

MINUTES OF MEETING  
JULINGTON CREEK PLANTATION  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Julington Creek Plantation Community Development District was held Tuesday, December 12, 2006 at 6:00 p.m. at the Community Development District Administrative Offices, 950 Davis Pond Boulevard, Jacksonville, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Susan S. Beaugrand	Chairperson
Kathleen P. Minnis	Vice Chairman
Al Abbatiello	Assistant Secretary
Brian Pincket	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

James Oliver	District Manager
Jonathan Johnson	District Counsel
Matt Maggiore	District Engineer
Mike Lucas	Basham & Lucas Design Group
Stacie Hernandez	Julington Creek Plantation
Shelly Timbol	Julington Creek Plantation

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

Ms. Beaugrand called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Organizational Matters**

**A. Oath of Office for Newly Re-Elected Supervisors**

Ms. Beaugrand stated the second item on the agenda is organizational matters. Do we want to hold off on this for a few minutes in case the other two supervisors get here a little bit late?

Mr. Johnson responded we can do that. It is partly precautionary and partly administrative.

Mr. Pincket asked who are the newly elected supervisors?

Ms. Beaugrand responded Al, April and me.

Mr. Johnson stated just for the record I will note that the public hearing on the boundary amendment we will discuss the procedures when we get there. It was noticed for a part of this agenda and we will handle that when we get to that item.

**B. Consideration of Resolution 2007-06 Election of Officers**

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of the Minutes of the November 28, 2006 Meeting**

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next item on the agenda is approval of the minutes of the November 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. In that we just received those minutes this afternoon about 2:00 p.m. we are going to table those if everyone is okay with that, for the next agenda for review and approval.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Report on Public Hearing to Consider Petition Amending the Boundaries of the District**

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next item on the agenda is the report on the public hearing to consider the petition amending the boundaries of the district.

Mr. Johnson stated we have published the notice required by Chapter 190. It is not only published in the local paper but the Florida Land & Water Adjudicatory Commission does publish that notice as well. As you know this is a public hearing that is intended to bring approximately 26 acres which we purchased within the boundaries of the district on which a portion of our recreation facility will be cited. We would like you to ask you by motion to open the public hearing and then I will talk about the next procedural step.

On MOTION by Mr. Pincket seconded by Mr. Abbatiello with all in favor the public hearing was opened.

Mr. Johnson stated in the context of the public hearing I want to note that while we discussed this at your last meeting appointing Brian as a hearing officer under your rules of

procedure to conduct that hearing, consider a report and bring that back to the board for a final decision, on further review I really wanted to do that within the context of the hearing so if you are amenable I suggest that you entertain a motion to appoint Brian Pincket as the hearing officer consistent with your rules of procedure and that this hearing be continued to January 9, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. at which point Brian will sit in a public session to take testimony from any interested persons.

Ms. Minnis asked why are we continuing to January?

Mr. Johnson responded so we have some additional time to put together the documents for the hearing and the testimony and so forth.

On MOTION by Mr. Abbatiello seconded by Ms. Minnis with all in favor Brian Pincket was appointed as the hearing officer and the public hearing was continued to January 9, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. at the same location.

Mr. Johnson stated the reason we are continuing to January 9<sup>th</sup> at 5:00 p.m. is we anticipate asking you to move your January meeting back to accommodate public notices for the recreation center rates. By having the boundary amendment hearing on the 9<sup>th</sup> we think that will give us time to then squeeze in a more formal report to the board when you have that later meeting.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Organizational Matters**

**A. Oath of Office for Newly Re-Elected Supervisors**

Mr. Johnson stated this is an unusual situation where all of you were previously elected and all of you have oaths on file; however, as a precautionary matter I thought it appropriate to administer the oaths again on the record. We also have an opportunity if you would like to revisit your current offices of chairman, vice chairman and so forth and item B would be an opportunity for you to do so.

Mr. Oliver being a notary public of the State of Florida administered the oath of office to Ms. Beaugrand and Mr. Abbatiello.

**B. Consideration of Resolution 2007-06 Election of Officers**

Mr. Johnson stated under Item B you have Resolution 2007-06 and either by consensus or motion you can fill those slots. Secretary, treasurer and assistant treasurer are currently held by members of your staff at GMS. The balance of the board who is not chairman or vice chairman serve as assistant secretaries. You may keep your current slate or make changes, it is entirely up to the board.

Mr. Pincket stated I am perfectly fine with the status quo, I think you guys are doing an excellent job.

On MOTION by Mr. Pincket seconded by Mr. Abbatiello with all in favor Resolution 2007-06 reflecting the same slate of officers was approved.
--

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Recreation Center**

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next item on the agenda is the recreation center.

Mr. Johnson stated we can report that the bond pre-closing on the funds for the recreational amenities was conducted today. All the documents have been signed so everything is in escrow. We expect the funds to be released by bond counsel tomorrow morning and the deal will be officially closed and the trustee will be in receipt of those construction funds. We have representatives here to talk to you about the current status of the permits and they can do that now and then take up any other matters that you have.

Mr. Pincket stated I have a question before we get into that. I want to confirm. You are saying the trustee will have the \$14,510,000 tomorrow.

Mr. Johnson responded tomorrow.

Ms. Beaugrand stated just for everyone's edification, the average coupon on these bonds was at approximately 4.3% which is exceptional.

Mr. Pincket stated and that is fixed.

Ms. Beaugrand responded that is average. There are different maturities within the bonds that we sold but the average coupon of all of those bonds is 4.3%.

Mr. Johnson stated which is better than the coupon rate assumed in the methodology that you all saw and approved. You will see back at your January meeting or following the bond closing we will have a supplemental assessment resolution along with a report from GMS that

will show you exactly where those final numbers landed by way of single family assessments, multi-family and so forth.

Mr. Pincket stated looking at the cover sheet some of these rates are as low as 3.625%, is that correct?

Mr. Johnson responded that is correct. They have different interest rates with different maturity dates.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the longer bonds for example the ones that go out to 2036 are at 4.5%.

Mr. Lucas stated the master development plan has been submitted. When I talked to Matt a couple of weeks ago I informed him that I thought the construction plans and water management would be submitted in time. We came across a conflict on the survey and both the engineers and the environmentalist had to rework the plans a little bit. It didn't affect the building, it affected the retention pond so the county construction plans and water management plan are going to be submitted this week. That is anywhere between 60 and 90 days to get those. We will get comments back before then but typically from what I understand it is probably three submittals. We have already had one with the county construction plans, we will have another one after this one. What is left to do is we have to submit to the Army Corps of Engineers which will probably take 30 to 45 days. We have two other submittals. One through JEA and one through Florida Department of Environmental Protection and those are anywhere between 30 and 45 days.

Ms. Minnis stated when you say they are going through and it will take 45 days, is that from the time you submit to the time they review and approve? It doesn't take you 45 days.

Mr. Lucas responded no, that is how long it takes them to do it. I have asked my civil engineer to find out if I can submit my construction plans prior to getting the construction plans approved. I don't think I can but I am trying to see if we can. One thing is my construction plans can't be submitted until a contractor is selected because he has to do the truss drawings. Some counties are more flexible, unfortunately St. Johns County requires certain things and they won't look at it until you have a contractor who has done the truss drawings. If we can get that in, if the construction plans winds up taking the whole 60 to 90 days, I would like to be able to get in as early as I can but it is up to the county.

Ms. Beaugrand asked at what point in time are we going to be in a position to be able to go out for bid with the drawings that you have?

Mr. Lucas responded probably the first of February. I don't want to go out too soon because I want to back it out to make sure the contractors bid numbers will hold.

Ms. Beaugrand stated it is the cart before the horse issue there.

Mr. Lucas stated I am going to find out exactly if I can submit prior to the county having the site plan approved.

Ms. Beaugrand stated so the building plans submitted this week, that is the site plan approval?

Mr. Lucas responded that is the site plan approval.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the site plan approval will take 60 to 90 days, you cannot do the construction plan submission until the site plan is approved. That is what you are talking about theoretically.

Mr. Lucas stated that is what is happening to me on Durbin right now and I am assuming that they are going to do the same thing.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the Army Corps of Engineers, we submitted the initial application probably two years ago.

Mr. Lucas stated I spoke with Michele today and she had to send in a revised plan and basically the wetlands in that she wasn't worried about, it would go in along with the water management plans. We will have approval of that within 30 days.

Ms. Beaugrand asked has that been submitted?

Mr. Lucas responded they are in the process. They are both saying they hope to submit by the end of this week.

Ms. Beaugrand stated then the JEA permit.

Mr. Lucas responded the JEA is going to go in about the same time. That is about 45 days.

Ms. Beaugrand stated then the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.

Mr. Lucas responded the same thing, that is about 30 days.

Ms. Minnis asked are any of these permits dependent on another or can one hold up another one?

Mr. Lucas responded I don't believe so.

Ms. Beaugrand asked what about water management district?

Mr. Lucas responded she has redone that and that will be submitted this week or early next week.

Ms. Beaugrand asked what is the timing on the water management district typically?

Mr. Lucas responded 45 days.

Mr. Pincket stated the truss drawing is part of the construction plans.

Mr. Lucas responded they are not part of the construction plans, our structural engineer put that criteria and the contractor selected chooses a truss manufacturer to get those. That has to be done by the contractor.

Mr. Pincket stated a property owner cannot retain their own engineer to do their own truss drawings.

Mr. Lucas responded no, you can't force a contractor to use a certain truss manufacturer. Everybody uses different companies and that is going to affect his numbers.

Mr. Pincket stated and we can't even submit the construction plans until we have a general contractor.

Mr. Lucas responded St. Johns County won't even look at them. On Murabella the owner had truss drawings done but that didn't work out because the contractor didn't use them. We can't force a contractor to use a certain manufacturer.

Ms. Beaugrand stated thinking about timeline, let's assume worst case scenario that the site plan approval takes 90 days, that puts us into March. If we use February for the bid process so hopefully sometime in March we would be able to get the contractor selected and get the truss drawings.

Mr. Lucas stated get the truss drawings so we can submit that package and hopefully by then the county will not take more than a month.

Ms. Beaugrand stated okay so county approval for the construction drawings is approximately 30 days, typically.

Mr. Lucas responded that is what I'm hoping.

Ms. Minnis stated one of you just said based on this timeline we are looking at a construction bid of March?

Ms. Beaugrand responded February to March. We have to go through the whole bid process on this. February March so we get the contractor selected in March.

Mr. Lucas stated you don't want to get the contractor on too early because his subs aren't going to hold the prices.

Ms. Minnis stated we have a requirement because of the cost to put it out for bid and public notice and we are backing into that. Isn't that 60 days?

Mr. Johnson responded 30 days. What I'm hearing is that we need to ask at your January meeting your consideration of the RFP package and criteria so that you have approved the criteria you are going to use when the packages come back and we are authorized and can pull the trigger whether that is March 1 or March 10, we are ready to go. It sounds like you need to do that in January.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I agree and that is what I was trying to figure out.

Mr. Pincket asked is there anything we can do now to wet the appetite of GCs?

Ms. Beaugrand stated I have already had some call me.

Mr. Lucas stated we just bid a job in Durbin and they had two bidders.

Ms. Beaugrand asked who bid?

Mr. Lucas responded Dicky Smith and Alden White.

Mr. Pincket asked that was for what?

Ms. Beaugrand responded amenity centers in Durbin north and south.

Mr. Maggiore stated we had a \$1.5 million project out and nobody bid.

Mr. Lucas stated when I did Eagle Landing, I had one bidder.

Ms. Beaugrand asked who bid on that one?

Mr. Lucas responded Dicky Smith. He ended up doing all three phases of Eagle Landing.

Ms. Minnis asked isn't he the one who did this pool?

Ms. Beaugrand responded yes he did. The contractor is given criteria.

Ms. Minnis stated my question is because we keep hearing his name and he has done this work, are you putting it out as one amenity center, as the whole thing. You go from the amenity center, the pool, the basketball courts. You have to find someone available to do the whole thing.

Mr. Lucas responded it will be one package.

Ms. Beaugrand stated including the stuff across the street too. Dicky Smith did Oakleaf.

Mr. Lucas stated he did Bartram Springs as well as Eagle Landing.

Mr. Pincket asked what is his reputation?

Ms. Beaugrand responded it is good. If we are able to get a contractor selected in March, how long does it take him to get the truss put together so that they can then submit the plans to the county?

Mr. Lucas responded he hasn't formally been awarded the contract yet but he said he could do that in three weeks. He could probably do the same thing.

Mr. Pincket asked is that a comparable facility?

Ms. Beaugrand responded it is actually a little smaller.

Mr. Lucas stated it has two amenity buildings.

Mr. Pincket asked how many residents?

Ms. Beaugrand responded Durbin will have 2,400 and Aberdeen is between 2,000 and 2,500.

Ms. Minnis asked where are you publishing this?

Mr. Lucas responded Durbin was put in the Times and I called people and let them know that it is available. I called 10 people.

Mr. Johnson stated there is a contractors service that we can notify but they usually pick them up as well. It gets spread a little more widely. We are required to publish our ad in a newspaper of general circulation in St. Johns County. That can be the Record and that can be the Times Union, I think they are both certified but there is nothing that stops us from calling anybody that might bid.

Mr. Lucas stated I usually call contractors in the Orlando/Tampa area.

Ms. Beaugrand stated going back to the timeline again. If we can get a GC selected sometime in March and it takes them two or three weeks to get the truss manufacturer in line so we are looking somewhere in the first two weeks in April and it takes him 30 days to then get to the point of being able to do submissions to the county so we are looking at May and now we are looking at another 30 to 60 days to approve so we are we are looking at least June to have the permit, maybe July.

Mr. Lucas stated I will have a better idea with Durbin and I will come back and tell you how fast Durbin gets approved and get them going.

Ms. Beaugrand stated for next month can you estimate that timeline on paper for us when you have a better feel from what is happening with Durbin.

Mr. Lucas responded I can't even get Durbin permitted yet.

Mr. Pincket stated I guess the question also is to what extent do we need to have meetings that might help facilitate process.

Ms. Beaugrand stated if we need to schedule interim meetings, that is fine, we will do whatever we need to expedite that process. Give us as much lead time as possible so we can notice.

Ms. Minnis stated when you say meetings what do you mean by that?

Ms. Beaugrand responded board meetings, interim, mid month board meetings if we have to.

Mr. Johnson stated I think it depends. In mid January we will do your RFP package so depending on when that trigger gets pulled if you just assume that the ad runs on February 1, then you can't have a formal opening until March 3 because it has to run 30 days. We might be looking at bumping the March meeting back a little bit to have time to evaluate the packages and that would be your meeting to award your contract. I think we will know if we need a special meeting on something like that by when we actually publish that ad.

Ms. Beaugrand asked are we going to do with the RFP process, are we going to do what we did with the landscape contract or are we going to do it within the confines of this meeting?

Mr. Johnson responded that is up to you. There are several ways we can solicit contracts competitively. One is an invitation to bid and that is what you think of as typical government bidding and it is more common on things like horizontal improvements like roads and stormwater retention but you are simply and truly awarding to the lowest bidder. The lowest price comes in and they get the job. On facilities like this I have recommended the more commonly used request for proposals and that is what the package we put together for you for January because in that instance you will have a set of criteria which you will assign a score and we will hopefully have them add up to 100. Price might be 25 points so it is 25% of somebody's score but their financial competence based on their bond rating and financial statements, the adequacy of their personnel, local preferences, those things can be built in so when you get it you will go through and evaluate them based on those criteria, assign scores and then the proposer with the highest score wins, which may or may not be the person with the lowest price depending on how you weight price in there. It lets you evaluate qualitative factors as opposed to the purely quantitative dollars. In making that evaluation you have the option of doing that as a board and at a board meeting plowing through all of the proposals and assigning those or appointing a

subcommittee to do that for you and bring to you a proposed scoring which you then can approve or modify. That is a decision that we will need you to make. You don't have to make it tonight, you can make it in January to decide whether you as a board want to do that or you want to select a committee.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I wanted to bring it up to remind everyone of that process. Remembering that if we choose to do a subcommittee only one board member can be on that subcommittee. Then we will have staff or residents or whoever we choose to be the other members.

Mr. Johnson responded legally you could have more than one board member because you have to notice it.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I was trying to get away from notice, but that is fine.

Mr. Johnson stated we have to notice because it is narrowing your decision-making window.

Ms. Minnis asked in that meeting would minutes be taken?

Mr. Johnson responded they certainly can. We can have GMS there to take the minutes and be transcribed. It is not a requirement if you do it as a subcommittee that we transcribe those minutes but we would ordinarily record them just in case someone wanted them.

Mr. Lucas stated that is the way we did Durbin. We basically had three individual projects, we made it based on a possible out of 100 you could get 110 because what we wanted was to have one contractor for both amenities so we gave them a 10 point bonus if they were low bid on both jobs. I can fax you evaluation forms so you can see.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that would be great. It would be nice not to have to reinvent the wheel. I'm sure Jonathan has access to that also.

Mr. Johnson responded I would say CDDs constructing recreational facilities all of them have done it through an RFP process and you will see there have been variations on different boards weight things differently.

Mr. Pincket asked does this process include the bidders coming to a meeting and giving a presentation or is that not an option?

Mr. Johnson responded it doesn't generally. If you do that it is going to add some time and complexity to the evaluation. Usually, no, they submit their documents by a time certain at which time they are publicly opened and then it moves into the evaluation arena.

Ms. Minnis stated for Brian's edification, we have done it both ways when we did the proposals for the recreation center, they all came in and gave us proposals then spoke.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is right we did it for the architects too.

Ms. Minnis stated when we did the landscaping contracts we got proposals only and we did it as a subcommittee. What we found was a wide variation of documents submitted. Some were very detailed and some had the information and some had none and it just got rated poorly because of it and then you didn't have someone there to clarify what might have been missing. On the other hand with the people then it is limited on time, you can only ask so many questions, get so much information. There is a benefit to both ways and there is a hindrance to both ways.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we will address that next month.

Mr. Johnson stated we will put the package together and have that in your January agenda.

Mr. Lucas asked did you get the fax that I sent you on the aeration system?

Ms. Beaugrand responded yes, but I left it in my office.

Mr. Lucas asked Stacie, did you get it?

Ms. Hernandez responded I did.

Ms. Beaugrand stated why don't you bring the board up to date.

Mr. Lucas stated the pool consultant has done several amenity centers and he is concerned that the aeration system isn't going to do what you are hoping it will do. He has designed several features and he said that if the aeration just doesn't cool the pool like it is supposed to and by sending this letter he is passing design he wants to make sure that if we spend the money for an aeration system and it is not cooling like it is supposed to then he is sort of covered. Paul said that he thought that you had somebody who attended one of the meetings who was more familiar with the aeration system and could give us a little more insight on this.

Ms. Beaugrand asked is that John Aggas or someone else?

Ms. Hernandez responded probably John but that was a while ago. What pools has he constructed? I just got off the phone with Chris Oliver who is the athletic director at swimming at Boles and he said that the in-ground system that they had cools the pool by 10° overnight. He had no idea what I could possibly have been talking about. He has been there since 1998.

Mr. Lucas stated at Boles we took one half of the total recirculating water flow through a dozen golf course sprinklers to achieve a marginal 1° cooling. He felt that several reverse heat pumps would work but be expensive.

Ms. Hernandez stated I read that to him and he had no idea what that was talking about and then he said they also have a man made system which is PVC pipe and is laid out on the side of the deck and that works well too. I would like to know what pools he has done. What competitive pools and then I can either go and take a look or call and ask them what they have and what their recommendations are.

Mr. Lucas responded I will call Carey Wilmot who does the majority of the pools in Jacksonville. I don't want you spending something that is not going to work.

Mr. Pincket asked can you explain what this system is supposed to do?

Mr. Lucas stated it is like sprinklers into the pool to help cool down the water, through the hot part of the year.

Mr. Pincket asked where does the water come from?

Mr. Lucas responded it is recirculating through the pool. It is pool water and maybe we leave it on all night to help cool the pool water.

Ms. Beaugrand stated it brings the bottom water up through the top. Bottom water is cooler than the top water.

Mr. Lucas stated in the summer to that the pool is not bath water it is recirculating. According to Terry Beaumont who does all of our pools he wants to make sure that you get what you pay for.

Ms. Beaugrand asked Stacie, what about checking? There is Boles, Episcopal, they probably have an aeration system, UNF and the aquatic center out at Cecil Field. Check at least those four locations to see what they have.

Ms. Hernandez responded UNF doesn't have aeration.

Mr. Pincket asked would you call John Aggas also to get his thought?

Ms. Beaugrand stated we will research that one.

## **SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Approval of Pay Requests**

- A. No. 152 Payable to England Thims & Miller, Inc. in the Amount of \$2,207.50**
- B. No. 153 Payable to England Thims & Miller, Inc. in the Amount of \$4,909.83**

Ms. Beaugrand stated 152 is to ETM for \$2,207.50 and 153 is to ETM for \$4,909.83

Mr. Pincket asked what is work authorization 50?

Mr. Maggiore responded that is the engineer’s report and the other is the assessment notices.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Mr. Pincket with all in favor pay request no. 152 and 153 were approved.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS                      Other Business**

Mr. Oliver stated last year we went through the RFP process to select an auditor and the board approved Dufresne & Associates and that was for a one year agreement with two, one year renewals. Tonight I will ask you to consider renewing that agreement for \$5,900 which is what was in their original proposal and which is what we budgeted for fiscal year 2007.

Ms. Beaugrand asked were you happy with the process they went through?

Mr. Oliver responded yes, they are excellent to work with and they did a good job and they are a local firm.

On MOTION by Mr. Pincket seconded by Ms. Minnis with all in favor the agreement with Dufresne & Associates to perform the audit for fiscal year 2006 in the amount of \$5,900 was approved.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS                      Staff Reports**

**A. Attorney**

There not being any, the next item followed.

**B. Engineer – Work Authorization Amendment No. 11 to Work Authorization No. 1**

Mr. Maggiore stated the only thing I have to bring to your attention is the work authorization for the coming year. I went back and did a little research to plead our case a little bit to increase our rates. Over the eleven years since the original work authorization was issued, I went through what the annualized increase would have been for each position. Looking at it on that basis it is somewhere between 3% and 5% generally for each position. For example the senior engineer position is about 4 ½% on an annualized basis. I had accounting pull some

reports and to be quite frank with you just for our general consulting services we are actually losing a little bit of money which is fine because we provide other services for you at Racetrack Road, S.R. 13, Durbin Creek Boulevard and we do fine that way but because we held the rates constant for so long now we are actually paying our people more than the rates we are charging. I am here to plead the case to bring the rates up to our current rates and then moving forward we will be doing much smaller increases. Brian had a question last month about what other CDDs are paying us and to be quite frank we do charge some other CDD rates lower than our current rates because they are actually in the same position that you were in eight years ago, doing large construction type projects with them now, large design projects and kind of as a courtesy because they are giving us that work we are not raising the rates on a year to year basis because we are doing those large projects with them which is what we did for you. You did see some savings because the larger dollars are not on the design projects you did in the past. There was some savings that in retrospect I would probably not do it again. I will entertain any questions you have.

Mr. Pincket stated what I'm hearing is in fact they have held their rates low and I think it is fair to pay them the going rate and I appreciate the fact that we received discounted rates for those years. I know there was a business reason for it. There appears to be no longer a reason for it. I think it is appropriate that they are here today asking for an increase.

Ms. Minnis asked what about the projected work for the next two years based on this project?

Mr. Maggiore responded our work is rather limited because Basham & Lucas is the architect and our work is rather limited. We will do some update to the plans but it is pretty minor. The parking lot plans are approved but it will be a matter of bringing everything up to snuff but that is minor.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I think the bottom line is if we bid this out we would probably be paying at least equal to if not more and their history here is certainly valuable.

Mr. Pincket stated I do have a question about that. Are your rates pretty much in line with your competitors?

Mr. Maggiore responded I don't know because I don't look at other rates that often. I would think we may be a little higher than some people but I don't really know.

Mr. Pincket stated that is what I hear. I know there is a history here with institutional knowledge with you but I have heard that ETM is a little on the expensive side. That was from one of your competitors so I don't know how valid that is. They do good work but they are on the expensive side.

Ms. Minnis stated you get what you pay for. On the other hand like Susan said their experience that they have with the county has been invaluable to us in some of our projects such as Racetrack Road and S.R. 13. They have been proactive for our CDD as well. I kind of agree with Susan with the transfer of the work especially in a project where we are trying to change the boundaries and they have done our tax assessments, they have done the boundaries, they are familiar. We could be putting ourselves at risk at this point to make a change. I'm not saying maybe we should proactively start looking going forward and comparing but is this the time to make the change.

Mr. Abbatiello stated I guess over the years I have been sitting on here and my recent experiences with England Thims & Miller I really believe you guys do a heck of a job and are the Cadillac of the industry. I do have one question. I have been in sales a long time and most businesses understand that your best customers pay the highest prices. I guess as we move along here we may not be your best customer which may entitle us to a bit of a discount.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is kind of counter intuitive to what I was thinking.

Mr. Maggiore stated to be quite frank in the early stages the CDD was developer controlled and there is a great incentive to hold your rates low. You are not going to make as much money but in coming years you put the volume of work you are going to receive from that developer. We feel very fortunate to have done all of the work we have done for you but just on the general services over the last couple of years we have lost \$3,000 or \$5,000. We made no money there but we have been very fortunate in the other work you have given us.

On MOTION by Mr. Pincket seconded by Mr. Abbatiello with all in favor amendment no. 11 to work authorization no. 1 was approved.
--

**C. Recreation Facility Manager**

Ms. Hernandez asked do we have any comments on the definitions and/or rates for the recreation use?

Ms. Beaugrand asked do you have any extra copies of those?

Ms. Hernandez distributed the rate sheet.

Mr. Pincket stated I had a couple of comments and I will be happy to share the ones that were not resolved. First of all I want clarification or confirmation that a JCP resident must sign the documents that we are going to ask users of the facility to sign. The reason I say that is I was a little concerned for example I will use the boy scouts. If we have a resident in the community whose child is in boy scouts I don't want that person sending over a non resident to sign up the facility, I want the resident to sign the documents. Stacie assured me that that was their plan and that was their process anyway. I had another question about rates but they clarified all of those. They answered all of my other questions.

Mr. Abbatiello stated it says JCPCDD residents. What about people who are not residents but pay the fee?

Ms. Hernandez responded it is the same process we do when we execute a membership for the pool.

Ms. Beaugrand stated maybe what we should have there is members instead of residents. I think that covers it properly.

Mr. Abbatiello stated beyond that I thought it was a great document. You guys did a lot of work.

Ms. Beaugrand stated this is basically the same information that we looked at last month but in a different format. I have one question. On the key holder, weren't we talking at one point about some kind of liability disclosure or something with a signature.

Mr. Johnson stated we are redoing those forms.

Ms. Minnis asked what is the liability?

Mr. Johnson responded getting waivers, releases from anyone who signs for those things.

Mr. Pincket stated and agreements to accept liability.

Ms. Minnis asked shouldn't we have the person's address as well?

Ms. Hernandez responded that is on the other forms that you don't have in front of you.

Ms. Beaugrand stated this will go in to the January meeting.

Mr. Johnson stated you have already authorized the gist of this information. It has gone into the public ads for the public hearing. In order to accommodate the publication schedule we are asking you to consider moving your January meeting back one week which I believe will be

the 16<sup>th</sup> at your usual time and at this location and that would be the public hearing on those rates, fees and charges.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Mr. Pincket with all in favor the January meeting was moved to January 16, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. at this location.
--

Ms. Hernandez stated I will let Shelly give you a little update on our meet with Eastgate that we had on Saturday.

Ms. Timbol stated the women of the Eastgate Community have provided us with a Christmas tree this year and on the Christmas tree there are little gingerbread men tags and they wanted to be able to provide toys and goods for the house at the St. Augustine Boys Home which is a shelter for foster children who have been abused or neglected. In addition to providing gifts they also wanted to provide an opportunity for people in the community to come here and have a time to take pictures with Santa Claus. That will also get more people in the community in to be aware of their charity and what they are doing with the tree and I spoke with a couple of the women who were here on Saturday to do this and they said it was a terrific success, they were very pleased. The estimate of the number of children was around 100 children came. There was a line at the door. Some people actually gave them cash donations for the Boys Home when they were here. The women also were able to do the CDD primer and talk about our programs that we have here in this building and handed out some fliers for that and we have gotten some response. All in all it was very positive.

Mr. Pincket asked how did you get the word out for that?

Ms. Timbol responded they did that. They put it in the Jacksonville Sun and I think they also advertised in a couple of the elementary school newsletters and word of mouth.

Ms. Beaugrand asked when are the gifts due back?

Ms. Timbol responded if they can get back by this Friday that would be great. They are going to come by Monday morning and pick them up and the sooner they get them the better because they need to wrap them.

**D. Manager**

There not being any, the next item followed.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Supervisor's Requests**

Mr. Pincket asked have you looked into pressure cleaning the roof of this building?

Ms. Hernandez responded yes. It is happening this weekend.

Ms. Beaugrand asked have we asked them to careful where it leaks?

Ms. Hernandez responded hopefully that is taken care of. This will be a good test.

Ms. Minnis stated they recently took that chipper machine out, not recently as in the last week but maybe the last month or two and they did the mulching under the trees. Are we paying for that?

Ms. Hernandez responded the county made a mistake and did that.

Ms. Minnis stated they weren't consistent where they did it. They did it all the way down the middle but they didn't do the sides but that is fine. That's great. Can I point out to the residents that we got something from the county.

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Audience Comments**

Mr. Stewart stated I have the latest St. Johns County transportation plan too if anyone from the board is interested. (Mr. Stewart distributed copies of the plan.)

**ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Financial Reports**

**A. Balance Sheet as of October 31, 2006 and Statement of Revenues & Expenditures for the Period Ending October 31, 2006**

**B. Treasury Report – March 31, 2006**

**C. Special Assessment Report**

**D. Check Register Summaries**

**1. General Fund 11/03/06 - 12/04/06**

Ms. Beaugrand stated behind Tab D1 you will see the check register for the general fund, checks 1319 through 1331.

Mr. Pincket stated I have a question about the transfer checks, are they transferred out of the general fund and going where?

Ms. Beaugrand responded those are the tax receipts that are being put in our investment account. Transferring out of a regular account into our SBA account.

Mr. Oliver stated that is reflected behind Tab C.

Ms. Beaugrand stated you will be seeing those between now and April.

On MOTION by Mr. Abbatiello seconded by Ms. Minnis with all in favor the general fund check numbers 1319 through 1331 were approved.

**2. Recreation Fund 11/03/06 - 12/04/06**

Ms. Beaugrand stated behind Tab 2 is the check register for the recreation fund, checks 1856 through 1881 less 1861 and 1862 which were voided.

Mr. Pincket stated there is a check here for the YMCA, is this our last check to the YMCA?

Mr. Oliver responded that is the September payment and we will make sure that is applied to the 2006 budget.

On MOTION by Mr. Abbatiello seconded by Mr. Pincket with all in favor the recreation fund check summary for checks 1856 through 1881 less 1861 and 1862 was approved.

**TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Next Scheduled Meeting January 16, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. @ Community Development District Administrative Officer**

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next meeting is January 16, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. in this building.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Mr. Pincket with all in favor the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

---

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

---

Chairperson/Vice Chairman

