

MINUTES OF MEETING  
SAMPSON CREEK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Sampson Creek Community Development District was held Wednesday, August 27, 2008 at 4:05 p.m. at the Clubhouse at the Swim Club Meeting Room, 219 St. Johns Golf Drive, St. Augustine, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Bill Petkoski	Chairman
Mike Yuro	Vice Chairman
Brenda Griffey	Supervisor
Charles Sheppard	Supervisor

Also present were:

Jim Oliver	District Manager
Wes Haber	District Counsel
Heather Mickelson	Art of Living Director
Emile Benoit	GMS, LLC
Rich Whetsel	GMS, LLC

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

Mr. Oliver called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Affidavit of Publication**

Mr. Oliver stated the next order of business is the affidavit of publication. You have a copy of the published notice that was in the St. Augustine Record in your agenda package. Mailed notice was also sent out to each of the landowners regarding the public hearing.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of the Minutes of the July 23, 2008 Meeting**

Mr. Oliver stated the next order of business is approval of the minutes of the July 23, 2008 meeting. Are there any comments or corrections to those minutes? If not, I will ask for a motion for approval.

On MOTION by Ms. Griffey seconded by Mr. Yuro with all in favor the minutes of the July 23, 2008 meeting were approved.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Acceptance of Audit Committee Minutes of the July 23, 2008 Meeting**

Mr. Oliver stated the next order of business is acceptance of the audit committee meeting minutes of July 23, 2008. Are there any comments or corrections? Is there a motion for approval?

On MOTION by Mr. Yuro seconded by Mr. Sheppard with all in favor the minutes of the July 23, 2008 audit committee meeting were accepted.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Hearing Adopting the Budget for Fiscal Year 2009**

Mr. Oliver stated the next order of business is the public hearing adopting the budget for Fiscal Year 2009. The protocol for this is we will open the public hearing, the Supervisors will discuss the budget, and we will take comments from the audience, and then bring it back to the Board for discussion and close the public hearing. I have the budget on my computer so any changes we make today we will be able to incorporate into the budget you have before you. This is the same budget you saw at the meeting back in May, as well as the July meeting. Can I have a motion to open the public hearing?

On MOTION by Mr. Petkoski seconded by Ms. Griffey with all in favor the public hearing was opened.

Mr. Oliver stated the numbers remain unchanged in the budget you have before you, other than the actuals in the second column through 7-31-08, as well as the projections as a result of those. The proposed budget for FY09 stays the same. If you look in the top section under revenue, one big difference this year as opposed to past years, is the carry forward surplus. This year there is zero carry forward from previous year's budgets. Last year the budget was subsidized with \$133,000 worth of carry over. To explain that in general, if you go to Page 3, you will see Exhibit A, which is the allocation of operating reserve. You can see what the availability of funds will be at the end of FY08. Those funds will be utilized in two ways,

number one, \$250,000 for the first quarter operating expenses. Each year the tax revenues come in based on the tax receipts from St. Johns County. They send out the tax bill November 1 and they start receiving payments before November 30, so they will start rolling in by the end of November. We have to have a way to fund those first two months for District operations. The second number you see, reserved for capital projects, \$220,000, there will be future capital projects you have for renewals and replacements, such as roofs and roads. We recommend you retain as much of that amount as you can for future projects. Again, the Board has the latitude to make some changes to that. As you look at the next section, which is expenditures, you can see that's the administration portion of the budget. That's essentially unchanged from last year. There are some slight differences in those columns with the biggest being the attorney costs. As you can see, although the budgeted amount went up, there were a lot more meetings and public hearings this year with the transition of the Board. As you look at the largest part of the budget, which are the field expenditures, that is where the largest increase is. The two most important numbers I want to point out, the largest increase is in security. Last year we had security budgeted at \$9,000. That was during the period of time when school was out for the summer months and we had Giddens Security or River City Security at this facility four hours a night on Friday and Saturday nights. That was just for a limited amount of time. For the remainder of this fiscal year, based on guidance from the Board, we brought on Giddens Security every day for 12 hours a day. They were working 12 hours a day, seven days a week, through the remainder of Fiscal Year 2008. In addition to that we have off duty St. Johns Sheriff's Office deputies patrolling the development. That's at random, but it's usually somewhere in the neighborhood of 12 to 16 hours a week. It's not random in terms of we know when they are going to be out there, but it's not announced when they are going to be patrolling. Because of that, if we were to use that same model going forward, that would cost about \$100,000, as opposed to \$9,000 last year. The response has been good, but the Board may decide, with public comment, they may want to adjust that number somewhat. The other number I want to bring to your attention is the landscape maintenance. Although that number remained essentially unchanged percentage wise given the size of the number, we did find out two weeks ago that Turfection, which is the company that has been out here for several years and re-hired through the RFP process, is getting out of the business. For financial and other reasons they have decided not to remain in the business. We are going to have to go back through the RFP process

and bring on another landscape maintainer. I'm still confident you have a good number in there. We have found with some other Districts that we realized significant savings as we have gone through the RFP process. It could be a good thing. There's no guarantee there will be a savings, but I'm comfortable, based on what I've seen in three other Districts that we've done this with recently, there's plenty of margin and you will see a savings. The reason being is there are so many of these maintainers out there that have lost installation business because of the slowdown in development, there is more competition on the landscape maintenance side of the business. If you go down to the very bottom you will see the proposed assessment. The gross assessment of \$1,014.80 was for FY08 as well as 2007, and the FY09 number is \$1,203.44. This is grossed up for two reasons. Number one, there is a 2% collection fee by the St. Johns County Tax Collector, and also that incorporates the 4% discount available for early payment. If people pay their tax bill by November 30 they realize a 4% savings on all their taxes, including their assessments for Sampson Creek CDD. If you go back further in the budget, that is the accounting for the debt service fund, and that begins on Page 10. That shows the gross assessments for the debt service funds by unit count. If you recall, years ago there were two different issues, that's why there's a variation in what those rates are. In December of 2006 this District refinanced those bonds and actually had a reduction in the assessment per unit. I would like to tell you what those costs were. For Phase 1 the 55' lots, which are now \$563, were \$675. The 65' lots were \$725, the 75' lots were \$800, the 85' lots were \$875, and the 100' lots were \$1,100. In Phase 2 the 55' lots were \$745, the 65' lots were \$800, the 75' lots were \$880, the 85' lots were \$965, and the 100' lots were \$1,210. With that, it is time for Board discussion or questions you may have and then open it up to the public for their comments.

Mr. Yuro asked on Page 3, what's the estimated excess revenue over expenditures?

Mr. Oliver responded that number is the fact that you actually spent more than you budgeted for FY08. You actually realized some income from some carry forward surplus because of the refinancing of the bonds and some of that money was spent on the additional security that you have for the remainder of this year, some exercise equipment, and other capital projects.

Mr. Petkoski stated as far as security, I don't know who all in the audience might have been at the meeting in May, which actually resulted in this budget item going to \$100,000. This may come out in public comment, but that seems to be the driver of why the assessments and

budget are going up. I want to make sure we hear somehow from the residents that it's working. Jim made a comment that it's working and we have had positive comments, but to go from \$9,000 to \$99,000 for security is a big deal. I want to make sure the residents, through public comment, are heard.

Mr. Oliver stated the two biggest items driving the assessments upward are security on the expenditure side and the lack of a carry forward surplus on the revenue side.

Mr. Yuro stated this year, for the first time, we are setting aside money for future repairs. That's what the \$220,000 is for. We haven't had that before, correct?

Mr. Oliver stated correct. That's a subjective number. To the point you want to adjust that some, that's fine.

Mr. Petkoski asked how was that number generated?

Mr. Oliver responded the accounting staff developed that number, but it's very subjective. This is still a relatively young community, so you do have some leeway.

Mr. Yuro stated to that point, you are saying the \$291,000 is additional money we spent above what was originally budgeted for.

Mr. Oliver stated that number essentially represents the difference between FY08 assessments levied on landowners and other sources of revenue, to include carry forward surplus from FY07. At the bottom of page 2, projected expenditures for FY08 are less than the budgeted amount.

Mr. Yuro stated this past year we had to spend more money to keep things up and that's what that was for.

Mr. Oliver stated one reason you realized extra funds that you were able to use in 2008 is when you refinanced in December of 2006 you had already adopted the budget for FY07 and were assessed at that level. There were actually excess funds to pay the debt service fund and those funds were returned to the District. You will not have that this year.

Mr. Yuro asked from a security standpoint do you get reports from the Sheriff and Giddens that the reports are staying consistent or have the incidents come down?

Ms. Mickelson responded when they first started it was at least five a month. I think in the last month and a half there has been one or two. It has gone down.

Mr. Yuro stated it's making a difference. Is that the calls for service?

Ms. Mickelson responded it's reports if they had to get the Sheriff's office involved, not just asking people to leave the basketball courts.

Mr. Yuro stated that's from Giddens. The Sheriff, in addition to that, gives you a briefing of what his activity is.

Mr. Whetsel stated it has slowed down.

Mr. Yuro stated it seems to be working.

Mr. Oliver stated as far as adjusting of those numbers it might be helpful to have public comment first.

Mr. Diderio stated you sent a letter out and it appeared what you were saying in the letter was there was a special assessment of \$1,200. In looking at this that's not what you were saying. You were saying the budget is going to go up \$200 per house. Is that correct?

Mr. Oliver responded yes.

Mr. Diderio stated you might want to re-word that for next year. I can tell you that 90% of the people that live here thought they were going to get a bill for \$1,200.

Mr. Haber stated our job would be a lot easier if there weren't laws saying certain language absolutely needs to be put in those notices. We try our best to make those notices as user friendly as possible to explain what's going on, but still also make sure we are putting in the statutory requirements that the law requires to have about assessments. We apologize they are somewhat inartfully drafted in for any confusion. The sole purpose of that notice is to say last year's assessment was \$1,014, this year's proposed assessment for O&M is \$1,203, because it is going up you are receiving this notice. We apologize for any confusion.

Mr. Oliver stated we will refine the letter next year.

Mr. Diderio stated you had proposed granting the Board the power to make the assessments without any type of public hearing.

Mr. Haber stated we were saying the proposed assessment is \$1,200 and change. Obviously we are having a public meeting here today to adopt the budget. That budget will determine what the assessment level is. If no change is made, the assessment is going to stay at the \$1,200. If for some reason they take a line item out or reduce security assessments are going to go down. The purpose of that notice is to say if the assessments go down in a subsequent year the proposed assessment doesn't go above the noticed amount, to save the District the postage and effort associated with drafting those notices, the District doesn't have to re-notice the

community unless it's going to go above the \$1,200, not above whatever the adopted assessment here is today. It's for efficiency sake for the District. If it goes down to \$1,150 per unit it's probably not worth the District's expense to re-notice the entire community. What we are saying is as long as the assessment never goes above \$1,203, regardless of what the actual assessment is adopted here today, the entire community isn't going to receive that mailed notice.

Mr. Petkoski asked is the terminology the same as it's been every other year?

Mr. Oliver responded no, the cap is new.

Mr. Haber stated there's one additional paragraph that discusses the cap. Other than that one paragraph the terminology is somewhat the same as what we have used in previous notices. There's multiple statutory sections we need to comply with in those notices and it's getting all that language in there plus trying to make it user friendly and understandable.

Mr. Diderio stated a couple of meetings ago when we were talking about the whole security thing I think what precipitated the idea of the gates was there was a surplus, that's what I heard. There was \$50,000 surplus. In looking at this it seems to have disappeared. Was that just hear say or what it incorrect?

Mr. Oliver responded it may have been a misunderstanding, not hearsay necessarily. Part of it is the \$220,000 in reserve. Part of that money was used for security for the remainder of 2008. Remember, only \$9,000 was budgeted. Since that meeting we have had Gideon on 12 hours a day and the Sheriff's deputies out here. We have taken a look at that project and it would probably be somewhere in the \$600,000 range for capital cost. That's not even talking about the security that comes with that, which would be another couple of hundred thousand dollars, which would only have people sitting at the gates. It wouldn't help the internal security. There's no big pot of money sitting around for something like that. It would be a pretty large capital project.

Mr. Yuro stated this is really the first year we are setting aside money in reserve. If the roof breaks on this building we have to be able to repair it. We have never had money set aside in reserve for those types of maintenance issues before. This is the first year we are actually setting aside some money knowing there is going to be repairs coming up with the facilities being seven years old.

Ms. Griffey stated when the roads need repaired they will be ours to do also, so you have to have money for that. The county doesn't repair our streets. That's a big expenditure when it comes.

Mr. Diderio stated I know the security is a very emotional topic in this community. One hundred thousand dollars divided by 800 homes is \$125 each. Of that \$200 increase \$100 is probably for security. It would be interesting to find out what everybody felt about cutting the service in half. I didn't realize it was seven days a week.

Mr. Yuro stated the Sheriff's Office, in my opinion, we get a lot bigger bang for the buck for their 16 hours out here. Giddens Security, 12 hours a day, could that be eight hours a day or six hours a day, would that be more efficient use of the money. That was one of the things we were hoping to get feedback from the residents to help make those types of decisions.

Mr. Ayers stated I agree that having the county Sheriff come through will definitely be a better bang for the buck. On the security, as far as I know, they sit here and patrol four times a night. You are getting basically the security guy going through our community four times a night times seven days a week for 12 hours. We may want to look at that and say can we put more on the Sheriff's side, if anything, or tweak it a little bit. I think the security is great, I just think we may want to tweak it a little bit.

Ms. Griffey stated I think we have had a lot of complaints about kids from other neighborhoods coming to use the basketball courts and there was vandalism specifically to this facility. That was a big issue, but since he's around it's not happening in the summer like it had before.

Mr. Ayers stated I don't see much of an impact at 7 o'clock at night, but I think definitely at three in the morning having someone go around definitely helps. I had an incident on Saturday night next door to me where the security did come out. People were having a big party and eventually they did call the Sheriff to come in. We experienced the benefit of the security, but we may want to look at. My suggestion is we may want to shift the balance.

Mr. Haber stated one thing worth noting is the line item in the budget is security, so even outside of this meeting the Board is always able to adjust the contracts with either of those entities. If we are not looking for a savings on assessments, but just looking to determine how you want to go about spending your security money, that's not necessarily a budget issue, but how you spend your budgeted item.

Mr. Sheppard stated in the event that we kept this budget item or we cut back on security so there would be a net savings, what happens to the excess money? Does it go into reserves?

Mr. Oliver responded you could treat it at the end of the year as reserves or carry forward surplus, or you could make a decision today. If you were to tell staff that we want to allocated \$75,000 for security and the rest can be used to reduce assessments, we could plug that in today and give you the impact. The Board can get with staff to work out the details of how to allocate that remaining security money, how many hours the Sheriff's deputies would use and how Giddens Security would be scaled back, and still try to reach a level of security that the community wants.

Mr. Petkoski stated it's not going to make that big of a difference.

Mr. Yuro stated a \$25,000 cut in the budget is going to be \$30 per house.

Mr. Brannon stated compared to last summer, the things I have seen and heard in the neighborhood, this summer has been a lot better. Whatever you have done has worked, but I also applaud the idea of looking at more Sheriff's officers. I would encourage you to explore using the Sheriff's deputies more and Giddens less.

Ms. Hitchcock stated I noticed in the last minutes they were supposed to put in checkpoints for Giddens. Are the checkpoints in and have we been receiving those reports?

Mr. Yuro responded yes, I checked on that. I went to look at where they were at and I couldn't see them. I went with a GMS representative and it's like a magnetic chip about the size of a dime and it electronically reads when they go through there. There's one outside this building and a couple in the back of some of the cul-de-sacs and on certain light poles. They get out of their car and it reads it. GMS gets the reports.

Ms. Hitchcock stated when we first started with them we saw them on our street often, now you never see them. Do we know if there is a checkpoint at Stonehedge and Crosspoint?

Mr. Oliver responded we will check.

Mr. Yuro stated I would think that would have been one of the places we requested.

Ms. Borguessen stated I really think the security has helped. I have never really seen Giddens driving around, but I'm not out maybe when they are out. I love the Sheriff's department being here. I live right on the corner of Remington Court and St. Johns Golf Drive and as soon as the sun goes down the stop sign becomes invisible because everybody flies through it. When the Sheriff sits on Remington Court it's night and day. The other question I

had was on the reserve capital fund in the budget. Do you project that amount to be an annual amount or do you project it to go up at a certain rate each year to fund the capital projects? Do you have a list of potential capital projects and what the expenses are? In other homeowner's associations I have been a part of we've done it that way.

Mr. Oliver stated this year there is going to be a depreciation study done with all the District assets. The capital reserve set aside after this year, after the \$220,000, will be much less, unless through the study it's determined something needs to be replaced real quick. We are not aware of that and the roads seem to be in good shape. This year, for instance, you would be putting aside \$20,000 for capital reserve and that's on top of the \$220,000.

Ms. Borguessen stated once you have the study done I would rather have a larger budget carried forward so there's not a need for a special assessment five years down the road.

Mr. Oliver asked is there any Board discussion on the budget? If not, I will ask for a motion to close the public hearing.

On MOTION by Mr. Yuro seconded by Ms. Griffey with all in favor the public hearing was closed.

**A. Consideration of Resolution 2008-03, Relating to the Annual Appropriations and Adopting the Budget for Fiscal Year 2009**

Mr. Oliver stated behind Tabs A and B you have two resolutions. One is adopting the budget and the other is imposing special assessments and certifying an assessment roll. Is there any discussion regarding the budget? If not, we would adopt the budget through adoption of Resolution 2008-03, which is adopting the budget for Fiscal Year 2009.

On MOTION by Mr. Petkoski seconded by Mr. Yuro with all in favor Resolution 2008-03 adopting the budget for Fiscal Year 2009 was adopted.

**B. Consideration of Resolution 2008-04, Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll**

Mr. Oliver stated the next resolution is based on that budget imposing special assessments and certifying an assessment roll to go to the St. Johns County Tax Collector. Is there a motion to approve Resolution 2008-04?

On MOTION by Mr. Yuro seconded by Ms. Griffey with all in favor Resolution 2008-04 was adopted.

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Berger, Toombs, Elam, Gaines & Frank Engagement Letter to Perform FY08 Audit Services**

Mr. Oliver stated the next order of business is consideration of the engagement letter from Berger, Toombs, Elam, Gaines & Frank to perform the audit of the FY08 financials. You selected this audit firm through the RFP process. They provided the letter you have in your agenda package to perform that audit for \$5,750. I ask for a motion approving the engagement letter.

On MOTION by Mr. Sheppard seconded by Mr. Petkoski with all in favor the engagement letter from Berger, Toombs, Elam, Gaines & Frank to perform the FY08 audit was approved.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Designation of Date of Public Hearing to Adopt Revised Rules of Procedure in Accordance with Chapter 120.54, Florida Statutes**

Mr. Oliver stated the next order of business is designation of date of public hearing to adopt Revised Rules of Procedure in accordance with Chapter 120.54 of the Florida Statutes.

Mr. Haber stated when this District was first established, however many years ago, the Board held an organizational meeting, at which time it adopts a number of items including Rules of Procedure for the District. Those are rules that our firm drafted a number of years ago and they have pretty much went unrevised for a long time. We recently did an overhaul of the rules to bring them up to date to the laws as they are now. These rules govern the manner in which the District meets, how it needs to procure certain contracts, and generally governs the general operations of the District. These rules need to be adopted at a public hearing. As you may know, we represent a number of Districts throughout the entire state, and we have for every District we represent, are recommending the Districts adopt these new updated rules, which essentially bring the rules current with Florida Law. In some cases we sought to, to the District's benefit, revised the rules for more efficient operation. I would recommend that between now and whatever date you set the public hearing for, take a look at the rules and let me know if you have

any questions. I believe our office has a redline version of the new rules versus the old rules, so you can actually see the changes we made. I will get that to District Management and have that circulated to you so you can see the specific changes that were made. At this point it's just a matter of approving a public hearing date. As Jim mentioned, Turfection has gone out of business. We are going to need to begin the RFP process again, and it may make sense to try and coincide the meeting for the RFP process with the public hearing to adopt the rules. This requires a 28 and 29 day notice.

Mr. Oliver stated you have a meeting set for September 24 at 4:00. There is no meeting scheduled for October. I would like to move the September meeting to October 22. That would give us time to go through the RFP process as well as notice the public hearing for the Rules of Procedure. That would be October 22, 2008 at 6:00 p.m. at this location and would be the fourth Wednesday of October. Can we have a motion designation the date of public hearing as October 22, 2008 at 6:00 p.m.

On MOTION by Mr. Yuro seconded by Ms. Griffey with all in favor setting the public hearing date to adopt Revised Rules of Procedure for October 22, 2008 at 6:00 p.m. was approved.
---

## **EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Discussion of Landscape Maintenance RFP**

Mr. Oliver stated the next item is discussion of landscape maintenance RFP. We touched about this a little bit during the budget discussion. Turfection is no longer in the business so we are going to have to fill that void through the RFP process. You have been through that process before. What happens is the Board would select evaluation criteria, appoint a committee to review proposals, and authorize staff to issue a Request for Proposals. Those proposals would come back in and the committee would review and rank those proposals and bring them back to the full Board for selection. Once we talk about the RFP process we will talk about using an interim maintainer until we go through the RFP process and contract with the new vendor. I have put a package in front of you which is a scope of services and RFP package we used last time. With the scope of services you have evaluation criteria that you will use to rank proposals including price, experience, personnel, and understanding scope of work.

Mr. Haber stated this is what we used last time, and from what I recall it worked well. Those are commonly the criteria we use.

Mr. Oliver stated if you are comfortable with those criteria I ask for a motion approving the evaluation criteria for the RFP process.

On MOTION by Mr. Petkoski seconded by Mr. Yuro with all in favor the evaluation criteria was approved.

Mr. Oliver stated the last time we had a landscape RFP committee it consisted of Supervisors Mike Yuro and John Thibault, as well as Rich Whetsel, the operations director. Do you want to go with the same committee? If so, I'll take a motion appointing those three as committee members.

On MOTION by Mr. Petkoski seconded by Mr. Sheppard with all in favor appointing Mike Yuro, John Thibault, and Rich Whetsel to the landscape maintenance RFP committee was approved.

Mr. Oliver stated we asked for a motion from the Board to authorize staff to initiate the RFP process.

On MOTION by Mr. Sheppard seconded by Ms. Griffey with all in favor authorizing staff to initiate the landscape RFP process was approved.

Mr. Oliver stated the committee can work directly with the operations people to fine tune the scope of services if anything needs to change since we last approved it. In the meantime, we will notice the RFP immediately and get that going and bring back the proposals to the committee a week or so before the next Board meeting. LMI has agreed to perform landscape maintenance on an interim basis until we go through the RFP process. They have agreed to perform those basis services at the same price structure that Turfection did. We ask that the Board authorize that interim agreement.

Mr. Haber asked would LMI be willing to sign, for the two months they are actually out there, the contract we had with Turfection, just to get the District the protection of the

indemnification, rather than relying on the one page letter? That would be my preference and my recommendation that we have the formal agreement signed.

Mr. Whetsel responded I'm sure that would be no problem.

Mr. Oliver stated we need a motion allowing the interim agreement with LMI, subject to approval of the contract form by attorney, Chairman, or Vice Chairman.

On MOTION by Mr. Yuro seconded by Mr. Petkoski with all in favor interim agreement with LMI subject to approval of contract form by counsel, Chairman, or Vice Chairman was approved.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Other Business**

There not being any, the next item followed.

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Staff Reports**

**A. Attorney**

There not being any, the next item followed.

**B. Engineer**

There not being any, the next item followed.

**C. Manager**

There not being any, the next item followed.

**D. Art of Living Director**

Ms. Mickelson stated the upholstery was replaced on Monday for the five pieces of fitness equipment. I have been wrapping up the summer programs and I'm working on the Fall Festival, which will be October 18.

Mr. Petkoski asked were the summer camps received as well as they always have been?

Ms. Mickelson responded yes.

**E. Operations Manager**

Mr. Benoit stated storm prep was completed by GMS on August 20. We moved all the patio furniture, trash cans, tennis court wind screens, signs, and flags. The landscape company was put on standby for tree removal and debris cleanup. We are doing debris cleanup right now and should have the wind screens put back up tomorrow. The pool deck is open. If you have any questions I would be glad to answer them.

**ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS            Supervisor's Requests**

There not being any, the next item followed.

**TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS            Audience Comments**

Ms. Adams stated our house is on the back lake on Meadowview. We have made lots of phone calls to lots of people and have been told there is nothing we can do about the fact that it consistently stays four or five feet below the grass line, which then breeds scum and garbage. Even with all the rain it just made it to the grass line and is starting to drop. It's bad enough looking at the ugly lake, but the grass gets up. All the other lakes seem to stay mowed, and I know we are kind of off the beaten path. Usually it gets done when we call, but we always have to call.

Mr. Oliver stated first, let me apologize for the second thing you brought up. We will try to make it our goal for you to never have to call again for something like that. No one should be ignored if they are off the beaten path. We will do better. I will have to defer the other issue to the engineer.

Ms. Adams stated my husband has talked to him. I see the other lakes get down a little bit and you can see a little below the grass line, but ours is bad. If I would have known that's the way it was going to be I would have never paid a premium to live on the lake. It's so ugly.

Mr. Oliver stated we will get in contact with the engineer. I don't know which engineer you talked with.

Ms. Adams stated he told us that's the way it was set up.

Mr. Oliver stated we recently got a new engineer for the District and we will bring it to his attention.

A Resident (Tom) stated like Denise, I have called and you have responded very quickly. The lake we back up to is 14, 15, and 16. The issue is the algae and the vegetation. I look at the other lakes, and I'm not going to sit here and tell you it's the worst lake, but it's one of the worst looking lakes in the community. We were fishing the other day, and I should have taken a picture, by the time we got the fish up it was completely covered in algae. I don't know if we caught it too late and it's now taking a lot of applications, but if we could nuke that lake somehow and still keep the fish alive, that would be my request. It's unsightly.

Mr. Oliver stated both Tom and Denise, if you could get with Emile after the meeting and give him your contact information so we can get with Lake Doctors as well as the engineering firm to see what else we can do with both issues.

Mr. Sears stated I want to know who approves the selection of the colors of the paint on the houses.

Mr. Oliver stated that is the HOA. This Board has no jurisdiction.

**THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS      Financial Reports**

**A.    Balance Sheet as of July 31, 2008 and Statement of Revenues & Expenditures for the Period Ending July 31, 2008**

Mr. Oliver stated behind Tab A is the balance sheet as of July 31, 2008 as well as a statement of revenues and expenditures for the period ending July 31, 2008. These are unaudited and will be audited at the end of the fiscal year.

**B.    Check Run Summary**

Mr. Oliver stated behind Tab B is a check run summary for the period ending August 20, 2008. Those are checks No. 2179 through 2221.

On MOTION by Ms. Griffey seconded by Mr. Yuro with all in favor the check run summary was approved.
---

**C.    Special Assessment Receipts**

Mr. Oliver stated behind Tab C, which is incredible news, probably the best of all the districts I have seen, your special receipts schedule you are 102% collect, which means you are fully collected. The reason it is over the 100% is some people don't take advantage of the November 30 4% discount.

Mr. Petkoski asked what is a typical number?

Mr. Oliver responded I have seen a lot in the low 90%, unfortunately there are some in the 80%. That's still compares very favorably to some HOAs, but this is a real good number.

**FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS      Next Scheduled Meeting –10/22/08 at 6:00 p.m. @ the Swim Club Meeting Room**

Mr. Oliver stated the next meeting is scheduled for October 22, 2008 at 6:00 p.m. at this location. Is there a motion to adjourn?

On MOTION by Mr. Yuro seconded by Mr. Petkoski with all in favor the meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

---

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

---

Chairman/Vice Chairman