connect.

Mr. Maggiore responded correct. I looked at these costs and they are very reasonable. Part of what you are seeing is a credit for what we are not going to install and part of it is added for the additional long run of pipe that we have to install and that is \$5,622.

Ms. Minnis asked and the total for that project was how much?

Mr. Lucas responded it is all part of the master.

Mr. Pincket stated you may have answered this already but when you designed the parking lot you pitch it all in a certain way in order to drain. Whoever was actually drawing it how were they thinking the water was going to flow?

Mr. Maggiore responded the new parking lot is all graded to a set of inlets within the new parking lot. They are all interconnected and they connect to an existing pipe that runs to the pond. It was just that this one inlet sits in this parking lot was omitted, it wasn't considered in the design. It should have been connected to the new system we are building all along.

Ms. Minnis stated in my opinion it would be like looking on Google map in a zoom, the guy was working in a zoom mode and someone didn't pull it back to say oh, did you bring this in over here. Do you know this part is connected? That is what it appears to me. They were looking at one section not thinking something was coming through it.

Mr. Pincket stated this existing inlet where it is piped right now is going to tap into the new system you are creating and it all just goes to the same pond.

Mr. Maggiore responded correct.

Mr. Dosch asked which pond is that it is going to flow to?

Mr. Maggiore responded it is the pond that is behind the existing facility along Davis Pond.

Mr. Pincket asked is that where this drains right now?

Mr. Maggiore responded yes.

Ms. Minnis asked where is the drain? I don't remember seeing a drain.

Mr. Maggiore responded it is in the corner. When you drive out you drive right over it almost.

Mr. Pincket asked where is the current pipe to get this into the other side of the pool?

Mr. Maggiore pointed out the location of the pipe on the map.

On MOTION by Mr. Pincket seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor PCO #39 was approved.

PCO #37

Mr. Lucas stated PCO #37 is when I did my construction drawings the main corridor in the residents club had to have a one hour fire rating. I reviewed the way I proposed the fire rate to corridor with the county, they approved it and prior to construction Dicky Smith confirmed with the inspector that what we were proposing to do was the correct way to do it. Basically you have to have a fire rated ceiling to take the one hour wall to the deck, that is the way the drawings detail, that is the way prior to construction that Dicky Smith had approved with the inspector. Dicky Smith went ahead and constructed it that way. The next day the inspector came out and said I'm sorry I reviewed some details with my boss and we are not going to allow you to do it that way. They wanted to do it a different way. In this PCO you can see according to the way it is worded it says complete reconfigure one hour fire rated ceiling and wall assemblies at recreational complex first floor corridor as required by St. Johns County appointed fire inspector says initial fire wall inspection per St. Johns County. What they are charging you for is the additional work as far as rating the ceiling. They are not charging you for any of their cost to go back and have to do some of the things that they had to do themselves. They are only charging you for additional above and beyond. If Ron the superintendent were here he would tell you that the inspector said I am almost embarrassed to tell you this because this is a very sticky point that we always try to confirm, fire rates but they did not allow it to be done the way they originally approved. This proposed change order of \$7,773 is to reconfigure the rated corridor to conform to the county's wishes.

Ms. Minnis asked do we have the same fire inspector every time? Is this the same guy who is going to sign off on the whole thing?

Mr. Lucas responded yes.

Ms. Minnis asked can we get his name? Can we charge this to him? I'm concerned if he missed this he is doing the signoff too.

Mr. Lucas responded it is frustrating. Where you get into problems is if your trusses are running a certain way basically if you take your front one hour wall up through the trusses between the trusses to the deck it is no problem. What happened is where we went across the trusses typically you build that wall up to there, you fire caulk around the truss and do the same thing and they said they were not going to allow that that we have to come in instead of taking up the deck to go up and basically you are creating a tunnel, you are creating a one hour tunnel, your walls and you ceiling are what the rating is.

Ms. Minnis stated basically our hands are tied because we have to do this.

Mr. Lucas responded it is already done. He had to do it because he would have been stopped. He didn't have a choice in the matter and took it upon himself to go ahead and do it.

Ms. Minnis stated I appreciate the fact they did it.

Mr. Lucas stated he didn't charge you for anything for his work. He charged you for the gypsum wall.

Mr. Pincket stated I appreciate that Dicky went ahead and did it. I'm curious what is the additional cost that we have incurred as a result of doing it the wrong way first? If we had done it this way from the beginning?

Mr. Lucas responded you probably came out ahead.

Ms. Minnis stated because we didn't have the manual labor part and the design and change that he had to do.

Mr. Lucas stated it is close to a wash or maybe a little bit ahead.

Mr. Pincket stated so Dicky is really taking this on the chin.

Mr. Lucas stated I called the county to make sure. It was approved that way and prior to him constructing it the inspector came out and said you can do it this way. Then the very next day he came out and apologized. St. Johns County is in the process of building some new buildings and it was one of their buildings and I guess he went back and talked to his chief and said we are not allowing them to do it this way. You are probably pretty close to a wash and you may be a little ahead.

Mr. Dosch stated I assume we are working off the latest fire code. Your description indicates revised fire code. Does he come back in the end and say you have to change this or this?

Mr. Lucas responded no he has already signed off on it. It says per revised St. Johns County fire code enforcement. Enforcement is the guy coming back and saying this is the way I want it, not the new fire code book, not the law.

Ms. Minnis asked it is required or it is their opinion?

Mr. Lucas responded St. Johns County is making you do it.

Ms. Minnis stated it is not on the books as being required. If we want to pass we have to do it.

Mr. Lucas responded the way they interpret it that is what they want.

Ms. Minnis stated it is their interpretation of the code.

Mr. Lucas stated a one hour corridor can go to the deck above and the second floor is the deck above. That is a one hour deck. All my walls go to the deck above. All my doors in that wall are rated doors so I had a rate of assembly. What bothers them is where that section of corridor instead of going parallel with the trusses so it can go up between the trusses it crosses the trusses. They don't like the fact that the truss is going through the corridor. Most municipalities allow that to happen and all you do is route around the trusses and use fire caulk to get your protection.

Ms. Minnis stated I'm concerned that we have this one inspector that made this mistake and he is signing off on this.

Mr. Lucas responded this is a more strict way. There is no way they can't pass you now because you have created a fire tunnel.

Ms. Minnis asked who is the fire inspector?

Mr. Lucas responded I will have to get you that name. I don't have that.

Ms. Minnis stated I just wanted it for the minutes if we need it down the road.

Mr. Lucas stated I will get you the name of the inspector.

ON MOTION by Mr. Pincket seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor PCO #37 was approved.

Mr. Pincket stated I see that Susan is getting copied on this and it has her place of work there.

Mr. Lucas stated I will have to ask.

Mr. Pincket stated if it were me I wouldn't want where I'm working on this. I can see copying Susan.

Mr. Lucas stated I don't know if he really copies her or not. I need to find out. I noticed that once before and meant to ask Stewart but I see what you mean you can take off the "Wachovia."

Mr. Pincket stated just take off Wachovia. I think she had that preference.

Mr. Lucas stated I agree.

Ms. Minnis stated that is the issue I have had with email when you get stuff at work if the Times Union decides to come in I have to let them look at Bank of America's email and if I have been accepting, we have had an issue with my email account which I hope is resolved today but that was my concern too because this position cannot interfere with my job.

Mr. Lucas stated I will verify if he is even sending that because I don't think he is sending it to her. I will verify that. Would it be better to not go to her at all?

Mr. Pincket responded I'm fine with copying Susan but take off Wachovia Bank, N.A. I think if it were brought to Susan's attention she would probably say take it off.

Mr. Dosch asked is it Susan's preference to be copied on these?

Mr. Lucas stated he is saying mixing work and all of that stuff.

Mr. Pincket stated I think it is more of a problem with emails.

Ms. Minnis stated I think in her position when it comes through the mail and we have filters they look to see if account numbers are going out on my emails, in her position then they say oh that is standard email for her coming from a contractor because of her job. I would ask her because it is the fact that the Times Union did go out, they had an issue in Duval County and then they went to Clay and started saying to the commissioners over there, show us all your email and it was on their work email and home email and these people had to produce it.

Mr. Lucas stated really it doesn't need to go to her as part of the copy because as soon as I get one to present I sent it to Jim and he sends it out to everybody. I meant to ask Stewart once before if he really sent them because Susan had never said that she had already received them. I will make a note to have him quit sending them to her.

Mr. Pincket stated it is probably a good idea that it all goes through Jim anyway.

PCO #40

Mr. Lucas stated PCO #40 has two parts. The first part is \$150 and the way I understand what happened is the sidewalk out in front along Durbin Creek was installed as detailed on the construction drawings and the inspector came out and he wasn't happy and I don't know if this goes back to part of a previous change order where we had to do a bunch of things but he said he wasn't happy with the connection of the five foot section sidewalk going down Durbin that is going to tie into the eight foot section. Even though it was done per code and met the intent it was his impression that it needed to be torn out and redone. Re-slope it to a different slope.

Mr. Pincket asked the actual sidewalk itself needs to be re-sloped.

Mr. Lucas stated they pulled out an eight foot section of five foot sidewalk.

Mr. Lucas pointed out on a drawing the location of the sidewalk under discussion.

Mr. Lucas stated the next part of this through a previous conversation on the opposite side of the road adding the flares. The reason that was not a soft curb before is we didn't want somebody riding a bike and being able to zip on down across this road. We wanted them to actually come to a stop and not make it easy for them to carry that nice fast thing all the way across the street. We are adding crosswalks and wanted to make sure that they are aware of it. That is why the flares weren't added to begin with and it was a hard corner. Susan had said she would like us to look into making those corners softer so that as you are riding your bike it would be an easier transition. That is your call if you want to make those corners softer but the intent was that as you approach that you should almost be on your bike walking it because we were concerned about traffic.

Mr. Dosch asked they don't necessarily have to be concrete flares?

Mr. Lucas responded they are going to be concrete.

Mr. Pincket stated I think you need the flares, they are going to have to slow down the way the angle of the sidewalk meets the existing sidewalk you need the flares. I remember Susan saying about how it was a hard corner and it was difficult from coming over here.

Ms. Minnis stated if you go around Durbin Creek from Summerchase when they originally built the sidewalks they built them straight along the fence and then they put the stop signs up by the road so people weren't stopping and coming through the fenced areas people

were crossing across the road so now they moved the sidewalks so if you are riding your bike it comes up and you go with the stop signs so you go in front of the car. Now you see traction right behind where everyone continues down the original path, half go this way and half go that way. That is my other concern that half are going to be riding across here.

Mr. Lucas stated there is not a right way to do it and there is not a wrong way to do it that you are going to cover all bases, we were just trying to slow them down.

Mr. Pincket stated I have actually ridden my bike there since Susan made the comments and I think the flares are a good idea. I don't think it is going to create a dangerous situation and it might make it a little bit safer because it is a very hard corner to take.

Ms. Minnis stated I was thinking about little kids on bikes that may not be going fast. You have ridden and you would recommend this?

Mr. Pincket responded yes.

On MOTION by Mr. Pincket seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor PCO #40 was approved.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

There not being any, the next item followed.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Scheduled Meeting – August 12, 2008 at 6:00 p.m. @ Fruit Cove Middle School

Ms. Minnis stated the next meeting is scheduled for August 12, 2008 at Fruit Cove Middle School and that is our budget meeting.

On MOTION by Mr. Pincket seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor the meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Secretary Assistant Secretary

Chairperson/Vice Chairperson