

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, August 14, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. at the Fruit Cove Middle School, 3180 Race Track Road, St. Johns, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Susan S. Beaugrand	Chairperson
Kathleen P. Minnis	Vice Chairman
Al Abbatiello	Assistant Secretary
April Spears	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

James Oliver	District Manager
Jonathan Johnson	District Counsel
Matt Maggione	District Engineer
Mike Lucas	Basham Design Group
Chris Commins	Basham Design Group
Stuart Maxwell	Dicky Smith Company
Stacie Hernandez	Julington Creek CDD
Laura Callahan	Julington Creek CDD
Shelly Timbol	Julington Creek CDD
Ashley McVeigh	Julington Creek CDD

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Ms. Beaugrand called the meeting to order.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of July 10, 2007 Meeting

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next item is approval of the minutes of the July 10, 2007 meeting. Are there any additions, corrections or deletions?

There not being any,

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Mr. Abbatiello with all in favor the minutes of the July 10, 2007 meeting were approved as presented.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Hearing Adopting the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next item on the agenda is the public hearing to adopt the budget for fiscal year 2008.

Mr. Johnson stated by way of procedure it would be appropriate to have a motion to open the public hearing and have some preliminary matters to deal with and then we can get into the meat of the agenda item.

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

Mr. Johnson stated just a couple of housekeeping items. I will ask Mr. Oliver to confirm that tonight's public hearing has been properly noticed in accordance with Chapters 190 and 197 and that the appropriate proofs of publication are on file.

Mr. Oliver responded yes they are.

Mr. Johnson stated I will also ask for confirmation that a copy of tonight's budget has been delivered to St. Johns County 60 days prior to tonight's hearing as required by statute?

Mr. Oliver responded yes it has.

Mr. Johnson stated we are proposing to conduct tonight's public hearing just as you have each of your prior public hearings in previous budget years. Initially you will have a presentation from Mr. Oliver with some portions of that also handled by Ms. Beaugrand as to the budget what is included and what is not included and how we got to this point in time here today. At that point after the staff presentation we propose to have board discussion. After the board discussion concludes we will open it up for any audience comments or questions.

There are comment cards located on the table at the back of the room. If you wish to make a comment fill in the comment card and bring it up here to Stacie and we will get to those. We are asking everybody in the interest of time to keep your comments to three minutes. If someone has already made the same comment that you wish to make it is not necessary to repeat them. If you have questions come up here and we will put another microphone down here and if

you have questions read them into the record and at the conclusion of audience comments we will then have staff address those questions and bring it back to the board for any decision-making or final action.

Mr. Oliver stated if anyone has a cell phone if you will turn it off one would appreciate that. There are a lot of people here tonight so we would appreciate it if only one person would talk at a time. We record these meetings so that we can publish minutes and it makes it a lot easier for the person preparing the minutes if only one person talks at a time. As you can tell it is already a challenge to be heard. Jonathan has covered the comment card process so if you fill these out we would appreciate it.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I am going to over a little bit of the history of what we worked through over the last five years. I think it was back in 2002 where we started talking about adding an additional recreation center to Julington Creek Plantation. In doing so we created an ad hoc committee that included both residents as well as members of the board at that point in time. The group took a lot of time in looking at different options from a land perspective as to where the location could be and we also looked at different options as to the types of activities as well as facilities that the residents would want to see in a new recreation center. We did a survey of the entire community at that time. If my recollection is correct we sent out over 3,000 surveys to the existing owners at that point in time. We received approximately 1,200 back with overwhelming support to go forward with the recreation center and we prioritized from those surveys the types of activities and facilities that we ultimately designed and what you see in the back of the room is what we have been talking about effectively over the last four years when we hired Basham & Lucas as our architect in 2003.

Our land search took about four years longer than we anticipated. We had the two parcels that we ultimately purchased identified. The second parcel where the larger building will be located we had purchased from Rayonier and we were at the point of contracting on that site and they did a corporate change from a corporation to a REIT and held us up for two years before we were allowed to actually put that parcel under contract. This has ended up being a very, very protracted process, much longer than any of us would have liked to have gone through.

Over the last two to three years we have gone through the complete design process, planning programs and budgeting for those programs as far as revenues and expenses are

concerned. Two weeks ago Dicky Smith & Co. was able to go forward and start clearing the site as many of you may have noticed off of Durbin Creek Boulevard.

One of the things we did was refinance the existing bonds we had issued in 2002 in an effort to take advantage of the much lower interest rate market that was in existence at the time and we were also able to get a credit rating for the district which allowed us to get a very exceptionally low rate and that gave us some excess assessments that we collected over time that has also gone in to help pay for the land acquisition that we have already done and the purchase of the administration building as well as a lot of the upfront costs that we have expended to date.

The other thing we did talk about was making an effort to keep the assessments as low as possible taking into consideration that no one wants to pay any more than we have to but also trying to balance out the inadequacy of the recreational facilities that the developer originally put in to the Plantation.

To give a little bit of history on the assessments our budget for 2007 had an assessment of \$488. In November the board made the decision to go ahead and issue the bonds for the construction of this recreation facility and at that point in time we held a public hearing and approved an additional assessment of \$139 a year for a single family homeowner. Just to use the single family as kind of the example here because it is much easier to use one property type than multiple.

Then what we have been doing since that point in time is refining the programs, the design of the project and the budget to come up with what we are going to recommend to you tonight as an additional assessment that relates to operating of the facility. Then part of the budget that you will hear Jim talk about tonight includes a lot of start up costs that we have had to budget to get the supplies necessary, to get the staff, onsite training, all of those things that you need to start up any business that you may have ever been involved in. There are a lot of upfront costs included in the budget that you see tonight that will not be in future budgets. There will be other expenses that will take their place as we have a full year of operation going forward in 2008/2009.

It is not expected that this facility will be delivered for use to the community until 12 months from when the contractor is able to start construction on the building itself. They are currently clearing the site, we are hoping they will be able to start vertical construction next month as we get the permit from St. Johns County so the timeline estimate from that point on

would be a year from September giving a delivery of the facility probably September of next year which is very close to the end of our fiscal year which is September 30. We are budgeting probably three months worth of operations for a safeguard in case they are exceptional contractors and get it done early. There may be parts of the facility that we do have to start maintaining a little bit earlier as they get other parts of it completely finished. Taking that into consideration and taking into consideration that there will likely be additional discussion about assessments going on next year as we replace some of those upfront costs within our annual operating costs that we have already estimated and we have a good feel for a range of where they will be. Through our discussion tonight we will talk about all of that. We will give you an idea of where we are today and where we think we are going to be tomorrow. Keeping in mind that we have worked through this process for a solid five years with a lot of thought with a lot of input from a lot of people who are in this room, a lot of professionals that we have hired to do the best they can do to assist us like Basham & Lucas, England Thims & Miller, Dicky Smith, Hopping Green and GMS, etc. This is not anything we take lightly. We are all residents too. This is our home and we are concerned about the marketability of our property just like you are. There are a lot of new projects coming in around us that have great facilities. We want to make sure that we are still thought of as the premier residential development and at that point in time when you go to sell your home we don't want anything to detract from it. With that being said I am going to turn it back to Jim to go through the budget overview.

Mr. Oliver stated the first thing I want to do is remind everyone that in June the board approved the proposed budget and that sets this process into motion and at that time we set tonight's public hearing. When we set that, this hearing had to be at least 60 days after the approval of the proposed budget. You received mailed notice for the first time in a long time because the assessments are going up. Mailed notice is required when the assessments are proposed to increase and that is why you received the notice. During that 60 day period staff has been working to refine that budget and look for a way to reduce the costs and there have been some reductions since the budget was originally proposed.

The debt portion of the budget has already been determined. Those bonds were issued in December 2006 and for the single family home the assessment is \$139. In addition to the existing bonds which were refinanced in 2002, the series 2006 bonds were issued. The 2006 bonds were approximately \$14.5 million.

I want to talk a little bit about budget adoption. There are a couple of documents on the back table. One is the actual proposed budget and the other is a summary of assessments. I want to go through these so you will know where we are.

If you go to page 1 you will see the proposed general fund budget and that is broken into revenues and expenditures. Across the top you will see five columns, the adopted budget for fiscal year 2007 which is the budget year we are in right now. That is what was adopted this time last year. Then we took the actuals through June 30th which was nine months into the budget year then based on that we projected the next three months so the fourth column is what we project for the end of this fiscal year with excess revenues of approximately \$90,000. If you look at the next column you will see \$89,799 at the very top. That excess revenue flows right through to the carry forward surplus. If you look at the total administrative costs you will see that the budget is essentially the same, it goes from \$148,000 to \$158,000. There are some basic cost of living increases. If you look at the next column you will see the total field expenses and that drops from \$315,243 to \$243,000. You will see a decrease in capital reserve from \$140,000 to \$68,049. That is for two reasons, you have a larger increase in capital reserve for the recreation fund which we will go into next but another reason it went down this year is we felt we had ample reserves. The last column under operating reserve the same reasoning for example operating reserves already in the fund and also you will have operating reserves in the recreation fund which is the largest fund. That is the administrative budget for the district. There are four budgets overall.

If you turn to page 5 that is the proposed recreation fund budget and you will see the same columns but you will see quite a few items for revenue and most of those line items weren't there last year. If you look down the column for the adopted budget you will see a lot of zeros. A lot of this revenue is associated with opening of the new facility with the programs that are going to be offered there. Most of these programs will be funded at least part or fully from the revenues they generate. Then you have the expenditures. Many of those stayed the same.

Further down in the administrative field you will start to see the impact. The bottom part of this budget is for the opening of the new recreation center. Also later on we will have a discussion about the recreation facilities as we do at every one of these meetings.

I will call your attention to the first column showing the adopted budget for fiscal year 2007. You will see a lot of zeros in that column because we didn't have these expenses last year, these are going to be new expenses associated with the recreation facility.

I talked earlier about the operating reserves that is for line items under total field towards the bottom of the budget. We had \$50,000 last year and this next year we are going to have \$579,917. It is going to be a massive undertaking. In addition to insurance coverage, we have to have adequate reserves in case of hurricane or other catastrophic type occurrences.

At the bottom you will see three line items for assessments. There is a 2% collection cost that the county charges to collect these assessments on the tax bill. There is also a discount. Each year when you receive your tax bill November 1, you have the opportunity to pay it November 30, December 31, January 31, and February 28 and if you pay by those deadlines you will receive a corresponding 4%, 3%, 2% or 1% discount. The same holds true of your assessments. Your assessments are one line item on the tax bill that you received from the county tax collector. There is one line item that says non ad valorem assessments Julington Creek Plantation CDD. This is the combined assessment for your debt and O&M.

I received many calls on the letter noticing this public hearing. The letter we drafted may have been somewhat confusing. Some people thought this was an HOA letter.

As you go further into the budget you will see two other budgets in there. On page 11 is the debt service fund budget for the series 2002 bond. These are bonds that were in effect in 1996 and 1997 and refinanced in 2002 to take advantage of a credit rating and the very low interest rates. This is what you see each year on your debt assessment for single family it would be \$1,485.

On page 13 you will see the debt service fund for the bond issue we just did in 2006.

This is the overall budget with the budget numbers if you will look at the other sheet this is a summary of the assessment for a single family home. A resident suggested that we put frequently asked questions and answers on the website and that was good advice. On the bottom half of the last page of the FAQ sheets, you will see two different product types, single family and multi-family. For for fiscal year 2007, the O&M assessment was of \$274.05 and the 2002 series was \$215 for a total assessment of \$488.90. Coming into this year for the single family the O&M would be \$325.56 which would be a \$50 increase that we are talking about tonight. The 2002 bond stays the same at \$215 and the new issue is \$139 in debt for a total of \$689.56.

The total increase is proposed to be approximately \$190. That kind of lays out the budget. We can get into line items later as we get into public comment and also the board discussion but that is where we are at right now.

When we get into public comment we will call your name from the card and put the microphone so that the person can be heard in the audience.

I want to be clear that tonight is about the O&M. We have already issued the bonds, we had a public hearing and the bond debt is increased by \$139 for a single family home. Tonight is to come to a decision about what the O&M will be for fiscal year 2008.

Ms. Beaugrand stated at this point in time we are going to start out with board discussion. I want to go ahead and mention one thing. Al has certainly had some concerns about the O&M and he did mention and I think a lot of you probably saw the article in the newspaper over the weekend where he had a concern about having the \$50 increase that we are discussing tonight and one of the solutions he came up with was to potentially sell the administrative building. I wanted to go ahead and address that upfront. I have had a lot of discussions with staff about it and my feeling on it is it is not something we should do at this time. The board took a lot of discussion and consideration when we originally purchased that building and took into consideration as we completed the design of the recreation facility as to whether we would include additional office space in that facility in that we were talking about purchasing the administrative building. We ended up not adding the additional space to that building because we do have the space within the administrative building that we are using at this point in time. It would have added additional cost to the construction to build out that space and add additional restroom facilities to that property compared to as it stands right now. There is no other place for us to put the staff if we were to go forward and choose to try to dispose of the property. The space that we originally thought about using for office space in the new recreation center is on either side of the fitness center. That space is now being taken up by the mechanical equipment being used to run HVAC and the like to run the facility so that space is no longer available so if the board were to take action to sell that building we would have an issue as to where to put the administrative staff that we have right now because there is not enough space to accommodate them in the new recreation facility by design because that is why we purchased the building in the first place.

The other thing to take into consideration is that building pays for itself. The revenues that we generate out of that building with the programs we are running there effectively cover the costs. The annual cost of operating that building is about \$65,000 a year and we are covering that pretty much dollar for dollar at this point in time. I just wanted to go ahead and address that issue from staff.

The other thing that I want to remind the supervisors of we had a discussion last November about different financing scenarios when we were getting ready to issue the bonds. We had precollected assessments over the years after we refinanced the bonds in 2002 with the anticipation of using those moneys to offset the costs associated with the new facility we are discussing tonight. We also had a little windfall when we went to get the credit rating in October/November where we were able to get all of the debt service reserve released from the original bonds. That gave us an extra \$700,000 worth of cash in our hands to be able to help finance the cost of the facility along with about \$1 million we had on hand and then we also had budgeted in the construction a 10% contingency between \$900,000 and \$1 million. When we did the estimate of the cost of construction done by England Thims & Miller for the construction to determine how much the bonds were they had estimated the cost to be in about the \$12 million range and by design they estimated high because we didn't want to end up in a shortfall situation. Once we went out for bid the bid came in a little over \$2 million lower than that so those are moneys we had budgeted within the bonds prior to when we went to contract with Dicky Smith & Co. Effectively, we have cash reserves or over budgeting within our budget of almost \$5 ½ million. Those are moneys that this board will not to decide what to do with ultimately until the construction is done. Those are contingency funds if we have cost over runs, if we find it would be prudent to make some update modifications to the existing swim pool facility, those things could be taken into consideration out of those moneys but we could end up taking whatever of that \$5 ½ million is left over once the construction is completely done and take those funds and repay the bonds and what that ultimately will do is reduce the assessments to all of us. The approximate reduction is about \$10 per million dollars. Of the \$139 that the recreation building bonds total the debt service totals for the recreation bonds we could effectively reduce that assessment depending on how much money we do refund back to the bondholder anywhere from zero to \$55. That is not a decision that we will make until the construction is 100% done because we certainly want to make sure that we have the funds sufficient to complete it the way

you and everyone else in our community wants to see that facility completed. But I did want you to know that that is an opportunity that we have. We are all well aware of it. We have tried over the past five years of working through this to be very prudent from a fiscal responsibility standpoint. It is your money, it is my money and I don't think anyone has taken it lightly as to how much money we are spending here but it is for a wonderful community and it is going to be a wonderful facility.

I am going to open up discussion to the board at this point in time. After we go through any questions and comments that we have we will then open it up to the floor and everyone will have their fair chance to ask whatever questions you desire.

Mr. Abbatiello stated thank you very much for that summary I thought it was excellent. It is heartening to know that there will certainly be some moneys left over. We know for a fact that there is going to be at least something on the order of \$2 million left over from construction at least we anticipate that. The difference between the bonds that we issued and the bid from the construction contractor, Dicky Smith. That \$2 million if left over according to Jonathan Johnson must be returned. There is no option. As Susan talked about the reserves that are there that we can potentially use in case of over runs is great. The anticipated potential increase in O&M assessments in the fiscal year 2008/2009 may not actually occur. That really has been my primary concern. From the beginning of the process I was concerned and that is one of the reasons I ran for election to the CDD board to begin with is how a CDD uses money and how they can tax and they don't necessarily have to go through you other than the budget process to pass additional assessments yet this board because we are all residents definitely take that as our duty to be sure that all the residents are apprised and aware of what we are doing. My concerns have always been trying to limit the expenses yet provide a facility that the community will be proud of. I know for a fact that this facility when completed will be a plus for the entire community and actually will increase values. If you look at other communities around us such as Aberdeen, Durbin and other communities their assessments start at double what we will be when this facility is completed. I think we definitely have a value yet we still have to be a watch dog. I know we originally started off with a 13,000 square foot building and we can now have a 16,000 square foot building. I didn't like that increase but it happened and I did agree with it because we needed it to provide the programs that we thought were essential to this community and then when we purchased the administration building I felt it was not appropriate since we

were going to be building a 16,000 square foot building and at that point I was out voted four to one but again it is a democratic society and we accept those things. That is really where it is at and my concern and my statement as I mentioned to Mark Pettus of the St. Johns Sun is that if it were possible to sell the administrative building that we purchased for \$850,000 that would reduce some of our O&M costs at some time in the future. After having a discussion with Stacie a few days ago I understood a little better the budget issue that she had this year in start up costs. That drove up the O&M costs more than I thought they would plus there were some misunderstandings in previous meetings that I wasn't clear enough in stating that O&M was in addition to the \$140 that we did agree to when we did the bonds. That is where I stand. I would like to say that I will continue to try to be a watch dog over expenses and hopefully once we get into the new facility with the programs that Stacie has planned that we will see enough revenue plus the savings of the bond money in construction that we will hopefully not have to increase the O&M costs next year. I think you all need to be vigilant and be at some more of our meetings particularly when we get into the budgeting time of the year so that you become more familiar with exactly what we are talking about and not just rely on word of mouth and all of a sudden be surprised when a notice comes out that your assessments are going to go up. I don't like the increase maybe you don't either but on the other hand we have a facility that we need to build and it will be an asset to the entire community and we ask for your indulgence or at least I do. Thank you.

Ms. Beaugrand stated one thing I want to clarify is we have talked a little bit about what might occur next year. The process that Stacie and her staff has gone through in order to help develop the budget before you is to effectively do the whole budget for 2008/2009 and then take that budget and work backwards for a partial year for 2007/2008. We have already in our hands a working budget for the next fiscal year. Obviously, over the next fiscal year we are going to continue to refine that budget coming up with revenue generating opportunities, looking for ways that we can continue to pare down the costs as much as possible and some of that isn't going to be able to happen until we get into the facility and see what the residents want. There may be programs that Stacie has planned that are overwhelming successes and there may be others that are a little lackluster and we are going to be fluid in responding to what the community wants in making sure that we maximize our staff and money that we have to spend for what the community wants. With that in mind while we are talking about a \$51.50 increase in the O&M

for this year what we are talking about next year is in a range of anywhere potentially from \$50 to \$75 keeping in mind that once we do finish construction there is an opportunity for us to offset that additional O&M cost with a reduction in the debt service. It is not a definite but it is definitely an opportunity. Al is right that we are all very vigilant in making sure that we are doing the right things and it is great to see everybody here because we normally don't have that many people at our meetings. It is important for all of us to know exactly what is going on, on an ongoing basis so that you are not surprised by things that you might see in the paper or mailed notices that come out.

Ms. Minnis stated I want to give some people some background also on the building. The building was originally zoned commercial and when the building went up for sale by the developer there was an overwhelming response from the community to this board to purchase it to not allow any facility that was commercial to go there. There were a lot of residents that were given misinformation by the realtors that that building would eventually be a recreation center and when they heard the building was up for sale they began questioning. We were encouraged by more residents than not to buy that building and it is open for use and for rental. There are rules around it but we aren't the only people using it.

Ms. Beaugrand stated at this point in time we are going to open it up to public comment. I have the comment cards that have already been filled out. We have numbered them by when we received them so everyone gets their priority. We are going to ask again that if someone has already mentioned the comment that you wanted to make just say I pass. We do ask again that you hold your comments to three minutes as well. Our first speaker is Katey Stuart. The second speaker so you will be ready is Spann Gertrud.

Ms. Stuart stated I would like everybody to know that we have lived here since 2002 and since that time we have been attending CDD and POA meetings and are well aware of the due diligence that has been paid by the CDD in keeping costs down where necessary. I appreciate that and I think we have a wonderful complex coming. We have been scouting the new neighborhoods going in and we are amazed at the charges that those people are facing as they buy their new homes. The minimum we found were double our charges. I would like to say I was not a supporter of the skate park part of our new amenity center but over the course of the five years skateboarding is really exploding again. Even though we will have a small park in the new county facility it will not be enough to handle our teenagers and our young people here. I

think that will be a great added incentive for a lot of families to come here because it will be within walking distance. I just think it is very good. Don't sell the other building definitely, it is being used and it will be a great place for seniors to have things going on. A lot of the new amenity center is geared towards family.

Ms. Span Gertrud stated I have a question about the 2002 and 2006 bonds and when we have to pay every year.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is an annual number and the term of the CDD bond is a 30 year bond in total.

Ms. Gertrud asked will this be every year?

Ms. Beaugrand asked the debt service part of it?

Ms. Gertrud responded yes.

Ms. Beaugrand stated yes.

Ms. Gertrud stated so every year it is going to be \$700 or even more?

Ms. Beaugrand responded it is hard to project what is going to happen in the future, the numbers could go up the numbers could go down. Any time we have a change in the assessment we have to do a public hearing similar to what we are doing tonight.

Ms. Gertrud stated that is lien against the homeowners all the time?

Ms. Beaugrand responded it is not an official lien but it is an assessment against your home until the bonds are retired.

Ms. Gertrud stated I bought my home in 2000 and there was nothing against this.

Mr. Johnson responded there was a lien on the property as of 1996 for the original bonds that were in place to build the recreation center and the roads and you should have received in your chain of title, in your title insurance an exception.

Ms. Gertrud responded it is all clear. I was told that the CDD cannot put a lien against you without your being notified.

Mr. Johnson stated when this board undertook in 2002 and in 2006 to first refund its bonds and then issue new bonds individual mailed notice was provided to all property owners.

Ms. Gertrud responded I was not. There was no one before me and I find this very sad that it took this long for me to find out that there is a lien on my home.

Mr. Johnson stated I think we would all agree with that.

Ms. Gertrud stated you have retired people living on limited income you also have homeowners with half million dollar homes but everybody pays the same for this new thing, I also think it is a crime.

Mr. Bill Kirk stated I wanted to come here tonight to commend the board on a tremendous amount of really hard work on what I feel is a first class facility. As a resident, husband and father and vice president of one of the swim teams I wholeheartedly support it. I think it is a wonderful addition to the community. I had a prepared statement tonight that I think all of those things have already been said. The only thing I want to add is the fact that when I do the math \$51.51 divided by 365 days is 14¢ a day.

Ms. Kathy Bravo stated I think this is a tremendous value to this community. We have other areas coming in that are going to build fabulous facilities for their residents. If we do not have something that makes us competitive we will be passed over for resale of our homes. For those of you who do not have small children myself included, my youngest is 20 and I have never even walked into the pool complex but I know for a fact that for the resale of my home I have to have it available for the next homeowner. As far as sharing costs evenly I have 2 kids that are grown and I pay the same amount of money as those who have a lot of kids using the facilities, however, it doesn't matter if you have 5 kids using the facility or no kids using the facility it will benefit everybody's home equally. This was all explained when we bought our homes. It is in our statements that we got. It is something that was approved, I have been at many meetings as well and watched the approval process. These people have put in a tremendous amount of hard work with no pay for our benefit. I think they should be commended for a fabulous job.

Ms. Denise Dancull stated I am a divorced parent and raising a middle schooler who attends this school and I have been in the pool about six times with regard to the whole issue to fairness and equity of use. My concerns are more than my own personal preferences. I think we are more interested in accumulative impact of approximately \$200 increase for everybody that is anticipated to have \$140+ \$50. I think the other issue to bear in mind is fiscal responsibility even though there is a very different situation at this point in time in our housing market than what was anticipated when this was first discussed five years ago. We have the mortgage crises, declining home sales. I know in my neighborhood houses are on the market for more than six months. My neighbor is asking less than what they paid in December 2005 because of the new

home construction and people would rather buy a new home than an existing home. I'm also concerned that although there may be more expensive assessments in other developments there are also cheaper assessments where people can buy without much of an assessment increase. I would like the board to consider that in terms of any future decisions.

Mr. David Taus stated I am also the president of the POA of Julington Creek Plantation. I notice that there is a difference between the single family home and the multi-family and I know I brought this up at a prior meeting. Today I looked at the Florida Statute and having a different assessment for the use of that recreational facility does not seem to be supported by the statute. If you want to distinguish between classes of users I could see the difference between a resident and a commercial property but I cannot see a distinction between a single family and a multi-family residence. I would hope that the board would address that and I would be glad to give you the section of law.

Regarding the existing administrative building I was not very pleased to see that building purchased because I believed it would be under utilized. As president of the POA who has attempted to use that building and have been basically shut out of it, we were told we could have meetings there but they would have to commence after 5:00 p.m. which is not when we start our meetings. We have asked to post our meeting notices on the board, we were told we don't want to do that, we want to do what is for us. We have a certain amount of materials and paint stored on the property behind the building and we were told to get it out. From the POA's perspective we have received no benefit from that building and since we represent all of the residents we feel they have not received the benefit as well.

Looking at the budget I'm confused about who does what for the CDD. Looking in your budget explanation is that England Thims & Miller in charge of the assessment roll and they have a hand in the accounting but they are an engineering firm. I don't understand why they are providing that function while we are paying for the services of a management company.

Ms. Beaugrand stated ETM in the past has always done our assessment rolls. This year we changed it in the fiscal budget we are looking at now and it is going to GMS. That is a change. That function was not duplicated between ETM and GMS or any other entity at any point in time in the prior history of the CDD.

Mr. Taus stated my last point is the actual administration of the recreation center. There is some concern by residents myself included and I have heard from other people that the board

should address other ways to administer that building such as outsourcing it to other companies to provide those kinds of recreation services. I'm not sure what they do in Eagle Harbor or Heritage Landing but I believe they have an outside party.

Ms. Beaugrand responded I know Eagle Harbor does not.

Mr. Taus asked has the board looked at that on trying to get a look at the qualifications versus keeping it in-house which I think exposes us to a lot more risk if Stacie should decide she wants to leave where are you all?

Ms. Hernandez stated this is our first year of running the facility. We kept 100% of the employees who were with us before. Most of them had five to six years of experience so we really appreciate that. The third party always took around \$30,000 to \$40,000 of the Julington Creek homeowners money. They obviously have to make a profit for coming out here and running the facility. This year our projection was probably make around \$25,000 for the CDD homeowners to keep. We are looking at a projection of about \$50,000+ keeping it within the community. As far as insurance and liability we are fully covered from the Florida League of Cities. Eagle Harbor and Oakleaf are fully funded by the developer. They brought in teams and they take care of all of that. I have been here for 10 years and the fact that we can run it in-house and return money back to the community I think is wonderful. As far as you being unable to use the recreation office, I'm going to have to disagree with probably everything you said. I understand what you are saying. Please come into our office we will be happy to work with you. You have to understand that we are running a business. We have four employees in there, the other side is now camp, we are generating \$50,000+ for the community for the homeowners. Using that side of the building you have kids in there, you have staff, you have plenty of people. That building is used constantly. All the money we are generating, services that we give to the homeowners and the children comes right back to everybody. I'm going to have to disagree. Please come into our office and we will be happy to sit down and work a time out. You have to remember we have a business that we are running in there.

Ms. Phyllis Abbatiello stated I very seldom use any of the facilities. I want to make it clear that when you say that the realtors and I'm a realtor that this is going to give extra value to your property, you don't get dollar value from it. What you do is get a selling. These are selling points. You don't get money for it and I think you need to make that clear so people don't think they are going to get extra money in their pocket because they have this facility, that is not true.

I happen to agree with David Taus on a lot of the things that he said. The other thing I would like to caution you last year when I was here at the meeting and you were going to buy that building the board as cautious as you are you always make these points of saying, well it is only \$10 a year, it is only 14¢ a day. With that kind of theory our fees are going to continue to go up because it is that 14¢, the \$10, \$20, \$5 that bring up our costs. There are people in this development that are not in a situation where they can keep spending this money. I think that if you think that you are cautious it is not enough. You have to put yourself in everybody in this rooms place, money-wise, financially, and physically and everything.

Ms. Beaugrand stated as a clarification what I said was that the addition of the facility supports the continued marketability of our properties within Julington Creek. I didn't say it added value. It does support the marketability.

Ms. Behrmann stated I was one of the ad hoc committee so I have been with the program since day one. There has been a tremendous amount of work put into this. The facility's purpose generally is to support the family atmosphere we have here from the young children to the seniors. We tried to incorporate programs that would address all ages and all likes and dislikes. We had a lot of comments they were all taken into consideration including the bad ones. There were people who were very much against the skate park but our largest group of children that don't have anything to do are our teenagers so we wanted to try to have space for them because if they are occupied they are not getting into trouble. I understand seniors and money problems and I was a single mom at one time but overall it keeps it competitive with everybody else coming into the marketplace and even with the increase we are going to be substantially less than the other neighborhoods are. Since I have been here since 2002 thank you all because you have worked very hard.

Mr. Bob Carr stated I want to tailgate on what David said and that is the combined assessments between single family and multi-family I'm assuming the multi-family is going to have the same people who will go to the facility. It might be only 1 or ½ of a person instead of 2 but whoever uses the facility ought to pay for it.

The 38.99% increase, no matter what we are paying \$138 of the change. The other \$50 what am I getting for the extra \$50? I'm certainly not getting a better mowing job on the common areas. I would like that \$50 to include somebody taking care of the common areas a lot

better. I will say the areas taken care of by the POA are mowed more often or appear to be mowed more often they appear to be in better shape.

Ms. Fionnuala Dominguez stated I have been a resident since 1996. I also want to bring up the inequity between the assessment for single family and multi-family homes. I was unable to come to the meeting where the bonds were passed but now we have O&M as well. We do not distinguish between the \$200,000 homes and the \$800,000 homes. We do not distinguish between the ones who have 6 people in their house and those who have 2. I think it is incredibly unfair that a unit is based on the fact that it is a townhome is charged \$100 a year less. That is what we are talking about here. We talk about an increase in our assessments. My assessment is going up by \$200 a year. Someone who lives in a townhome their assessment is going up about \$100 a year and I have yet to hear an explanation that makes sense to me as to why this is being done. I have the paperwork from the last meeting and it hasn't changed since the last meeting. It was brought up at that meeting that this was going to an issue so it is no surprise to the board. I understand most of you are residents here.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we all are.

Ms. Dominguez stated I did not support building this new facility and the reason our family didn't support it is because I live two blocks from the pool and I drive by there every day and once it is complete it is over with. This is a democratic process and we accepted the fact that it was a resident CDD, we accepted the fact that the majority of residents wanted to do this. I have no complaints about paying for the bonds or paying for the maintenance of the facility. What I do object to is being assessed differently from someone else who lives in the same community. If we are members of the CDD we should all pay the same amount. I urge you to have the legal representation of the CDD look for exceptions in the Florida Statutes and see if we are out of line doing this.

Are there in this budget or in the bond issue plans to upgrade the existing pool facility? Last week the pool temperature was over 90° every day. It is not cooling down because we did not spend the money and when I say we I'm not talking about the community it was developers at that time who made the decision because they were running the CDD to spend money on landscaping like that big waterfall instead of putting lights and aerators and heaters in the pool to make the pool more useful. If we can spend some of the money upgrading that pool I would be

more than willing to have some of my money go towards that out of whatever it is we are going to spend on this new facility.

Mr. Mark Batchelor stated I have heard comments from single moms, real estate agents, values, current market conditions. Let us be very, very careful. A year ago I was employed by the second largest homebuilder in the country. We did a market research survey for the Jacksonville market that says where people want to live. Julington Creek Plantation came out number one in the Jacksonville market of approximately a year ago. Of course there is a downturn in the market and I am no longer employed there and neither are 60% of the staff. If you see these homes of single moms and people going up for foreclosure Julington Creek will change and will no longer be the place where people want to be whether we have a nice facility or not.

Ms. Eleanore Leising stated I believe I am standing alone here. I think the reason there is a discrepancy as opposed to single family is because most of our townhomes don't reach anywhere near \$200,000 in value and the single family homes usually start at least at \$250,000. That is part of the reason why there was a discrepancy. About the seniors and the senior coffee. One of the ladies in the beginning mentioned why don't we keep the facility obviously we are keeping that administration building and we presently do have our senior coffee there in the winter. Architecturally it is dysfunctional. We are in a little room it is hard to hear people talking, etc. The recreation staff is doing their best but we are shoved off into a small room. We want to be in the new facility.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the senior activities will be in the new recreation center.

Ms. Fran Ziolkowski stated one comment you made that you are almost breaking even with the building and the activities that are going on in the CDD building. Almost breaking even, it doesn't even pay for the building does it?

Ms. Beaugrand responded we are breaking even.

Ms. Ziolkowski asked are there activities for teenagers? When I drive down the roads when I'm going to Race Track Road or 13th the lawns in front of the gated communities seem to be fertilized and watered more often and they are cared for. Race Track doesn't look very nice at all and it is supposed to be Julington Creek property. I do feel for people who are retired and who have lost their jobs or having a hard time paying their bills. Costs are going up and that is a

reason why your costs are going to go up and you will have to raise your prices. We don't need all these things. We wanted them but we don't need them.

Mr. Johnson stated the numbers that you see in the prepared charts that Mr. Oliver has passed out it is important to understand that those numbers are not simply picked this year or any previous year as a dollar figure with the board deciding to either give or not give multi-family some differential treatment. Back in the mid 1990s when the original bonds were issued there was an assessment methodology which has been continued through each of these present bond issues and is available at the district office for inspection. The numbers that run through there run through some mathematical formulas that were developed by the assessment consultant this district hired and there have been several generations of them over time and it was used to support the initial bond issue and it has been used for each subsequent bond issue.

In terms with compliance with Florida Statutes your assessments are legal, valid and you are fully in compliance with Florida law as to the method and manner of their imposition. I believe but we would have to go back in the historical record but I believe that methodology was actually put before the circuit court that the bonds were initially validated prior to their issuance. I think that now that the bonds have been issued your hands are tied. Your input and the ability of this board to make changes is limited to the dollars that is input into this formula as opposed to a change in the formula. Because they are disclosed to bondholders prior to their purchase of the bonds that provide the capital funds for these facilities we don't have the latitude that methodology as it relates to the debt absent some extreme proceeding involving consent of all of those bondholders and I'm not certain that would be either legal or pragmatic and would require whole new rounds of public hearings.

To the extent that you are looking at the manner in which your operating and maintenance assessments are calculated you are running it through the exact same methodology which is what I will say is a best practice because you are assessing the cost of owning and maintaining a facility in the same manner in which you assess the cost of constructing and providing that facility. It is certainly possible that you could in a future year look at trying to segregate out the purely incremental expenses associated with active operations that are not governed by fees and looking at some different methodology although I would urge you to be on firm legal ground you would want to have someone prepare that for you and you could provide testimony and support it, you would have to go back through another public hearing process

similar to what you did in association with the bonds but I think that is possible only for that increment and I will say that I think you are on less firm legal ground when you are assessing the cost of maintaining your facilities different than the way you assess the cost of establishing them. I wouldn't even begin to try to explain all of the formula in that methodology. It is available, it is a public record so if someone wants more detail they can get that in Stacie's office but your decision is really what number is input and it runs through those formula and you come out with what is the commercial being assessed, what is the single family, what is the multi-family, etc. and those are all outputs from those formula which again was adopted and has been through the validation process.

Ms. Beaugrand stated there were a couple of other issues that I think remain unaddressed. One thing is the mowing and the landscape maintenance. One of the issues that we have before the board today is to put together the criteria to go out with a request for proposal for a new landscape company for the properties that we maintain along Race Track Road, S.R. 13 and the CDD owned properties. That is separate from the properties that the POA currently maintains in the community itself. Those are things we are trying to address. There are issues along Race Track Road. We have had longstanding issues with the soil in parts of Race Track that has been very difficult to keep the grass in tact there. We are trying some things and as we get a new landscaper we will go through the whole proposal process we will be readdressing those across the board.

A couple of years after we started the swim team we looked into what it would take to bring the competition pool up to code from a lighting standpoint and this is the swim team that did this, this is before I was on the CDD board, but we with the developer's permission looked into what it would take to bring the lighting up to code to be able to keep the pool open past sunset and also to look at an aeration system. If I am remembering this correctly we could not do that without literally ripping up the entire pool deck and part of the pool for the lighting as well as the aeration system. From a cost benefit analysis standpoint it was not something that we could afford to do at that point in time. I have no idea what that cost would be today. We haven't really looked at that with the onset of having the additional competition pool going under construction at the new recreation facility but it is definitely something we looked to doing a number of years ago. It was a daunting task to be honest with you.

A resident asked will the shortcomings of the current pool be addressed?

Ms. Beaugrand responded that was one of the things that was on a card and the speaker didn't actually bring it up. That is something that as we get closer to the completion of the construction and we have a better handle on exactly the funds available at the end and when we made that decision early on we didn't have as big of a gap as I was talking about earlier but that is something that we discussed going back to the ad hoc committee and we will keep that in constant conversation because we have an investment here that we need to maintain as well. We will continue to talk about that.

A. Consideration of the Annual Appropriation Resolution 2007-14

Mr. Johnson stated the budget is really back to you as a board member. You have the draft in front of you. If you have changes to make to any particular line items was to be done in context. Ultimately you have two resolutions 2007-14 and 2007-15 which you would need to approve in conjunction with your approval of the budget.

Ms. Beaugrand asked are there any changes that the board had on the budget or are you comfortable with where it stands at this point in time?

Section 3A is Resolution 2007-14 which is the annual appropriation resolution of the Julington Creek Plantation Community Development District relating to the annual appropriations and adopting the budget for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 2007 and ending September 30, 2008.

Mr. Oliver stated the resolution is for adopting the budget. As we discussed earlier there are four parts of this budget and that is the general fund, the recreation fund, Series 2002 bond and the series 2006 bond.

If you turn to section 2 you will see totals for each of those budget categories. Assuming no changes to these line items we will put the totals in the resolution.

Ms. Beaugrand stated at this point in time I will entertain a motion to approve Resolution 2007-14.

Ms. Minnis stated on section 2 there is sum total, will the total of all funds go into the sum of dollar total, will those two numbers be equal?

Mr. Oliver responded that is correct, from all four budgets.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor Resolution 2007-14 was approved.

B. Consideration of Resolution 2007-15 Levy of Non Ad Valorem Assessments

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next resolution is Resolution 2007-15 which is a resolution of the board of supervisors of the Julington Creek Plantation Community Development District imposing special assessments and certifying an assessment roll, providing severability clause and providing an effective date.

Mr. Oliver stated now that the budget has been adopted we will take these numbers and prepare the assessment roll, certify it and provide it to the county tax collector to be placed on the county tax bill.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor Resolution 2007-15 was approved.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor the public hearing was closed.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Recreation Complex

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next item on the agenda will be discussion of the recreation complex. We have Stuart Maxwell who is a superintendent for Dicky Smith & Co. who is our general contractor for the recreation facility and we thought we would bring him in and introduce him to the residents because he is the face we will be seeing around the community for the next year.

Mr. Maxwell stated it is a pretty fantastic facility. It rivals most of the facilities we have put in place.

Ms. Beaugrand stated give us an update as to where you are at this point in time.

Mr. Lucas stated as you can see we have all of the site plan approvals so everything with the city and county. The building plans are in for permit right now and that is what we are waiting on but as far as clearing the site they have been clearing. We probably won't have a building permit for three weeks.

Mr. Maxwell stated we are trying to get ahead of the game right now. The contract is about 335 days from the issuance of all permits which puts us about one year from right now and our goal is to meet or exceed that time frame. The main focus is the 16,000 square foot clubhouse. Our goal is 30 days from this point in time to start foundations depending on the fill situation and how fast we can make progress on putting approximately 4 feet of fill on the site. Our schedule should be dynamic and we can work around the issues that happen all the time and changes every day so I can tell you one thing and next week it will be something different.

Ms. Beaugrand stated one thing I want to remind you of is that as part of the construction we are also going to do improvements to the parking area next to the existing pool as well as redoing the parking lot at the park across the street and adding restroom facilities there. That is already a part of the numbers you see in the budget and the bond issue that we have already issued at this point in time.

Mr. Lucas stated I just want to present to the board the pay request from Dicky Smith the insurance and the bond that is in the amount of \$89,000.

Ms. Beaugrand asked wasn't there general conditions in there as well?

Mr. Lucas responded \$2,500 less retainage so the total draw to be approved is \$89,657 builders risk, permits that he has put in for.

Ms. Beaugrand stated so that is net of retainage.

Mr. Lucas responded yes, retainage is 10%.

On MOTION by Ms. Spears seconded by Ms. Minnis with all in favor pay request no. 1 from Dicky Smith & Co. in the amount of \$89,657 was approved.

Mr. Lucas stated the next is that there is no change in contract amount for proposed change order no. 2. We would like to redo the drawings calling for a wet sprinkler system be added and we would propose changing that at no cost. Originally the engineer thought it was less expensive to go ahead and do it that way but they are able to do this at no cost. In the long run it will save us because we have a wet sprinkler system. Over time it may need to be adjusted. They are in a concealed space so I was happy to see that we could change this out at no cost.

Ms. Minnis asked can you explain the difference between a wet and a dry?

Mr. Lucas responded with a wet system water is in the attic and you have to keep heaters in there to keep it hot. A dry system basically the pipes are empty and if water is needed, water is sent up to the attic.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor the no cost change order from wet to dry to sprinkler system was approved.

Ms. Beaugrand asked can you give us the status on building permit?

Mr. Lucas responded all three buildings were submitted at the same time. We have approval on the pool house which is one of the smaller buildings. We have no word yet on the bigger building and we have only had one comment back on the skate park and that was all we had. Hopefully in the next two to three weeks we will hear something. They keep things posted on the website and Stuart checks it and I will check it to see if comments come in.

Ms. Beaugrand stated so it would be expected that the timing of the issuance of all three permits would probably coincide with when you are ready with the pad for the site.

Mr. Maxwell responded that is the goal.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Clerk of the Circuit Court Letter Third Quarter's Impact Fee Distribution

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next item on the agenda is the discussion of the Clerk of the Court letter third quarter impact fee distribution.

Mr. Johnson stated there is a letter in your agenda package reflecting the impact fees in the amount of \$7,538 that has been deposited into the appropriate account. There is no action is required.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Landscape Review Committee Meeting

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next item on the agenda is the discussion of the landscape review committee meeting. This is part of the contract with the recreation center and it is relating to what contractor we will be using for the landscape. We went out with a request for proposals for this contractor. We got in bids from I believe 10 different contractors. We have a

committee that met several weeks ago to review the packages that these contractors submitted to us and went through the process of culling those contractors down to those who were most appropriate and then making a decision. Basically what we ended up doing is there were three contractors out of all of them that stood out heads above the other landscape contractors and all of the members of the landscape review committee which included Stacie, myself, Al, Chris Commins from Basham Lucas and Matt Maggiore from England Thims & Miller. We all agreed that the top three choices based on the evaluation criteria were Luke Brothers, Down to Earth and Sun State. Those three companies also had the most comprehensive packages put together. The criteria included personnel, experience, understanding the scope of project, financial capability, price and schedule. Each of those criteria have point values assigned to them. We went through each of the contractors as a group and we individually assigned points to them, discussed where we felt they fell into and came to a conclusion as a group as to what we would value each of those criteria as we went through it.

I will start with Luke Brothers which is a new company to the market, they have no local projects at this point in time and as a result of that they were marked down a bit by the committee relating to personnel and experience. From a financial capability standpoint they were without question the strongest company. They were a very, very strong company, unlimited bonding capabilities. Unfortunately, they were also the most expensive bid that we got out of all of the bids that we received. They did get a deduct on their point scale based on not submitting a schedule of work to us. Their point total out of 100 possible points was 67 ½ points.

The next of the three that we had narrowed it down to was Down to Earth. Down to Earth is a local company it had good references from active projects and developers in the community. Examples would be Oakleaf Plantation, Durbin Crossing. They had revenues of about \$5.6 million last year and they do have sufficient bonding capacity at this point in time. Their price was in the mid range at about \$494,000. They had a two month schedule to complete the work. They just gave us a timeline they didn't really give us any commentary relating to that schedule. The total points were 86 points out of a 100 points.

Sun State was the third of the top three. Sun State is also a local company with good projects and references that they had been involved. Nocatee is one of the projects they are working on and if you have seen the parkway you know they do a pretty good job. Their

financial capability they had \$9 million in revenues last year and their bonding capacity is also more than sufficient to support this project. They did come in as the cheapest bid of all of the bids that we received at \$397,000. They also provided us a full schedule and full narrative relating to that schedule as to the timing issues relating to when they could do certain things depending on when the construction was complete or parts of the construction that they could work on first, etc. They had 96 points out of 100 points.

The committee is coming back to the board with a recommendation to award the contract to Sun State.

Mr. Johnson stated you really have two actions to consider. One is whether you accept the committee's recommendation, if you have a substantive basis upon which you disagree you are not bound by the committee's recommendation but if you are accepting it then first would be a motion to accept the recommendation and ranking provided by your committee and then having done that a second motion would be to award the contract assuming you follow the recommendation to Sun State as the lowest, responsive, responsible proposer.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I will entertain any discussion or questions that the board may have of the committee.

Ms. Minnis asked can you clarify what is to be looked at?

Mr. Johnson responded your first issue is whether you accept the recommendation of the committee as to its ranking and points. You are not foreclosed from for example disagreeing with the committee as to the scoring on financial capability or schedule or otherwise. This is a recommendation but you are not bound by it. If you agree with the recommendation then you can adopt that by motion or you can amongst yourselves come to some differing point allocation and adopt that revised ranking. Once you do it then you really are in the position of awarding to the lowest, your criteria is the lowest, responsive, responsible proposer which is what this point system is designed to indicate. I think once you adopt a ranking whoever has the most points would logically be awarded that contract but that would be a separate motion.

Ms. Minnis stated I went through this process the last time and I know it is a tedious process so I agree with your ranking.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor the ranking of the landscape review committee being Sun

State with 96 points, Down to Earth with 86 points and Luke Brothers with 67 ½ points was accepted.

Ms. Beaugrand stated next I will entertain a motion to award the bid to Sun State Nursery and Landscaping, Inc. in the amount of their low bid of \$396,543.19.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor the contract was awarded to Sun State Nursery and Landscaping, Inc. in the amount of their low bid of \$396,543.19.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Evaluation Criteria for Landscape Maintenance RFP

Ms. Beaugrand stated the other thing that was not on the agenda but is kind of in the same vein is determining the criteria to go out to RFP for the actual landscape for Race Track Road, S. R. 13 and the interior properties that the CDD owns.

Mr. Johnson stated you have in front of you a set of evaluation criteria prepared by staff. They are in the same vein as those you have seen before. We are recommending the deletion of the schedule criteria as was in landscaping but keep personnel including location of the headquarters and adequacy and capability of key personnel as 25 points. Experience including both work for other community development districts and past record and experience on similar projects is 15 points. Understanding the scope which would be used in evaluating their specific proposal is 30 points and price is 30 points with 20 points being awarded to the proposer submitting the lowest total cost proposal and 10 points being awarded based on the reasonableness of the unit prices contained in there trying to avoid an unbalanced bid. These criteria would be included in the RFP package that would be publicly noticed and go on the street and then within any protest period if one were to be filed so I think from staff perspective we don't have any further comments or suggestions to you. We are happy to take any comments you have.

Ms. Hernandez stated the problem I have had with Nanak's is the days of service. They are out here every two days, every other week, sometimes every week. Is it possible to put a number of days of service required? I would like to have a team here every day because there is so much work to do. We are including the work that we have now including the new facility that is going to require someone here every day. I know that for a fact. For the grounds maintenance

as of July 31st Nanak's was terminated as our provider for irrigation and landscape of Race Track Road and S.R. 13 and until we go to bid our current properties and the new recreation our interim contractor will provide JCP with service to include 1.8 miles past Bishop Estate East to Durbin. The savings to the district will allow us to provide that additional service at no added cost to the homeowners. That land we have been concerned about that we haven't addressed in all these years is now going to be addressed starting October at no additional cost.

Ms. Beaugrand asked which land?

Ms. Hernandez responded the 1.8 miles from Durbin up to Bishop Estates all the way down to the new school.

Ms. Beaugrand stated to Durbin Creek Elementary, okay.

Ms. Hernandez stated in the interim that will start October 1st. The problem I have had with Nanak's and the problem I see in this criteria is that they come and they go. I worked with Nanak's for three years and out of the three years I had six supervisors which meant every six months I had to start all over again telling them what I want, telling them I want them in my office once a week so I can see what they have done and make sure they did go out and fertilize, make sure they did the seeding or whatever it may be. They wouldn't check in, they were sloppy, I would call, they would come, I just need more control. I need a team to come in, I need to address that team, we need to work together so I can identify to them what my vision is and how I want our property to look.

Mr. Abbatiello stated the one 1.8 miles is all the way to the new school which is property that the widening the county did that we have not been maintaining.

Ms. Beaugrand stated correct.

Mr. Abbatiello stated I think my only comment or question is if we do this now and it is no charge but at some later date we go out and get a new contractor then we are probably going to have to pay for that which was not the plan.

Ms. Hernandez responded it is in the budget.

Mr. Abbatiello stated I didn't realize that was in the budget but that is an expense that I don't think we should be committing to at this point.

Ms. Hernandez stated you just committed to it by accepting the budget. What I'm saying is it is in the budget.

Mr. Abbatiello stated we are going to have to be diligent in this so at some point in the future we don't wind up being forced to maintain it because we are maintaining it.

Ms. Hernandez stated I get phone calls constantly from homeowners who are embarrassed about that property. I can certainly understand that. We have struggled over it all these years so if you want to go on record as saying you don't want to take care of it fine, I will go on the record saying that I do and if I can and we can work it into the budget I think we should do that.

Ms. Beaugrand stated going back to the budget for the landscape is that the portion in the general fund at \$175,000?

Mr. Hernandez responded correct.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is the same amount we had budgeted in 2007 so there is no additional cost in the budget this year for the additional 1.8 miles going from Bishop Estates Road to Durbin Creek Elementary School.

Ms. Hernandez responded correct. The problem with the number you see there is that there was water for irrigation on Race Track Road and S.R. 13 in that number and I have just been made aware of that and I am going to reassign the water over to appropriate spots. That addition of \$36,000 for that additional road will be able to manage in that line item. The water for that will go over into our water budget which has always been relatively low.

Ms. Beaugrand asked have the actual expenditures on the water been lower than what we had budgeted because I don't see that in the budget.

Ms. Hernandez responded that is in the recreation fund. In addition to that I have been on Race Track Road this last week looking at our water and it appears that we may have been watering property for the POA for awhile. I am going to be settling that hopefully within the next week or so in order to make sure that not only the POA but the CDD is watering and paying for the appropriate usage.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I'm seeing the water/wastewater budget under field programs on page 6 of the budget going from \$23,678 to \$40,200. Am I looking at the right page?

Ms. Hernandez responded yes.

Ms. Beaugrand stated as far as the portion of Race Track the 1.8 miles technically at this point in time the county maintains that if you can call that maintaining so if at any point in time we chose to discontinue the maintenance of it the county is still bound to take up the maintenance or what they consider to be the maintenance.

Ms. Hernandez responded yes. It used to be 6 to 9 weeks now it appears it is on a 4 to 6 week rotation. Can we require days of service?

Ms. Beaugrand responded what I was going to suggest was in the evaluation criteria there are two things in this evaluation criteria that are not in here that were in the one that we used for the one that we just considered and that is financial capability and schedule. The schedule for the one that we just did was a bit different because it was the schedule of actually getting the work completed within a compact timeframe. In this case we could define schedule as in the maintenance service, the weekly maintenance or what the required scheduling would be including trash, whatever it is you want to put in there. The other thing is when staff put this together not considering the financial capability was there any talk about that?

Mr. Oliver responded there was but when we put together the bid package and tell each of the proposers how to respond we have a list of requirements in there and financial capability could be part of that. If they are non responsive then it goes against them.

Mr. Johnson stated just by way of process I suggest if you want to put something in these criteria and allow proposers to suggest to you what they would recommend in terms of an onsite presence frequency then you can do that and score it. If you want to require them to be onsite every day or a specific number of days I wouldn't put it here I would put it in the specs so it is not part of what they are graded on it is part of what they are obligated to do when they bid on the contract. It wouldn't necessarily be a change to this document but you would put it in the specifications that that is what you are requiring and then they are bidding and pricing accordingly. Otherwise you are really asking them tell me what you are suggesting in your grading and that might not get to where you want to go.

Ms. Minnis asked the difference between this sheet and this sheet is financial capability? Can we accept this one instead, the one that was used the same percentages? I agree with Jonathan about putting it in the specs.

Ms. Beaugrand stated what the RFP committee for the recreation center did on the landscaping is you already heard the point breakdown and it did include financial capability and it is hard because contractors generally don't give financial statements so what we used for criteria for example in the other RFP was revenue numbers and bonding capabilities. Quite frankly, bonding capabilities tell you a whole lot more than some financial numbers do in some cases. It just depends on what these guys are going to give. Some of the guys that bid on the

RFP also do scheduled maintenance and it would be wonderful to kind of reach out to some of those guys because we have the proposals. Maybe we can reach out like we have in the past to try to make sure that people know that we are taking bids. I don't have a problem adding financial and schedule but putting the schedule in the criteria and the specs so they know exactly what our expectations are upfront. Evaluation criteria that we used from a point value standpoint worked on the other RFP. We may want to go ahead and adopt the same evaluation criteria for this landscape proposal that we used for the RFP for the recreation center landscape.

Ms. Hernandez asked when does this take place?

Ms. Beaugrand responded we have to schedule that.

Mr. Abbatiello stated I just want to go on record as being against adding the 1.8 miles. If whatever point in time we are going to get an increase in our landscaping costs because of that 1.8 miles that was never in our budget but is the responsibility of the county at that point in time I will absolutely fight against any increase in our assessments.

Ms. Minnis stated I think we ought to add financial capability especially if it gives us information on their bonding capability.

Ms. Beaugrand stated just as a comment back. I don't think any of us are saying that we made any decision as far as we are adding or not. I think what we need to do is see how that impacts the proposals and go from there. We have a decision to make in that regard when we go through this RFP process.

Mr. Abbatiello responded okay. It is a county responsibility and I don't want to take that financial liability away from the county and if we have an issue with the county and we need to talk about it with the county and we do have a commissioner who lives in our neighborhood and we have another one who did live in this community. We do have some people around here that can help us at the county level including our good friend Ben Rich.

Ms. Beaugrand stated at this point we need a motion to approve the evaluation criteria being that which we used for the landscape RFP for the recreation center.

<p>On MOTION by Mr. Abbatiello seconded by Ms. Minnis with all in favor the evaluation criteria used for the landscape for the RFP for the recreation center was approved to be used in the landscape maintenance bid.</p>
--

Ms. Beaugrand stated we need to discuss the makeup of the committee at this point in time. We need an odd number, three or five people and in that I have been on the last two committees I prefer not to be on this one. Al has been on the last two also. You are certainly welcome to be on it and if you don't want to that is your choice.

Mr. Abbatiello stated if no one is looking forward to it I will volunteer.

Ms. Spears stated I will volunteer.

Ms. Minnis stated I will volunteer.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we need someone from our engineering firm so we will have a representative from ETM and two supervisors being April Spears and Kathy Minnis and Stacie and having four is okay because it is a point total.

On MOTION by Mr. Abbatiello seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor the RFP landscape maintenance review committee will include a representative of England Thims & Miller, Stacie Hernandez, April Spears and Kathy Minnis.

Ms. Beaugrand stated at this point in time we will direct staff to put the proposal together, the criteria, the specs and go from there. We will schedule it once we get the advertising and dates and everything. Will you bring it back to the next meeting?

Mr. Oliver responded what we will do is we will lock in the specs and get those nailed down precisely and then we can move forward with noticing, setting committee meetings, review the proposals and bring them back to the board. I anticipate we will be bringing it back to the October meeting.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of Pay Requests

- A. No. 177 Payable to Hopping Green & Sams in the Amount of \$3,898.15**
- B. No. 178 Payable to Basham & Lucas Design Group in the Amount of \$507.08**
- C. No. 179 Payable to Basham & Lucas Design Group in the Amount of \$4,495.27**

Ms. Beaugrand stated pay request 177 is to Hopping Green & Sams for \$3,898.15 and the detail of the pay request is on the next page including construction contract negotiation, assessment notices, bond validation and other various and sundry items relating to all of those issues.

Pay request no. 178 is to Basham & Lucas for \$507.08 relating to the prequalification and bid process as well as putting together the landscape bid sets.

Pay request no. 179 is also to Basham & Lucas in the amount of \$4,495.27 and this is relating to reviewing the shop drawings for the construction project as well as preparing stuff for the water management district, Corps of Engineers, tax collector's fees for the blueprints and conservation easements.

On MOTION by Mr. Abbatiello seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor pay requests 177, 178 and 179 were approved as presented.

NINTH ORDDER 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. Recreation Facility Manager

There not being any, the next item followed.

D. Manager – Proposed Meeting Schedule for Fiscal Year 2008

Mr. Oliver stated you have the proposed meeting schedule for fiscal year 2008. We are proposing to continue to have it the second Tuesday of each month at 6:00 p.m. at the community development district office at 950 Davis Pond Boulevard. If approved tonight we will publish the annual meeting notice.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I did double check that this does not conflict with spring break.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor the meeting schedule for fiscal year 2008 was approved as presented.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Supervisor's Requests

Ms. Spears asked when would be an appropriate time to do some kind of a groundbreaking or something to bring attention to the fact that we have actually started moving on the property?

Mr. Lucas responded we did issue a press release and I thought Linda was going to send you a copy of it.

Ms. Beaugrand stated she asked me for comments but I haven't gotten anything back from her as to a press release.

Mr. Lucas stated we were going to issue a press release and I will check with her when I get back to the office tomorrow.

Ms. Beaugrand stated then the question is whether we want to do an official groundbreaking.

Ms. Spears responded yes. It has been a long time coming, I think a little bit of celebration would be good and bring attention to it so people will know exactly what is going on and get people buzzing about it.

Ms. Minnis stated my son has been waiting for this so that he can wear a shirt in the background that says, "We have been waiting for this for five years" and my mom has been working on it so I'm for it.

Ms. Beaugrand stated since you brought it up you get to plan it.

Ms. Spears responded okay.

Mr. Abbatiello stated I agree whole heartedly with a groundbreaking simply because everybody has been looking forward to it and even though they see the land clearing they ask when can we start building. I agree that we should get something out. I don't know when you are going to schedule it but I have to be out of town for the next three weeks with Phyllis up in Rochester, Minnesota with some medical issues so if it is before then I won't be here, if it is after that like the 12th of September I will definitely be back.

Ms. Spears asked who do I get with to talk about that?

Ms. Beaugrand responded Stacie.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Audience Comments**

Mr. Del Dosh stated I am head of the grounds committee for the property owners. Our committee brings some value and expertise and I'm asking if there is a possibility of one or two of our committee members helping you to sit on your committee to maybe evaluate or maybe add value in your grounds maintenance.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I don't have a problem with that. If the board is good with that we can amend our motion to add a representative from the landscape committee from the POA.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor the motion appointing the evaluation committee to the landscape maintenance bid process was amended to add a representative of the grounds committee from the POA to the RFP committee.

Ms. Dominguez stated I don't know whether or not my memory going back that many years ago we did road improvements on the first bond issue that there was precedent set at that time, I don't know if the POA is maintaining the section of Race Track and S.R. 13 or the CDD but the developer who made all of the decisions about that at the time chose to landscape those medians in the middle of Race Track Road thinking they were going to turn it over to the county and the county just didn't maintain it, finding out later that the county said excuse me but we don't maintain medians. They will do no more than mow. I am not coming down on either side of this issue I'm just telling you this is our history with the county, that there has already been a precedent set, they are more than happy to let us go ahead and maintain their property.

Ms. Beaugrand stated as clarification that is correct but the portion of the roadway that we are talking about from Durbin and Bishop Estates out to Durbin Creek Elementary School was not a part of that and it is the CDD that does maintain that and for that exact reason. When the road was widened in that segment the county tried to push it back over on to us to do that maintenance and we pushed back and said we pay taxes too. We did the same thing for the portion that was widened between Davis Pond Boulevard and River Oaks Plantation.

Ms. Dominguez stated I just think the residents who are complaining need to be fully informed. If you are going to maintain county property, your assessments are going to go up.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is absolutely right.

Ms. Dominguez stated I heard this summer from some residents in Sawmill Point about some of the issues with the teenagers and the partying that has been going on in back of the property where that white gate is right now. I assume that is the gate that was put up to prevent access to that area back there and that has been a problem. The sheriff's department apparently was aware of the problem. I'm wondering going forward I noticed when I drove by the clearing has started, do we have a plan after hours with the sheriff's department to be monitoring these areas that have been cleared because what I'm hearing from some of the residents that live back there is that they were carrying people out drunk from these parties at 7:00 a.m. There were hundreds of people out there. I just think you need to be aware of that and keep in mind this is a cleared area and it is not built up yet during the construction process this may be an issue.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I think the area you are talking about is a JEA easement where the gate is and that is the last little cul-de-sac within Aberdeen and there is no activity going on back there at this point to my knowledge. Maybe Stacie can put a call in to the sheriff's department.

Ms. Hernandez stated it is going to cost us.

Ms. Beaugrand stated just for their awareness of it.

Ms. Roseann Secari stated my question is regarding lighting and I don't know who is responsible for it but it seems like the Oaks has gotten forgotten about as far as street lights. It is very dark in there. It is dangerously dark. Who would be responsible?

Ms. Beaugrand responded the county. All of the roads are county roads.

Commissioner Stevenson stated there are two types on the state road, the county does the maintenance on S.R. 13 but the funding comes from the state. The county doesn't do landscaping at this time unless the homeowners associations will accept responsibility for doing maintenance. We do have a project going on on S.R. 210 for that. The ones you see landscaped are maintained by people like you or under our new plan we are going to ask that homeowners associations pay for that.

On the lighting we have within Julington Creek was paid for by either the POA or the CDD but JEA installed it.

Ms. Beaugrand asked are you talking about Davis Pond Boulevard?

Commissioner Stevenson responded yes.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I can tell you exactly what happened with that. That was Maryann Behrmann who spearheaded that and the lights that are along the sidewalk from S.R. 13 down to the pool area on Davis Pond Boulevard those were installed by JEA, paid for by JEA but we pay through the homeowners association the electricity on those.

Commissioner Stevenson stated St. Johns County doesn't do lighting in the tax, homeowner associations or homeowners who want to do it. That is just not a local service. You are like a city for us.

A resident asked who put the trees in the median by Durbin Creek?

Ms. Beaugrand responded Durbin Creek, those trees were put in by the CDD.

The resident asked do we maintain them?

Ms. Beaugrand responded no we do not maintain. Are you talking about Durbin Creek the development?

The resident responded no Durbin Creek from Boulevard.

Ms. Beaugrand responded the county did put those trees in but originally the landscape plan was a much more detailed landscape plan because they assumed we were going to maintain it and pay for the maintenance through the CDD. When we told them that was not going to be the case they pared down the landscape plan to at least include those oaks because of the minimum maintenance that was involved so we still have a consistency of something in the median going down through the plantation.

The resident asked who is maintaining those trees that have been knocked down and are dead and have been replaced? Did the CDD pay for those?

Ms. Beaugrand responded if it is between S.R. 13 and Bishop Estates Road the CDD does. If it is east of Bishop Estates Road it must be the county because it is not us.

The resident asked did you say the CDD put the trees in?

Ms. Beaugrand responded no I was mistaken I thought you were talking about Durbin Crossing.

The residents stated east towards Phillips.

Ms. Beaugrand responded those were put in by the county when they widened that road to four lanes. The county paid for the road widening east of Bishop Estates east of Fruit Cove Middle School.

The resident asked is that the same for all the way up Phillips past Bartram past the Bartram entrance on the left before the Race Track?

Ms. Beaugrand responded that is Bartram Springs CDD that put those in.

The resident stated it is the same situation from Bishop Estates Durbin east we have those trees in that median which is county which now the county says they are not going to maintain.

Commissioner Stevenson stated there are some little tiny exceptions where a little bit of landscaping got done and the county set a policy that we will keep what we have and there were a few little exceptions where some people got some street lights before the county changed their policy. They are expensive and you have a lot more that you are already paying for that everybody else does. It is not a good policy for the county to raise their standard because we would be in a losing position because we already have so much.

Mr. Edwards stated I think my comments should be tabled because there are three people maintaining property of Julington Creek and that is the biggest problem. Stacie is getting calls, the POA is getting calls and the county is getting calls because we don't have anything on any schedule. It looks awful down Race Track Road and it is looking horrible down Bartram Springs. I think one thing the CDD should do on their website is to add a frequently asked question about the landscaping to define what your roles are, what our roles are and what the county role is and that will help alleviate this until we can get our POA grounds committee and your landscape committee together so that we can at least get all of the internal property of Julington Creek looking the same.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is a good idea and we will do that. I suggest the POA does the same on your website as well. If you will work with Stacie so we have consistent information on both of the websites so we are not confusing anybody in that regard.

Mr. Edwards stated I will get with Stacie.

Mr. Frank Bullock asked what is the question concerning Race Track? I paid for Race Track every year that I live here. So what, why is it being maintained, is there some reason?

Ms. Beaugrand responded yes there is a reason. When the developer originally widened the portion of Race Track Road that goes from S.R. 13 to where Fruit Cove Middle School is, the developer chose to put additional landscaping over and above which the county will maintain and they approved those plans with the stipulation that the developer had to agree that the CDD would continue to maintain that landscaping on an ongoing basis and as a result of that the

developer committed the CDD to do so. We as a community pay for the landscaping, a decision that was made before any of us were involved in this district so it is something that we inherited that we are obligated to maintain for the integrity of the community.

Mr. Bullock asked for the rest of our lives?

Ms. Beaugrand responded as long as that landscaping is there.

Mr. Bullock stated as long as the developer decides they are going to do something that is okay? How many years do you have to pay for a road? There are new tenants moving in up and down Race Track. Are they paying for the maintenance as well?

Ms. Beaugrand responded any property owner within the district is paying. This is out of our control. This is something that was decided in 1996.

Mr. Bullock stated that is not what I signed on for in 1999.

Ms. Beaugrand responded actually it is. It is what we all signed on for when we bought our properties within the district. The bonds were issued prior to that point in time. There is nothing we can do to change that. Unfortunately, in the early days of the community there was not enough communication done for potential buyers in the community. It is up to all of us as property owners before we buy something to make sure that we know as much as we can. That doesn't mean that however deeply we research something we will be able to find it all. That was done in 1996 and unfortunately that is the way it is at this point in time. I understand your frustration. I have lived here since 1995, Kathy since 1994 we hear you and we have been paying for 12, 13 years too.

A resident asked can we go back to lighting? So, the county is not responsible.

Commissioner Stevens stated if somebody wants to get together and pay for it just like the CDD, there are small exemptions, they happened a number of years ago, just like the landscaping. If somebody came to me today and asked us to put in the landscaping we would have to pay about \$1,000 a median to maintain it and that is a lower level of service with no sprinklers. That is an option we are offering to the 210 residents right now.

A resident stated I want to go back to lighting. I want to go where I live and it is dark as anything, dangerously dark. I want to know if I have any recourse.

A resident asked is there a minimum requirement for lighting?

Commissioner Stevens responded we have monument lighting for dangerous intersections if you would like to come talk to me about that we will talk.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I ask that you take that outside the meeting.

Mr. Taus stated what you can possibly do if you have no lighting in that neighborhood and the majority of the residents in that neighborhood desire to have lighting, you could request the POA that your neighborhood would be special assessed for the cost of installing the lights.

A resident asked is there a minimum for lighting an area?

Mr. Taus responded no.

A resident stated so it can be pitch black.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we still have business to continue and I appreciate your concerns but I think that is something if you can get with your representatives within the POA and with Cindy, we can't help you with that unfortunately. There is nothing we can do to help you there, although we sympathize with you.

Ms. Leising stated this is the first meeting I have been too. I was happy to hear someone saying that the townhouse areas are maintained nicely. We work very hard to try to make our area look good. We are through our third landscaper now. When you talked about hiring a landscaper what exactly are you talking about, the common areas?

Ms. Beaugrand responded they are doing the medians and the swale areas on Race Track Road from S.R. 13 to Bishop Estates Road where Fruit Cove Middle is and the medians on S.R. 13 from Race Track to Davis Pond Boulevard and a portion of the onsite areas too but not the entry feature. It also includes the properties the CDD owns which is the pool, administrative building and the park right across the street where the pavilion is.

Ms. Leising stated there is a certain restaurant owner parking his vehicle on Race Track Road on the grass by the stop sign. I brought that to the attention of May Management who does manage a lot of our areas and it just keeps happening all over. Who would we see or where would we go to get this person to take his rolling billboard?

Ms. Beaugrand responded the sheriff. You can go into the county offices and talk to an officer there and ask them for some guidance.

A resident stated ask to speak specifically to Art May with the St. Johns County sheriff's office.

Ms. Beaugrand stated again, this is a non CDD matter. We need to move forward.

Mr. Dave Zellen stated we are about to put this big 16,000 square foot building on the side of Durbin Boulevard that has no sidewalk. Is there any talk of putting a sidewalk on that side?

Ms. Beaugrand responded it has been discussed. It has not been required by the county. There will be a crosswalk from the existing sidewalk to the entry feature that we will have there. That is something that we are going to have to think about and not to recklessly spend the funds we have available but it is something we will have to assess what the cost is and make that determination. We did talk about that early on in the ad hoc committee as that being a possible need.

Ms. Dominguez stated there seems to be a lot of question about exactly what pieces of property the CDD is responsible and what the POA is responsible for. I know we have those old maps left over from the developer that shows the different groups. Is there any way such as color coding those maps?

Ms. Beaugrand responded we have a map that Charlie brought tonight that will be in our CDD office and it shows what the CDD maintains in a cross hatched feature so we will have that in Stacie's office for anybody to go in and take a look at their leisure.

Ms. Dominguez asked could we scan it and put it on the website?

Ms. Beaugrand stated we will figure that out. That is a good idea.

Ms. Behrmann stated Trim Terrific I thought at the last meeting that they were really high on the list. I assume they did not score well?

Ms. Beaugrand responded they did not put in a proposal for the recreation center.

Ms. Behrmann stated Sun State I thought you approved those for general?

Ms. Beaugrand responded they are approved for the installation of the landscaping at the recreation center.

Ms. Behrmann asked is it possible to put up a sign at the new facility coming soon with a picture or something so that everybody knows that is the new place.

Ms. Beaugrand responded we will do that, we have enough contingency in the budget to pay for a \$500 sign.

Ms. Behrmann stated I wanted to again thank the board for all of the work that you have done for the recreation center and especially Stacie for all the budgeting help that had to be done to get this going.

Ms. Beaugrand stated Stacie has done a yeoman's job, unbelievable, just incredible.

Mr. Abbatiello stated Maryann we thank you for all the work you have done in helping us through some of the issues. At whatever time you do leave our neighborhood we will certainly miss you.

Mr. Stewart stated I suggest that the board not accept the 1.8 mile of Race Track Road. You have the same soil conditions there as you do on the rest of Race Track. You are going to have a problem trying to get grass to grow in there and if the county would put up a sign just east of Durbin Creek Boulevard stating "county maintained" then they can take all the calls.

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Financial Reports

A. Financial Statements – June 30, 2007

B. Treasury Report – June 30, 2007

C. Special Assessment Report

D. Check Register Summaries

1. General Fund – 7/1/07 – 7/31/07

Ms. Beaugrand stated we have the financials, the treasury report, the special assessment report and behind Tab D we have the check register. Behind 1 is the register summary for the general fund check numbers 1440 through 1453. You will see they are broken out in two different registers.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor checks 1440 through 1453 were approved.
--

2. Recreation Fund – 7/1/07 – 7/31/07

Ms. Beaugrand stated behind tab 2 we have the check register summary for the recreation fund items 2250 through 2300. Under the general fund there are some checks that should have been under the recreation fund, the construction inspection fee and the permit site fee should not be in the general fund.

Mr. Oliver stated we had to cut a check fast so it could be taken to St. Johns County and it will be reimbursed out of the capital fund.

Ms. Beaugrand stated there is also another permit application fee behind the second tab. There are probably three or four of them.

Mr. Oliver responded right.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor the recreation fund summary 2250 through 2300 was approved.

FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Next Scheduled Meeting – September 11, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. @ Community Development District Administrative Offices

Ms. Beaugrand stated we need to continue this hearing for two weeks from tonight. You will also notice that the next scheduled meeting would be September 11, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. at the CDD offices.

On MOTION by Ms. Spears seconded by Mr. Abbatiello with all in favor the meeting was continued to August 28, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. in the administrative offices.

Secretary Assistant Secretary

Chairperson/Vice Chairperson