

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, March 17, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. at the Julington Creek Plantation Club Multi-Purpose Room, 350 Plantation Club Parkway, St. Johns, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Susan S. Beaugrand	Chairperson
Kathleen P. Minnis	Vice Chairman
April Spears	Supervisor
Brian Pincket	Supervisor
Del Dosch	Supervisor

Also present were:

James Oliver	District Manager
Wes Haber	District Counsel
Matt Maggiore	District Engineer
Mike Lucas	Basham & Lucas Design Group
Stacie Hernandez	Julington Creek CDD
Jerry Hill	Julington Creek CDD
Shelly Timbol	Julington Creek CDD
Stewart Maxwell	Dicky Smith Company
D.J. Smith	Dicky Smith Company

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

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

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of the February 10, 2009 Meeting

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next item is approval of the minutes from the February 10, 2009 meeting. Are there any corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes?

There not being any,

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Mr. Dosch with all in favor the minutes of the February 10, 2009 meeting were approved as submitted.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Recreation Complex

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next item is discussion of the recreation complex. I assume this is just general discussion since we have the next item being the facilities improvement plan.

Mr. Lucas stated change order no. 14 consists of five PCOs that we approved at the last meeting. PCO 58 was basically an add to the contract time at no charge. PCO 59 was to add GFI outlets to the women's restroom as requested by Stacie. PCO 60 was we modified the site lighting and time clocks so they are better coordinated. PCO 61 was to add soundproofing in the fitness director's office for \$4,802 and PCO 62 was to rework the front desk for a change of \$5,614 for a total change order of \$17,207.

Ms. Minnis asked is the desk done?

Ms. Hernandez responded no, it is going to be started on Monday.

On MOTION by Mr. Pincket seconded by Mr. Dosch with all in favor change order 14 in the amount of \$17,207 was approved.

Ms. Minnis stated all of the doors are peeling.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I noticed that in the bathroom. It looks like the caulking.

Ms. Minnis stated that one and I noticed it on this one too.

Mr. Maxwell stated that is a warranty issue and will be addressed Monday when we install the desk. All of the non fire rated wood panel doors, the interior door panels have shrunk. It was observed during the punchlist phase of the project but they were still shrinking. We went through a period of drying out and gave them through the winter. At the time of the punchlist it was only two or three doors and since then it has gone to all of them and we are going to address that at one time.

Ms. Minnis asked is it just sand and paint them?

Mr. Maxwell responded yes sand, prime and paint.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Facilities Improvement Plan

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next item on the agenda is the facilities improvement plan. Everyone should have gotten an updated email and there is also a copy on your desk. There were a couple of minor changes to what we received last month from Mike. Mike will you go over what has changed?

Mr. Lucas stated on page 1 of 5 no. 12 Stacie and Jerry asked us to look at adding a storage facility. We are proposing where the existing bike rack is now to create a concrete block building, wood trusses, stucco finish 24 X 12 as a storage building and we would relocate the bike rack. I haven't really talked about the best place to locate the bike racks, possibly over to the right hand side and take up a couple of existing parking spaces.

Ms. Beaugrand asked are we talking about the bike racks that are over by the dumpster?

Mr. Lucas responded yes. It would basically sit on that pad right there. It would have an overhead door. We would modify the fence so there would be a man door coming out the side so that maintenance could get to the storage from inside the pool enclosure and there would be an overhead door that they could pull up and get to if they needed to.

Ms. Minnis asked what would be in this storage room?

Mr. Hill responded we would store a lot of our paper goods in there, tools, things that we have such as pressure washers, some extra janitorial type supplies. We are very limited on storage space right now. We have no place to store anything. We have no place to go in and do anything if we want to put things together, doing basic repairs. Going into the season our paper goods supply has been okay up to this point but everything is going to double or better because of the other facility opening and we just don't have any room.

Mr. Pincket asked should it be an air conditioned facility?

Mr. Hill responded no.

Mr. Pincket asked are you okay storing paper goods in a building with no air conditioning?

Ms. Beaugrand stated they aren't going to be in there that long.

Ms. Minnis asked what about the other facility? What is in that storage room?

Mr. Hill stated there really isn't any storage there either.

Ms. Minnis stated there was the back area.

Mr. Hill stated that is where the swim team and the lifeguards all congregate back in that room.

Mr. Pincket asked couldn't we create some kind of storage in the building we have over there?

Mr. Hill stated there isn't a space big enough.

Mr. Pincket asked we bought that whole big building with all that space and we are still running out of space?

Ms. Hernandez responded yes. If you recall our plans the other storage space that we had next to the filter rooms, because we had to redesign the filter rooms that took off half of our storage space from the original concept.

Ms. Beaugrand stated if there is a time to do it now is the time to do it. We have the money. We have more money for this facility than we have for elsewhere. Not that that is a reason to do it but if it is something we need, we need to do it now versus later because we are not going to have the money later.

Mr. Lucas stated to build that storage building and relocate the bike racks was approximately \$77,921. That is all that is on the new sportsplex.

If you turn to page 3 this is on the existing aquatics complex. At the last meeting Brian had asked for the option on the deck to put a thinset paver on top of the existing deck so Stewart and DJ came up with a number to do that and it is an approximate number. If you want to go down the line items, full coping, tile removal, replacement, selective pool deck demolition and haul off \$72,209. Pool deck pavers on one inch sand bed over existing deck and stair treads \$115,891. Everything else, site work, salvage and recondition handrails, trim and paint with trellis columns painted, pavilion columns, bases, landscape and irrigation restoration, drainage, concrete sidewalk repair, clean up and supervision is \$88,931. Pool deck canvass shade structure, those are the shade structures we were going to add \$17,595. Pool deck lighting upgrades, night swim allowance \$78,000. Remove and replace 4 foot chain link fence with eight foot black vinyl coated chain link \$10,000. This is a total of \$382,626 and this was the option opposed to going in and doing demo on the existing slab and replacing with pavers like we have out here. The one thing that will have to be done on this is there will be a certain amount of deck that is going to have to be removed probably within 10 to 15 feet of the building because we are going to have to taper that down so there is going to be a lot of deck that will have to be removed.

Mr. Pincket stated that is not a better solution. I thought after we discussed it and I probably raised it but I think after we talked about it, it was kind of a no brainer not to do it.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we have the homework done.

Mr. Lucas stated if it were a smaller pool deck it might be more practical but with all we are going to have to tear out and with steps and dealing with the pool we did the homework so you could at least see the comparison.

Ms. Beaugrand stated there is only an \$18,000 difference.

Mr. Lucas stated there are so many unknowns in dealing with this, worrying about making sure the drainage works.

On page 4 of 5 Jerry asked us on no. 10 over the existing basketball and volleyball courts to put a competitive volleyball equipment in there including new aluminum posts with winch and boundary lines that added on another \$2,800 onto that line item. On page 5 of 5 there is a line item that Stacie asked us to put on here, item 1 the new playground \$70,000, communication and networking \$30,000. This is something we talked about in the past existing aquatic fountain and entry revision we really don't have a solution for that yet. We allotted \$20,000 to rework that entry fountain in the front planter. Existing aquatics HVAC equipment replacement allowance. That is to get in there and replace the air handler units leaving all the duct work in place. That is a budget of about \$20,000. As we talked about before the Davis Pond renovation of the office building approximately \$311,600 and this is basically throwing in \$80 a square foot to the square footage. I sent the plan over to Stewart and DJ for them to look at but they really haven't delved into the actual cost of it they have given me an allowance. The last two items are the sidewalk extensions. The first one is to Flora Branch is \$106,013 and the other was to Race Track Road is \$128,817.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the playground improvements you gave us the two different options that you emailed to us after the last meeting. So this is just an assumption on that.

Mr. Hill stated that is what that was.

Ms. Beaugrand stated you need to pick a playground and tell us which one it is at this point.

Mr. Hill stated okay.

Ms. Beaugrand stated communication networking. This isn't one we have talked about before.

Ms. Hernandez stated no, just indicate where I'm going to go over there and have upgrades to having a computer and phone networking. I just put that in for safeguard. We have communication and networking over there right now. This is if we decide to do a lot of point of sales. We haven't gone through the season yet. We are going to do all of our swim lessons over at the aquatic complex, we are going to do everything hard copy because we don't have a point of sale over there but if I'm going to start the season here in May and find out if we do need to make any kind of upgrades so I put that in there for now. We can do without but if we did want to upgrade that is an allowance.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the other question I had on the HVAC equipment that is for the aquatics building.

Mr. Lucas stated that is for your existing aquatics building that is approximately 13 years old.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I'm good with that but what about the other building? Was that included in the \$311,000?

Mr. Lucas stated no the \$311,000 that is going to be brand new everything.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I just wanted to make sure we were covering it. For the benefit of the board we found out for sure yesterday that we are getting stimulus money for the sidewalks so we don't have to pay for it. In fact I am going to go down to the county tomorrow with Brian from Conley Wicker to meet with the county on that because they want someone from the CDD to be there. We aren't going to have to spend that \$200,000.

Mr. Haber asked do you know if the county will be providing the district the money and the district would be responsible for it?

Ms. Beaugrand responded no, they are going to be doing the work from what I understand. Actually, after our last meeting Cyndi Stevenson called me and said it is in there for sure and she was real excited about that. Then I got a call from Brian yesterday that evidently the county called and said they want to get started.

Mr. Dosch stated I recall we got the engineering finished.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we did the engineering so they are going to use our engineering which is why Brian is going to be there. That is good news so you can take that out of your numbers.

Mr. Pincket asked as they go through that process do we want Matt or someone to supervise that process? The county is using their money they are hiring their contractor to do it.

Mr. Haber stated as I understand it, it is the county's right of way. I don't know how much say Matt would have in the whole process. It is their property, it is their sidewalk, it is their money. They are our plans but we are going to be arguably donating the plans to them in consideration for them building the sidewalk. I assume no one has discussed having the county pay us for those plans.

Ms. Beaugrand stated no that was our contribution.

Mr. Haber stated I don't think Matt would have any say on it.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the other thing is they have done sidewalks. They did the additional sidewalks on the south side of Davis Pond and they did some of the sidewalks on the north side of Race Track Road where there were some gaps in there. They have done them fine. If there were errors in the landscaping they would come back and fix it and stuff like that. I would say if we have issues with it they know we are going to come and talk to them and they are going to fix them. I am comfortable with letting them run with it. I'm thrilled to death that we are not having to pay for something.

I did a little bit of playing with the numbers but the other thing that you got emailed to you is the fund balance report which shows exactly what money we have which we can't just leave this to the end because this really dovetails to the facilities improvement budget. We have the \$3.2 million towards the bottom, the fund balance for the 2006 bonds which has to be used on this facility only. The only portion of this that effectively can be taken out of that set of funds would be the first page and depending on whether we agree with all of those or not we have more than enough money. I think the total is \$680,000 versus \$3.2 million. It is a matter of what we think is appropriate or not. Then pretty much everything else that is on here would come out of the total of the funds which is \$1,512,000. Those are the funds that we have discretion on to use as we see fit. If you total out everything else we are getting pretty close depending on what we agree or don't agree to do that is within the non new facility.

Mr. Pincket asked in this total we talked about the thin paver option versus the full paver option, has only one of them been added in?

Ms. Beaugrand stated only the full paver option is in there.

Mr. Dosch stated on pages 2 through 5 we have \$1,512,000.

Ms. Beaugrand stated correct.

Mr. Haber stated one question I was asked at last month's meeting may be relevant to this discussion and that question was the extent to which you could use that \$1.5 million to pay down bonds to lower those assessments. I think you were asking just so you had all your options. Given these numbers I don't know if that is something you still want to consider doing or not but I don't think it is necessarily an option that we would have. There is a process called redemption whereby the district would use funds to redeem bonds which would lower the debt which would lower assessments. When this project is deemed complete the amount left in the construction fund which is the fund that has the approximate \$3.2 million in it whatever amounts are left in that under the trust indenture must be used to redeem bonds. For these other amounts, the question was can we use those to redeem as well. Under the terms of the indenture, these other amounts can only be used for optional redemption. The District cannot take advantage of optional redemption until 2016. This waiting period for optional redemption is to protect the bondholders. At the time the bonds were issued, the bondholders understood that any funds remaining in the construction account at the time the Project is deemed complete may be used to redeem bonds, however, the bondholders also had an expectation that the remaining bonds would remain outstanding at least until the optional redemption period. As an alternative to using the funds to redeem bonds, my recommendation would be that you use this \$1.5 million, if the board decides to move forward for example with the airnasium something that could be paid out of the \$3.2 million, leave that money in there and use the \$1.5 million to pay for the airnasium and you are effectively doing the same thing because you will have that money to redeem and you are using the other money for the airnasium.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I don't think we are going to be there anyway.

Mr. Haber stated I don't think you are going to be there but it was a question that was asked so I wanted to bring it to your attention.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is what I kind of thought the answer was going to be because of the original expectations of the bondholders.

Mr. Pincket stated you are talking about redeeming the series 2006.

Mr. Haber responded correct.

Ms. Beaugrand stated what is left out of the \$3.2 million would go to reduce the 2006 bonds so when we go through our assessment methodology for the coming budget it would potentially affect the assessments.

Ms. Minnis stated that would have to go towards page 1. Any others would come out of what?

Ms. Beaugrand stated the remaining three numbers which total \$1,512,115.47.

Mr. Pincket stated it is safe to say that we will be redeeming bonds and there should be some corresponding reduction in assessments.

Mr. Haber stated exactly.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we have to go through the whole budgetary process. Don't forget that is only one aspect of the assessment methodology. If we find that our expenses are running significantly higher than our revenues that may offset some potential to go up but who knows, so far we are doing okay but we haven't gone through the busiest season of our year either.

Mr. Haber stated that this is a technicality, however, there are different assessments. Without a doubt the redemption will result in a decrease in your debt assessments. Whether your O&M assessments need to go up for whatever reason may offset the total amount you are paying.

Mr. Pincket asked we can retain some portion of the \$3.2 million for O&M assessments?

Mr. Haber responded you cannot do that.

Mr. Pincket stated then we are going to be redeeming some bonds with this \$3.2 million.

Ms. Beaugrand responded yes. The portion of the assessment it affects is the debt service. You have two pieces of your total assessment, one is the debt service one is the O&M. It could have some offset to what we reduce on the debt service portion based on that pay down. There may be a portion that is offset. It is in our minutes and people will read them and I don't want anyone to read that it will go down when we haven't gone through the budget process and we need to make sure that everything balances out especially with this being the first year of the facility. It makes me really nervous to think about reducing assessments until we know exactly what the numbers are going to be for the full year. Remember we didn't open effectively until October 1st.

I guess what we need to do now is have some feedback on the items that are in here. I think most particularly things that we don't want that is on this list or things that may not be

necessary or whatever. I will open the floor to the board on any conversations you want to have in that regard.

Ms. Minnis stated I don't see the value of the jogging path with as many paths and bike lanes that we have in this area and that cost. The other thing is it is going around the lake. I consider that an attractive nuisance. We have had issues with the ponds by Julington Creek and had the same issues with the kids riding into them. People can jog here and they can jog home I just don't see that personally. I would rather see a storage shed than that. The second one is the airnasium. I just have a hard time with demolition on a new project. I had that with the front desk and I have talked with other people and they are kind of insulted that we are tearing down new stuff and why didn't we think about this previously. Those are my two objections.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I have to comment on the front desk issue. I think that people need to understand that you can plan and plan and plan on a facility and try to get it right the first time and until you get in there and see how things work, I think we did pretty well. We found a few mistakes but until you get in and see how things function there are going to be little adjustments that we might have to consider and that is the category I put the front desk on. The airnasium, I 100% agree with you. I think that people need to understand and if they are insulted I'm sorry but we are trying to do the best we can. If that \$4,000 or \$5,000 expenditure makes this place function smoother so they don't have to wait and end up complaining to us about waiting then so be it.

Ms. Minnis stated the other thing about an airnasium is the O&M when that thing gets older. As far as storage to Stacie's point if they took out to accommodate something else then that makes sense. As far as whatever we can do to fix the other pool I like the new paver option not the thin paver. We want to keep that pool going and we want them to go there. I am for putting money into there. The back house improvements, the storage room seems to be necessary.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is really what all of this on page 2 is kind of retrofitting everything to bring it up to date from 13 years ago when we built it.

Mr. Pincket stated I would like to hear Stacie's thoughts based on your experience and comments you hear from people, maybe not about these specific items but just generally that you think might be directly or indirectly related to these kinds of things. What are your thoughts?

Ms. Hernandez responded I am going to have to agree with Kathy. I don't think the airnasium nor the jogging path are necessary. There are other more important issues primarily the storage building.

Mr. Pincket stated you say more important that means one relative to another one but if you don't have to choose are you saying there is no demand for an airnasium. You don't think you can use it? I understand this would be a shade over the basketball court. Is that what it is going to be?

Ms. Beaugrand responded yes.

Ms. Hernandez stated we could possibly maybe make more money on basketball teams during the rainy season yet we have not gone through our busy season so it is hard for me to say what is going to happen to the basketball courts in the summer. But spending \$500,000 on an unknown I'm going to leave that decision up to you. It would be wonderful to have and I'm sure that people would love it and if you look at the courts they are packed. But \$500,000 on a roof? I haven't heard any comments but they don't know its coming, people don't realize that is an option. I think the aquatic complex the building improvements are absolutely mandatory. It is falling down and showing age and we have to take care of it. This is an ongoing thing.

Mr. Pincket stated I wholeheartedly agree with the jogging path. I don't think it is a good idea for lots of reasons that Kathy mentioned and a few others too. It seems to be a consensus there. On the airnasium I want to address Kathy's comment that she said an issue with demolition of something we just built. If the cost of the demolition was significant relative to what we were getting I could kind of see that point but I think the demolition to put this up is a relatively small component. It is not broken out here so I don't really know. That being said I wouldn't let that necessarily drive the decision. If we independently of that think this is a good structure to be built and it will be used, it is desired and all of that, I can get over whatever negative feedback might come my way from demolishing a project that was initially built. I think I can convince most reasonable people that we thought through it that when we build this project it was so big we spent so much money that was on the wish list not on the priority. That is my thought, that the airnasium was a wish list, we are spending a lot of money here let's just deal with the core kind of facility that we want to build. I guess that would be my response to that just generally. I'm not a basketball player and probably will never step foot on those courts but I have been out in the sun my whole life in Florida in the summer and it is brutal. I don't

know how much use those courts are going to get from 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. every day. I don't think there is going to be much. I don't feel strongly for the airnasium. I think it is probably something I would like to keep considering but I can't argue with the fact that everybody said no, that is \$500,000 for shade I understand that point. The rest of it I don't feel strong about. I think it is all necessary stuff. I think you do need to renovate the old facility. Most people would probably agree and those that don't we can't please everybody.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we have to protect our investment.

Mr. Dosch stated I agree with what the majority have endorsed. I'm on the fence about the airnasium. I picture basketball you are out there with blood, sweat and tears and it is an open court. My only comment on the storage building, I'm nervous you said you are going to store cleaning things in there. I'm concerned how hot that building can get if you are going to store things for a long period of time unless there is some kind of special ventilation.

Mr. Lucas stated it will be natural ventilation and we will have some exhaust fans.

Ms. Beaugrand stated it will be insulated as well.

Mr. Lucas stated we are not going to have air conditioning but we will have ventilation and vents drawing out and we will have screens in there to get air circulation in there so it is not going to be a spa.

Mr. Pincket stated the fans will be pulling the air out.

Mr. Lucas responded yes.

Ms. Minnis asked would the storage be like the temperature of your garage?

Ms. Beaugrand responded yes and I assume that it will be architecturally compatible with the rest and the same color.

Mr. Lucas responded yes it will basically be the same and the same color stucco.

Mr. Pincket stated the only other item that I have to give more thought and consideration it doesn't mean I am necessarily against it is renovation of the Davis Pond office building. It is a big number, we are gutting it, we probably need it but I would like to look at the floor plan we have now versus what we want to do and see the additional functionality we are getting for this kind of money. We are not voting tonight, are we?

Ms. Beaugrand stated we need to at some point get off the pot on this. We need to close out the construction records for the bond. I guess the deadline would be the point in time when we need to refund that money back so that we can budget properly for the assessments.

Mr. Haber stated, with respect to the funds in the construction account, the Board will need to make a final determination as to what else, if anything, needs to be constructed to complete the project. At that point we will go to the district engineer to fill out a certificate of completion and we would have a resolution that (1) accepts the certificate of completion and (2) finalizes the assessments and by that you would adopt a final assessment roll which would be created by Jim's office which would take into account the amount of money you have to redeem and show the impact that redemption will have on the total debt assessments. I don't know how long it takes once you conclude what you are going to spend the money on and then how much is going to be remaining in that account, how long it takes to prepare that final assessment roll to attach to that resolution but I assume a 30 day period would be enough to do that.

Mr. Oliver stated that is enough. We mainly want to do it no later than parallel with the budget process about a month ahead of that budget process would be better.

Ms. Beaugrand stated what I was just thinking is, this first page is the only thing that is applicable to the 2006 bonds. The only items that are in question are the jogging path and airnasium and if you take those two items out we are only talking about \$103,000. We can easily conclude on that without having to conclude on everything else. If we are still bantering around about exactly what happens with the other building those are our funds, we can dole those out and those are not going to affect the assessments. That makes that decision a lot easier because all of this stuff has to be finalized from a planning standpoint, hard bid, and so forth for the majority of the other stuff. Whereas the things other than the storage building, that is the one thing that has to be drawn up and engineered. We probably need to at least come to some conclusion on the front page portion so that the pricing of the storage shed can be done fairly quickly so that we can be sure to get this portion of it done to get rid of the bond issue.

Mr. Oliver stated then decide what funds you are actually going to fund that with. It may be out of the \$1.5 million.

Ms. Beaugrand stated my recommendation from that standpoint is I don't think we are that far off the \$1.5 million as it is and what I would like to see and everyone else would have to agree with me but whatever we have left over there I would like to put in reserves. It is not going to be any more than \$200,000 and with as big a facility that we have here it wouldn't hurt to start out our reserves with a nice chunk of change like that to give us the latitude if we find

other minor things that we need after we refund the bonds then we have a little bit of extra money to play with. It is not that much money to just blow out somewhere else.

Ms. Minnis asked does the storage facility include any shelving or is it a structure only?

Mr. Lucas stated it is a concrete block structure right now.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is a great point.

Ms. Minnis stated then we are going to come back and say we have nowhere to store anything. What do we need to do to make it functional? Give us one price and do it while we have the money.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is going to be two separate prices for that building. One for their stuff and then you need to plan it and come up with a cost for it to be turnkey.

Ms. Minnis stated the reason I'm asking is Jerry in one comment said he is going to store and fix things so I'm thinking a work bench, tools are going to be there you are going to have to have possibly a way to lock things up. Have you ever built one that you can give him recommendations?

Mr. Lucas stated he has to tell me what he wants to do in there. Storage shelving, work bench, we have done a lot of maintenance buildings but I will have to sit down with Jerry and go over exactly what he wants to accomplish in there and what he wants to get done.

Ms. Minnis asked would it have any running water?

Mr. Lucas responded it could. The number probably didn't include that.

Mr. Maxwell stated it was just a shell structure, stucco. There is plumbing over there and access to all of that stuff.

Ms. Minnis stated it is \$3 million but now when I start looking at this, this cost is going up but we are not doing the other things. I would rather have a good functional one that you are going to be able to use and you are not going to die of exhaustion.

Ms. Beaugrand stated what we need to do in the next month or before the next meeting is try to get that, get that kind of set so we can try to come up with a number because that is April and May starts budget.

Mr. Oliver stated ideally if you could certify the project complete at your May meeting you could have those revised numbers in your proposed budget in June.

Ms. Beaugrand asked does that schedule work with being able to get the plans and bid out and all that kind of stuff?

Mr. Lucas responded if you are turning us loose to draw something for Dicky Smith to bid.

Ms. Beaugrand asked is everyone in agreement that we need to move forward with that portion, the planning portion of the storage shed?

It was the consensus of the board to move forward with the planning portion of the storage shed.

Ms. Beaugrand asked do we need a motion for that?

Mr. Haber responded yes.

Ms. Minnis asked is the motion just on the storage?

Ms. Beaugrand stated basically we are just making a motion to give staff the go ahead to come up with a plan and a cost relevant to the storage building. We haven't decided what we are going to do on the rest of the stuff yet. The other stuff is pretty easy.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Mr. Pincket with all in favor staff was directed to move forward with planning and getting costs for the new storage facility for the new recreation facility.

Mr. Lucas stated we had submitted a proposal at the January 13th meeting and you had approved parts 1 and 2 which was to do the preliminary planning for the Davis Pond building and to do anything, drawings, that needed to be done so that Dicky Smith Company could get some fees. Now parts 3 and 4, part 3 will be to do the construction drawings if you approve the plans for the Davis Pond building and I guess that is up for further discussion but part 5 would be to create any construction drawings needed to get a hard price on things that you choose to proceed with.

Ms. Beaugrand asked it is really just no. 5?

Mr. Lucas responded 4, part 4 is complete any type of construction drawings needed.

Ms. Beaugrand stated basically it is priced hourly at their standard rates that they have been charging not to exceed \$7,500 for site related renovation construction documents. That is providing the necessary construction documents, specifications and narrative to adequately explain the limits of the renovation and specific site related improvements. That would encompass really anything plus this.

Mr. Lucas stated that number was prior to having the building out there. We will do everything hourly but these were just doing the smaller things. We will do everything hourly and track everything.

Ms. Beaugrand asked are you okay with approving that part, the additional part? We have already approved parts 1 and 2. We are not ready to do part 3 which is the office building on Davis Pond so part 4 would enable him to go ahead and get paid for the design and drawings for the storage shed and anything else they would do here too.

Mr. Dosch asked so we won't have to split the engineering fees in accordance with the old aquatic center and the new one.

Ms. Beaugrand stated this will cover anything they have to do in that regard. It doesn't cover Davis Pond admin building. That is separate, part 3. The part on the storage shed would come out of the \$3.2 million. Do I have a motion to approve part 4 of the Basham & Lucas proposal dated January 13, 2009 for their site related renovation construction documents?

On MOTION by Mr. Pincket seconded by Mr. Dosch with all in favor part 4 of the Basham & Lucas proposal dated January 13, 2009 for site related renovation construction documents was approved.
--

Ms. Beaugrand stated it sounds to me like we are all pretty much in agreement with going full boat on the pool deck pavers, doing all the work necessary to bring the older facility up to grade and knocking out the sidewalks. Brian wants to talk more about the office building. I think at this point we need to focus on whether the board is interested in considering the jogging path and the airnasium. I would like to get to a conclusion on that so that we can meet that May deadline for budgeting purposes. If you choose to do the airnasium design work has to be done on that as well.

Mr. Dosch stated I am not in favor of the jogging path nor at this time the airnasium.

Mr. Pincket stated I am not in favor of the jogging path and I am neutral on the airnasium.

Ms. Spears stated I am not in favor of the jogging path and I am on the fence about the airnasium. It is a lot of money but the shade would be nice. I guess I will say that I am neutral also.

Ms. Minnis stated I am not in favor of the jogging path and I am not in favor of the airnasium.

Ms. Beaugrand stated it doesn't matter what I think about the jogging path because everyone else doesn't want it but I agree. On the airnasium I have to go no on that based on cost and not knowing if we are really going to get the return on that amount of money. Based on that we have three people saying no and two neutral so I think that is an item we pass on along with the jogging path. We go forward with the money that comes out of the 2006 bonds would be items 3A, 3B, 4 and 12. If we can get staff to get those tied up so we can have that back at the next meeting and try to get it finalized for the May meeting. Is there anything on the older facility, the aquatics complex that anyone has an issue with?

Mr. Pincket asked are you talking about numbers 5 through 8?

Ms. Beaugrand responded pages 2 through 5.

Ms. Minnis stated I have a question. The only thing is thinking about building a pool it is easier to do it all at once. Does the pool actually need remarciting this year? Can that be put off a year and done at another time or if you are in there with decks and stuff remarcite is more effective?

Mr. Smith stated it is definitely more effective if we get in there we can remarcite now. With all the activity there is going to be more demo on the deck there is going to be stuff going into the pool. It is definitely more effective to do it now. Could it be done down the road? It could be done down the road so it is really a judgment call on your decision. If we are going to go ahead and put the spa in and stuff like that, then it is better now.

Mr. Lucas stated you only want to shut the pool down once. If you have to come back and remarcite you have to shut the pool down later and drain it.

Ms. Minnis asked in what order would you do? Would the marcite come first and the deck come second?

Mr. Smith responded no it would be the deck first then the marcite. Marcite is kind of like a house, you want to do your carpet last. You want to do the deck first and save the marcite to the very end.

Ms. Minnis stated you are right there could be damage along the way. I was trying to see if we could spread it out but I don't have an issue with anything that is going to improve that pool to make it more usable.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the only other thing that we talked about last time and it was the slide and \$92,602 was the number that Mike gave us that was an estimate and adding the slide.

Ms. Hernandez stated \$153,000. It is section 9D and I personally just don't see a reason or a need for the slide over there. I think it would be great, I think it would be wonderful. Again, I have no idea who is actually going to go over there and use that pool. I know the swim teams are going to be over there but they are going to be in the competition pool and any of the kids would come over left over from the swim team to use that perhaps.

Ms. Minnis stated that is one more lifeguard that we have to have.

Ms. Hernandez stated two more lifeguards. That will be complicated. This pool here demands quite a few lifeguards. It is going to be a little tricky at times. That is why that slide will not be open until 4:00 p.m.

Mr. Dosch asked is there a slide there now?

Ms. Beaugrand responded no, there is a waterfall. Is the board in agreement to delete the slide feature under no. 9?

Mr. Pincket stated I am. Is that something that is easily addable?

Mr. Lucas stated if you are going to go ahead and tear that deck up right now, it is going to nice that you are going to put pavers in there it could be added but you are going to be digging holes for the footing of the slide which is 9 X 9 and you definitely wouldn't want to come back and do it later.

Mr. Pincket asked we aren't near a timeframe of doing this from a budgetary standpoint are we?

Mr. Haber responded the only impact I can see on it is as Susan mentioned you wanted to put some of this in reserves. It would impact how much you are able to put in reserves.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that still doesn't affect the budget. That is independent of what we throw into reserves on an annual basis anyway.

Mr. Haber stated if you have a capital projects line item or reserve line item it would depend.

Ms. Beaugrand stated if it is not spent it stays where it is.

Mr. Haber stated exactly. The impact is not substantial.

Mr. Pincket stated we have a top notch slide here I think if kids are going to use a slide they can come over here.

Mr. Dosch stated I am leaning with Brian I think \$153,000 is too much.

Ms. Beaugrand asked is everyone else in agreement with that?

Ms. Spears stated if the idea is to try to spruce up the existing pool something different is needed. If we don't do a slide and I have talked to a lot of different people that are excited about sprucing up that pool and putting a slide in.

Mr. Pincket stated the reason I asked the timing question was we don't know what kind of use it is going to get this summer. My thought was maybe we want to wait and see what kind of use it gets over the summer in there.

Ms. Hernandez stated if we can wait I can give you numbers and tell you how many people are in that pool.

Ms. Beaugrand asked when does the eagle zone finish?

Ms. Spears responded May to October.

Ms. Beaugrand asked is the buildable time?

Ms. Spears responded yes.

Mr. Lucas asked are you going to have a true number of people? If they are saying that is the old one and it is not spruced up they aren't going to use it?

Ms. Beaugrand stated it is not going to be a true number.

Ms. Spears stated I think you will have a lot more people going to the old pool if there is a new slide. If there is not a new slide you are not going to see the numbers.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the question is, are we going to be ready to do that work between May and October of this year.

Mr. Maxwell stated design and permit for verifying what is required.

Ms. Beaugrand stated it is mainly the demolition portion that would have to be done.

Mr. Lucas stated we would have to get HRS involved and there is permitting. I don't know what all is going to be involved.

Ms. Beaugrand stated there is no guarantee that we are going to be ready to do this early enough before October to be able to get the demo done before eagle zone cuts us out.

Mr. Smith stated the slide would be the only thing HRS has to look at.

Mr. Lucas stated if we have night swim involved they are going to have to look at it again. There are a lot of unknowns. It would be nice to think it could get done but I can't

guarantee because I haven't done one this size before and construction wise we have an idea of what we are getting into but there are still a lot of unknowns.

Mr. Dosch asked is this slide like that one?

Mr. Lucas responded it is going to be a custom slide because the location we were going to put it is on top of your waterfall to try to use that mound to come down in there. It is not going to be a store bought slide because of the site conditions.

Ms. Spears stated it may be an idea too because this one here is a pretty big slide so the kids have to be a certain height. The smaller kids are not going to be able to go on this slide. Maybe if we do put a slide at the existing pool and maybe do something a little bit smaller, I don't know if that makes a difference in the height requirement.

Mr. Lucas stated we are still going to have the same height criteria regardless of the slide.

Mr. Maxwell stated if I recall that eagle zone went through a portion of the competition pool their main deck was outside it and not affected. The concern is demolition and I'm sure with the demolition in that region can be completed. The corner of the competition pool deck can be taken out and if we are taking considerations for lighting at least the conduits can be put in place so that area is kind of out of the way.

Ms. Minnis stated I have a question about the slide. How deep is that pool?

Ms. Beaugrand stated it is deep enough.

Ms. Minnis asked it is deep enough? I thought it had to go into 8 feet.

Ms. Beaugrand stated before we even started construction here Mike and Stewart and I went over there to kind of talk about that as a possibility and that one section is deep enough.

Mr. Lucas stated it may be too deep. We really haven't talked with a slide guy yet to find out what we can and can't do there.

Mr. Maxwell stated it is really most feasible when you are doing a pool modification. There are pumps, equipment and electrical tie in to the slide. There is tie into the pool shell itself so if you are going to be updating the pool and making those modifications anyway it makes a lot of sense to do it now. That might affect your cost if you do it after the fact. Depending on the permit process and everything the slide is something that can be added in during construction at some point. It is the lead time on the slide that the modifications to the pool and consideration for a slide can be made.

Ms. Minnis asked based on this HRS and not knowing the usage can you do the pool improvements now or does the pool deck need to be done now? Can it wait a year to see what the usage is going to be?

Ms. Beaugrand stated it wouldn't necessarily be a year. Probably before it is ready is going to be towards the end of summer anyway. I think school starts the end of August.

Ms. Minnis asked can any of this be done before the pool? So, all of this is after this season.

Ms. Beaugrand stated yes. What is your thought on the slide?

Ms. Minnis responded there were people who expressed the wish to have a more adult pool and keep the kids over here and have more adults there. We do have a swim team and you have siblings. Are you saying that people would specifically go to that pool to swim?

Ms. Spears responded yes, I think so.

Ms. Minnis stated okay. The cost of the lifeguards is the other issue.

Ms. Beaugrand stated put some thought into that. Let's move on as far as the rest of this. I think that is the only issue that we are up in the air on as far as the non new facility issues.

Mr. Pincket stated we can move forward with this if we have to and make that decision later in terms of the addition of the slide or not.

Ms. Beaugrand stated yes. We don't have to conclude 100% tonight. It is not as imperative to make a decision tonight versus next month on the stuff we are doing at the old facility because it is not going to affect the budget. Whereas, these things we need to conclude. Let's all kind of do our own private surveys and be prepared to come back next month and conclude exactly what we are going to do with the rest of the stuff. I think we are all pretty much in agreement with everything but coming to conclusion on the slide. Brian, if you will go look at whatever you want to look at with Stacie before the April meeting so you are ready to come back in April to conclude on that too.

Mr. Lucas stated there are different degrees when you are going through the aquatics building, the improvements, there is tile on the floor, tile on the walls, so you need to look through each different option when you are looking at it. We don't have one lump sum to do everything you need to know. You can only put tile down on the floor, you can put tile on the floors and walls in the showers so you need to look at all those numbers to see how far you want to take it.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of JCP Sportsplex Offsite Sidewalk

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next item on the agenda is discussion of the sidewalks which we already had.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Report of Landscape Maintenance RFP Review Committee

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next item is the report of the landscape maintenance RFP review committee.

Mr. Haber stated I can tell you where we left off. Prior to the last meeting the RFP review committee met and evaluated the proposals and came up with a recommendation for the board. In light of the fact that during the time between the submittal of the proposals and the February Board meeting a number of supervisors didn't have a sufficient amount of time to review the proposals, the request was made at the meeting that that item be tabled so that the board could review the proposals and then discuss today the RFP committee's recommendation. Where we are today is I believe this board has already been provided with the committee's recommendation, a copy of their scores as well as the minutes of their meeting. You have also had the opportunity, if you desired, to speak with members of the committee with the exception of Kathy. The board has options now. You could consider their recommendation and ask them questions. You could not accept their recommendation, review the proposals and score them yourselves and come up with your own decision as to whom you want to award the contract to. I think as far as timing the proposals required that the price remain valid for 60 days and I think we are reaching that threshold so I do think it is prudent to try to make a decision today as to who the contract will be awarded to.

Mr. Pincket stated you mentioned that you thought we were provided the scores of the landscape committee.

Mr. Haber asked was that not sent out?

Ms. Beaugrand stated it was in the minutes.

Mr. Pincket asked you mean in the narrative format?

Ms. Beaugrand responded yes in the narrative format but we didn't get a formal run.

Mr. Pincket asked do you have a grid now that has the landscape committee members or committee as a whole, their scores?

Mr. Oliver stated I do and I have one copy. We can make copies if you like.

Mr. Dosch stated this is from the last meeting.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we can share. What the committee did was they talked about each category, personnel, experience, scope, price for each of the submitters and then concluded on an average depending on their discussion. What is on here would be the final number the committee concluded for each of those categories and then total amount.

Mr. Haber stated I think if I recall in some instances if they couldn't reach a consensus on an average each person would give their score, all three would be added up and we would take the average of that.

Ms. Beaugrand stated and sometimes they changed their score based on the conversation which is fine. I read all of the proposals from one end to the other. I scored them on my own. I read the minutes twice and I charted out on my own exactly how everyone scored them just to see how consistent the viewpoints were or biased one way or the other or just looking at it from all different directions. I really felt that there was some inconsistency between the members of the committee. I am not slamming anybody here I'm just trying to analyze the numbers. I think that based on the minutes of the committee and doing my own scoring it appears to me that the top three are truly the top three and the committee had ranked Trim Terrific one, Cornerstone two, Luke Brothers three. True Green and Nanak's weren't that far off, each of them had nuances in my opinion that either brought them up or took them down. I think probably the best package put together was Cornerstone by far. I think they had the best detail I think they gave us a lot of backup on how they would handle the project. I know they did not want to use tractors but they also were amenable to discuss it if they got the contract once they got into the project and I feel like they were hit unfairly based on that one aspect. On the other hand I didn't feel like Luke Brothers gave us very much detail on the personnel side and how they would man the project. Trim Terrific did. It is hard because Trim Terrific is already on the project we know they understand the scope, we know they can do the project but I really didn't deem from any of the information that there was a lot of difference on those top three between the personnel, experience and scope. I felt like all of them could do it from a personnel standpoint because even though Luke Brothers didn't give us as much detail as we wanted you can certainly

interpolate that they have the staff to do it, although it would have been nicer to get that detail. Of all of them, clearly the one that had the most CDD experience I think was Cornerstone. Luke Brothers has a tremendous amount of experience for developments all around. Trim Terrific doesn't, the only work is here. Scope, I think they all understand scope and I cannot differentiate there. With that being the case I really think in my opinion it comes down to price. There is just such a spread on the price it drives me crazy. The other thing that really bothers me is the markup. Luke Brothers was the cheapest but they had one of the higher markups. Trim Terrific was the most expensive and they had a low markup. Cornerstone was kind of mid priced and they had a 15% markup if I remember correctly. It is just all over the board and I'm a numbers person and having the numbers all over the board make me crazy. When it comes down to price that is where the differential is and what scares me about Luke Brothers is we have a low base price but we have no idea how bad that markup is going to hit us and I have to look at somewhere in the middle of the road from a fiduciary responsibility standpoint which is what we have here as a board it is our fiduciary responsibility to do the best thing for this community in the use of money. I have to look at kind of the best price for the capability of the company that we are getting that is the most certain overall.

Mr. Haber stated this is probably not something the board is going to want to hear, however, to the extent that the board decides to not accept the RFP Committee's recommendation, I think it is necessary, and for purposes of following the process that the RFP required, that this board score all of the proposals using the evaluation criteria and the points included in the RFP. I don't think you can now discuss without the detail required by that criteria. To the extent that you don't take that recommendation my recommendation is to keep with the process defined in the RFP which would be to go through them and score them as though you now are evaluating them and making that decision.

Mr. Pincket stated I'm going into detail and not bashing anybody I am inclined to do our own separate scoring.

Mr. Haber stated you are fully entitled to do that. The purpose of the RFP committee was to help with the legwork but after your review you are the ultimate decision maker.

Mr. Pincket asked do we need to make that decision first and then move on to a discussion?

Mr. Haber responded yes, I think if the board makes a decision to not accept the recommendation of the RFP committee that is a decision that is made. You may do your own evaluation and end up with the same result but that is not necessarily you taking that recommendation, now it is your review. If that is the direction the board is going to take I think it is appropriate to make a motion to reject the recommendation of the RFP committee and then evaluate.

Ms. Minnis asked since I was on the committee do I vote on this or do I have a conflict?

Mr. Haber responded I don't think you have a conflict because I think you are going to be reviewing you are going to be giving your score you are going to be discussing. I think you are going to have discussions that may be different than the discussions you had with the RFP committee. You may hear ideas that may change what your thoughts were on the committee work. I think you are entitled to participate in this review and I don't think there is a conflict.

Ms. Minnis asked are we rescoring right now?

Mr. Haber stated that is my recommendation assuming you make the motion to reject the recommendation of the RFP committee.

Ms. Hernandez asked they are going to rescore without that conversation between them on how they scored?

Mr. Haber responded that is why I said they were not going to be happy.

Ms. Hernandez stated that is an hour or two hour process and then will they review the budget?

Mr. Haber stated they will be doing in essence what the RFP review committee did. You still have your RFP committee here, you have Jerry and Stacie and to the extent you have questions about their experience and knowledge you can take advantage of that as well.

Mr. Pincket asked in order to shorten that timeframe because I agree if we went through all eight of them it could be lengthy, would we be permitted to maybe have an initial discussion about the top four, eliminate the bottom four? If there is a consensus among all five of us the bottom four is the bottom four.

Mr. Haber stated I think you have to score them. My concern is you have a brand new group of people looking at these. I think you have to score them because if I were one of those bottom four and had brand new people looking at it I would want to see what their thoughts were on mine. You can score them quickly because I think some of these packages allowed

themselves to be scored quickly because they are not the greatest packages. I don't think they require lots of discussion. That is my opinion don't let that reflect in your decision.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the other thing is we may not have to talk about every one. There may be issues relevant to one aspect of one of them that draws discussion whereas others may not. When you are on an RFP committee you talk about every single score for every single submitter. We are going to have to work through this.

Mr. Pincket stated again, without any reflection on the landscape review committee I think as we have gotten through this process I realized this was much more involved than I thought it was going to be and with eight proposals I didn't think we were going to get that many and as a result of that I just felt that I wanted to independently have my own input in this process. That is the only reason why I move to reject the recommendation of the landscape committee.

On MOTION by Mr. Pincket seconded by Mr. Dosch with all in favor the landscape review committee recommendation was rejected.
--

Mr. Pincket stated I also want to respond to something that Susan said earlier. Susan made some kind of comment and I don't want to put words in your mouth but the gist of what I got was you were having some difficulty and concern with this markup variable and you were concerned that you didn't know where that number was going to come out. I asked Stacie at the last meeting or the meeting before because I had that same concern to what kinds of items that would fall into that category, that percentage markup category or even the unit price type things. Based on past experiences making some reasonable assumptions I think we can put a bracket on the kinds of work we might need. Assuming that one bad windstorm the kind of cleanup would we need and try to quantify that. I do have a concern and as you point out Luke Brothers is 45%, Trim Terrific is 10% and TruGreen is 60%. That is just a percentage markup on materials I think but the dollar amounts had pretty wide variances as well. Do you have any information on that, Stacie?

Ms. Hernandez responded heavy winds and hurricanes can add an additional \$12,000 to \$18,000 depending on how long the spread is if it is on both sides of Race Track Road.

Mr. Pincket asked and the irrigation type costs, is that all built into one price?

Ms. Hernandez stated that costs us anywhere on average \$5,000 to \$10,000 a year for irrigation.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is for replacement of fittings and so on.

Ms. Hernandez responded yes.

Ms. Beaugrand asked what was the hurricane number again?

Ms. Hernandez responded \$12,000 to \$18,000

Mr. Pincket stated per storm. Any other items you can think of that we needed over the past couple of years that would fit into this category?

Ms. Hernandez responded we have had a lot of water main breaks. Jerry can probably address the last one we had.

Mr. Hill stated we have had three or four in the last two months. Most of them have been on Race Track Road. The last one was a 4" main break on Race Track and the water was bubbling up and we had one recently up by Orange Avenue and that was a 3" break. That broke under the sidewalk so it had to be dug down and get under the sidewalk to fix it.

Mr. Pincket stated these are things that our current service provider Trim Terrific would provide.

Mr. Hill responded exactly.

Ms. Hernandez asked what was the cost for that?

Mr. Hill stated the last one was about \$1,700.

Mr. Pincket asked about how many water main breaks do we have per year?

Ms. Hernandez stated maybe one, maybe two. Going forward there will be more.

Mr. Hill stated everything is getting old.

Ms. Hernandez stated in terms of cost eight to ten years ago when Julington Creek had a contract with R&R for Race Track and State Road 13 that contract was \$124,000 per year. In 2005 with Nanak's our cost was \$152,000 and the following year it went up to \$195,000. Two years ago when I was preparing the budget I called several communities and different landscapers and the average cost for just this recreation center here was around \$100,000 to \$123,000. Just basic information. Not including the aquatic complex, the parks, volleyball and the basketball court.

Ms. Beaugrand stated you have a lot of hand cutting that has to be done here. The same with the ditches on Race Track Road.

Ms. Hernandez stated I put everything together and did the budget for our current budget \$300,000 to \$350,000 was the average that I was looking at and the numbers that I did get from other vendors.

Mr. Haber stated just so that you know this price column the score sheet and the 15 points, that number will not change. That is based on a formula based on a calculation from the high price based on the low price and that number will remain the same.

Mr. Pincket stated I did my own price calculations separate and apart and before I saw anything that the committee had done. Wes and I talked a little bit about the ways we did it and all my numbers came out fairly close except for the low bidders. Luke Brothers I'm way off so I'm curious to know why are those two off by so much.

Mr. Haber stated there are different ways that these could have been calculated. One way that I have seen used which I generally don't recommend is you look at the total percentage difference in the price and not using the numbers you have in front of you but by way of example if you have a bid where the low bid is \$100,000, you have one for \$200,000 and one for \$300,000 if you look at a percentage difference because the \$200,000 is 100% higher than the \$100,000 then arguably under some formulas that \$200,000 is going to get zero points because they are already 100% higher than the \$100,000. The problem I have with that is you still have the \$300,000 proposer who is \$100,000 higher than the \$200,000 proposer and they are going to the same zero and the ranking then didn't make sense to me. The manner and equation that I used and applied to these will result in a number of points being assigned at all times, there is no way that two different prices can both receive the same amount which would be zero. If I recall Brian I think what we discussed and I don't know if what I just discussed about multiple parties both getting zero would be a result in the way you calculated it but because that was a factor it was our recommendation that we use the equation which we did use which ultimately ends up with scores for everybody that are different.

Ms. Beaugrand stated so basically you did like the lowest bidder got 15 points then it was a percent off by the differential of how the bids went up and the score went down accordingly.

Mr. Haber stated the manner in which I did it was I took the low price, divided it by the high price and then multiplied that number by 15 which is the maximum number of points. The low bidder got 15 everybody else got a percentage of 15 based on that equation, low price divided by high price. The other equation that I was mentioning is more complicated. You

would take the high bid, subtract the low bid, divide it by the low bid, times that by 100 then you get the percent difference then you take the percent difference times it by the number of points allocated then there is one other step after that.

Mr. Pincket stated you are comfortable with the way you did it.

Mr. Haber responded yes.

Ms. Minnis stated I did it in Excel the way you first explained it. There was one question where Environmental in the notes I said I came up with 13.35 and you came up with 13.53 but otherwise we came up with the same numbers as far as the price.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that would not have made a difference in any ranking issues there either.

Ms. Minnis stated out of the eight, seven out of the eight we agreed and I did mine in Excel with the same formula so I must have added up one number off to be off from yours. I agreed with his formula.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I am only going in the order that I picked them up.

Mr. Oliver asked do you want blank score sheets for your records?

Ms. Minnis asked are we going in the order of the score sheet?

Mr. Oliver stated I can write them down in the order.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the first one I have is Environmental Innovations and I actually agreed with the committee on this one as far as the scoring. Let's start with personnel.

Mr. Oliver asked before you start talking and I start recording on paper, are you going to try to reach a consensus for each score so that I just write down one score? I'm not recording five different scores.

Ms. Beaugrand stated correct.

Mr. Pincket asked meaning we are not going to average our individual scores, see if we can come up with consensus first?

Mr. Haber responded right and if you can't reach consensus then I suggest you average them out in other words if you can't agree on a score.

Ms. Beaugrand stated on the personnel side for Environmental Innovations I gave them an 11 and that is out of 25.

Mr. Pincket stated I gave Environmental 10.

Ms. Minnis stated I gave them 13.

Mr. Dosch stated I gave them 12.

Ms. Spears stated I gave them 11.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that comes to 11.4. On experience I gave them 5.

Mr. Pincket stated I gave them 3.

Mr. Dosch stated I gave them 3.

Ms. Spears stated I gave them 4.

Ms. Minnis stated I gave them 5.

Ms. Beaugrand stated it is a 4 average. Understanding scope I would say about a 3.

Mr. Pincket stated I gave them 7.

Mr. Dosch stated I gave them 5.

Ms. Spears stated I gave them 5.

Ms. Minnis stated I gave them 10.

Ms. Beaugrand stated it is 6 on average. We already have price. We need to score unit pricing.

Mr. Pincket stated I added each component other than price per cut for the entire job and divided it by 13. There were 14 components that were hourly and the top one was by acre and I simply added those up and divided by 14 to come to an average unit price for each proposal and then I also looked at total price per cut and would bump up the average a point or down a point depending on where they stood, their total price in relation to the other total price of the cuts.

Mr. Haber stated there is no right or wrong way to do that.

Mr. Pincket stated for Environmental I came up with 5 on the unit pricing.

Mr. Dosch stated I have 6.

Ms. Spears stated I have 5.

Ms. Minnis stated I had 7 and it was based on going across comparing each person on each item so I did it different than Brian.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I am going to give them a 5 based on what Brian just said. That gives them a 5.6 average.

Mr. Pincket asked what is the total?

Ms. Beaugrand stated 40.53. The next one I have is Cornerstone. Why don't we go down the line?

Mr. Dosch stated personnel for Cornerstone I have 20.

Mr. Pincket stated I have 15.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I gave them 20.

Ms. Spears stated 15.

Ms. Beaugrand stated Kathy, you gave them 18 based on my notes and the minutes. That is 18.8.

Mr. Pincket stated at some point I want to talk to Stacie and have Stacie explain on the record if she wants to her personal experiences with any of these bidders good or bad with the idea that that might influence someone's ultimate score. We all came in with scores I think and nevertheless we are committed to change those scores and those scores might be influenced by things that staff says. We run through this process, put the scores on the record, then Stacie has an opportunity to speak and voice her concerns then we can go back and amend scores it might prolong the process.

Ms. Beaugrand asked is there anything you want to say, Stacie?

Ms. Hernandez asked should we wait until we get to the end?

Mr. Pincket stated I'm just saying what is the end. If the end is that we are laying all of our scores out, averaging them and totaling them up, then we are going to go back and listen to you we might want to then amend our scores. I would like to hear from you first because that may influence the scores that we give Susan right now so we don't have to do this process twice.

Ms. Minnis stated it is in the minutes from that meeting that we asked if that could be part of it. It was specifically to Nanak's and I specifically said that in two public meetings we have and those minutes are posted on the website that we have publicly said what our issues were with that company. We asked Wes and it is in these minutes if that can be factored in.

Ms. Beaugrand stated and the answer was yes.

Mr. Haber stated essentially what the law is on the issue is you can take in your personal experience or ask someone who has personal experience with that particular contractor and use that in your evaluation of a given proposal as long as you are doing it in good faith. In other words you can't go in knowing that you don't want someone or you did want someone to win and you were relying on that particular experience that either give them low scores or high scores. If you are listening to the information they tell you and based on that information evaluate the proposals you are entitled to and there is case law that says you are better off knowing that information which makes sense. I can see where Brian is and I don't know the

extent to which you read the minutes or you want them further commented on but I can understand what you are saying that you have only gone through one or two now to hear those comments or further comment before you go through this whole scoring process may make sense.

Mr. Pincket stated that is fine. I have read the minutes and I have spoken to Stacie this afternoon so I don't particularly need it for my own personal scoring.

Mr. Haber stated okay if the rest of the board is okay with that.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I am going to make a correction, I added wrong on Cornerstone personnel the total is 88 and the average is 17.6. On experience, Del?

Mr. Dosch stated 15.

Mr. Pincket stated 8.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I have 15.

Ms. Spears stated 15.

Ms. Minnis stated 15.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is a 13.6 average.

Ms. Minnis asked what was Brian's number?

Ms. Beaugrand stated 8. Just out of curiosity what was your thought process on that?

Mr. Pincket stated I think our actual scores relative to each other are probably not that relevant but our actual scores relative to how we ranked the experience we saw in a particular proposal relative to a competing bidder is probably more relevant. You are going to see for experience you will probably see my scores are pretty low. My recollection of Cornerstone was the kind of experience they had and there are eight bidders. They may have had one CDD and the other ones were smaller projects.

Ms. Beaugrand stated this is the one that actually had a huge number of CDDs. That is why I was curious.

Mr. Pincket stated not in this area.

Ms. Beaugrand stated they are new to the area. They do have more commercial. I think they have hotels and Walgreens. That is why I asked, I wasn't sure because they had the most experience on CDDs, they were the newest to this market though. On understanding the scope.

Mr. Dosch stated 28.

Mr. Pincket stated 20.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I have 35.

Ms. Spears stated 30.

Ms. Minnis stated I gave them 35.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is 148, 29.6. They already had 10.8 on the pricing so on the unit pricing.

Mr. Dosch stated 7.

Mr. Pincket stated 8.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I gave them 8.

Ms. Spears stated 8.

Ms. Minnis stated I had 9.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 8 average, that is 79.68.

Ms. Minnis stated this is the one that they did not provide a price so we changed.

Ms. Beaugrand stated they are the one that didn't have the extra mowing price or they had \$25.

Ms. Minnis stated that is why we changed because it threw off their overall price.

Mr. Haber stated I don't know if it was this issue or another but my comments in the minutes on that and I don't want to prolong this anymore but I think that is something that can be waived and you can still score it, just take into consideration the fact that it was an error and it is not so substantial that they need to be knocked out.

Mr. Pincket stated I thought the bid package was way too voluminous, way too cumbersome, way too much information. We didn't ask for all of that information but we got it. Some of that I can see putting a marketing spin on it but that book was as thick as the other seven combined. Then I also thought it was interesting that the information we actually asked for was literally the last piece of information in the booklet. To me that wasn't real responsive to what we were looking for.

Mr. Haber stated just for the record "responsive bids" is a key term in these public procurements. If a proposal is not responsive then, arguably, you do not have to consider them in your scoring. However, I don't know that you meant responsive in those terms.

Mr. Pincket stated I said the information we asked for was in the end.

Mr. Haber stated I just wanted to clarify because responsive is a key term in these proposals. I want to make sure that you didn't mean it in the legal sense.

Mr. Pincket stated no.

Ms. Beaugrand stated Trim Terrific. Personnel.

Mr. Dosch stated 22.

Mr. Pincket stated 21.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I have 23.

Ms. Spears stated 21.

Ms. Minnis stated 19.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is 104 so it is 20.8. Experience?

Mr. Dosch stated 10.

Mr. Pincket stated 11.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I have 10.

Ms. Spears stated 10.

Ms. Minnis stated 10.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 10.2. Scope?

Mr. Dosch stated 30.

Mr. Pincket stated 30.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I gave them 35.

Ms. Spears stated 30.

Ms. Beaugrand stated Kathy you gave them 25. That is an average of 30. Total price is

8.27. Unit price.

Mr. Dosch stated 9.

Mr. Pincket stated 7.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I gave them 9.

Ms. Spears stated 7.

Ms. Minnis stated 9.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is an average of 8.2 so it is 77.47. Next is Futch.

Mr. Dosch stated for personnel 11.

Mr. Pincket stated 10.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I gave them 18.

Ms. Spears stated 11.

Ms. Minnis stated 10.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is 12. Experience?

Mr. Dosch stated 7.

Mr. Pincket stated 5.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I gave them 10.

Ms. Spears stated 5.

Ms. Minnis stated 5.

Ms. Beaugrand stated that is 6.4.

Ms. Minnis asked should we put on the record that we are going from left to right with Del, then Brian, then Susan, then April and then me on these numbers?

Ms. Beaugrand stated you just did. Scope.

Mr. Dosch stated 17.

Mr. Pincket stated 10.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 20.

Ms. Spears 15.

Ms. Beaugrand stated you had 20, Kathy. That is 16.4. Their total price was 8.02 then unit pricing.

Mr. Dosch stated 6.

Mr. Pincket stated 5.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 7.

Ms. Spears stated 5.

Ms. Minnis stated 8.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 6.2. That is 49.02. I have TruGreen next.

Mr. Dosch stated 19.

Mr. Pincket stated 19.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 20.

Ms. Spears stated 19.

Ms. Minnis stated 20.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 19.4. Experience.

Mr. Dosch stated 9.

Mr. Pincket stated 8.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 15.

Ms. Spears stated 10.

Ms. Minnis stated 15.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 11.4. Scope.

Mr. Dosch stated 10.

Mr. Pincket stated 20.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 15.

Ms. Spears stated 15.

Ms. Minnis stated 20.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 16. They were 13.11 on price. For unit price?

Mr. Dosch stated 4.

Mr. Pincket stated 7.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I gave them 1.

Ms. Spears stated 6.

Ms. Minnis stated 4.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 4.4. 64.31. Next is Motes.

Mr. Dosch stated 9.

Mr. Pincket stated 10.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 10.

Ms. Spears stated 10.

Ms. Minnis stated 10.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 9.8. Experience?

Mr. Dosch stated 4.

Mr. Pincket stated 3.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 5.

Ms. Spears stated 4.

Ms. Minnis stated I gave them zero.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 3.2. Scope?

Mr. Dosch stated 11.

Mr. Pincket stated 9.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 10.

Ms. Spears stated 7.

Ms. Minnis stated zero.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 6.6. They were 9.38 on price. Unit?

Mr. Dosch stated 5.

Mr. Pincket stated 3.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 5.

Ms. Spears stated 3.

Ms. Minnis stated 5.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 4.2. 33.18. Next is Luke Brothers.

Mr. Dosch stated 13.

Mr. Pincket stated 15.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 18.

Ms. Spears stated 15.

Ms. Minnis stated 13.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 14.8. Experience?

Mr. Dosch stated 12.

Mr. Pincket stated 8.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 15.

Ms. Spears stated 10.

Ms. Minnis stated 15.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 12. Scope?

Mr. Dosch stated 22.

Mr. Pincket stated 20.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 25.

Ms. Spears stated 25.

Ms. Minnis stated 30.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 24.4. Their price was at 15. Unit price?

Mr. Dosch stated 7.

Mr. Pincket stated 8.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 5.

Ms. Spears stated 8.

Ms. Minnis stated 6.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 6.8. 73.0. Nanak's is next.

Mr. Dosch stated 16.

Mr. Pincket stated 19.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 20.

Ms. Spears stated 18.

Ms. Minnis stated 18.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 18.2. Experience?

Mr. Dosch stated 10.

Mr. Pincket stated 8.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 10.

Ms. Spears stated 10.

Ms. Minnis stated 10.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 9.6. Understanding scope?

Mr. Dosch stated 23.

Mr. Pincket stated 25.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 30.

Ms. Spears stated 25.

Ms. Minnis stated 25.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 25.6. Their price was 11.17. Unit price.

Mr. Dosch stated 9.

Mr. Pincket stated 7.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 7.

Ms. Spears stated 7.

Ms. Minnis stated 10.

Ms. Beaugrand stated 8. 72.57.

Mr. Dosch asked will you verify the total?

Ms. Beaugrand stated on Cornerstone going across personnel 17.6, experience 13.6, scope 29.6, total price 10.88, unit 8 total 79.68.

Mr. Pincket asked Jim, did you actually add up the different components of each of these scores and do the math and arrived at the same number Susan did? Or did you take these five scores add them up and agree with the 79.68?

Mr. Oliver stated once you came up with the components.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I want to go back and double check all my math. If someone will read out the totals I will reverify while you are doing it or you can hold off for a minute. I agree with them all on the re-checks. Based on the numbers I'm showing the number one ranked is Cornerstone, number two is Trim Terrific, number three is Luke Brothers, number four is Nanak's, number five is True Green, number six is Futch, number seven is Environmental, number eight is Motes.

Mr. Haber stated you have heard the results. If you are comfortable with the procedure you followed, I know you have all reviewed these and you have the criteria that you have established in front of you, if you are comfortable with the results you arrived at going through that process it would merely be a motion to approve the ranking and authorize district staff to send out a notice of intent to award the contract. If you want to discuss the numbers how they came out, discuss the proposals in any more detail you are welcome to do that as well.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I don't know how we can go into it any more at this point. I am comfortable with what we have done. I don't think we could lose in this situation because we had some very good submitters. We were very lucky because in the past we haven't. I will entertain a motion if someone is desirous of moving forward.

Mr. Hill stated I would like to make one comment. In reference to you were close with Cornerstone and Trim Terrific I don't know if location plays a part or not but Trim Terrific's response time to broken water pipes they are very quick. The last water break we had they were there in 10 minutes. I don't know if location plays a part but in their case they are close and do respond very quickly.

Ms. Beaugrand asked is this the one that was going to have their equipment close by and they would also have staff located close by? The other thing is the difference in price. I can't ignore that. There is an issue or not an issue or good or bad or whatever with every one and I think we have picked this process apart twice now and I don't know how much more we can pick it. If anyone has a suggestion I am open.

Mr. Pincket stated not with the process. I said at the last meeting and in conversation with Stacie we went through the process, we picked somebody and if they don't live up to the terms of the agreement I have no problem terminating with 30 days notice and if you ask us to go through the process again we will do that.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I agree with you on that.

Mr. Haber stated it would be a motion to approve the rankings and included in that motion would be authorize staff to send a notice of intent to award to Cornerstone and let the other proposers know as well. There will be a 72 hour period that the district will need to wait with respect to determine whether any protests are filed. If one is filed then they have a week to follow-up with formal protest, if none are filed within that 72 hour period then we can move forward and enter into a contract with Cornerstone. We will probably want to see how that works with respect to our current contract with Trim Terrific.

Ms. Beaugrand asked it is a month to month isn't it?

Mr. Haber responded yes so if we want them to finish March and then get service in April.

On MOTION by Mr. Dosch seconded by Ms. Spears with all in favor the rankings were approved and staff was authorized to send a notice of intent to award to Cornerstone and to let the other proposers know as well.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Acceptance of the Landscape Maintenance RFP Committee Minutes of the February 4, 2009 Meeting

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Preliminary Opinion of Costs

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next item is discussion of preliminary opinion of costs. That is basically Stacie's budget.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Cost to Complete Schedule

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next item is the cost to complete schedule which effectively is what we had talked about earlier that GMS put together for us this month.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of Pay Requests

- A. No. 309 Payable to Julington Creek Plantation Community Development District in the Amount of \$1,165.45**

Ms. Beaugrand stated pay request 309 is reimbursement to Julington for fitness equipment for \$1,165.45.

B. No. 310 Payable to England Thims & Miller, Inc. in the Amount of \$2,409.75

Ms. Beaugrand stated pay request 310 is to ETM for \$2,409.75 for construction administration of the parking lot.

C. No. 311 Payable to Hopping Green & Sams in the Amount of \$1,510.00

Ms. Beaugrand stated pay request 311 is to Hopping Green & Sams consultation for a variety of issues \$1,510.

D. No. 312 Payable to Julington Creek Plantation Community Development District in the Amount of \$13,178.00

Ms. Beaugrand stated pay request 312 is reimbursement to us part of it is free weights part of it is for Basham & Lucas.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Mr. Pincket with all in favor pay requests 309, 310, 311 and 312 were approved.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

There not being any, the next item followed.

B. Engineer

Ms. Beaugrand asked the porta potties over at the park, do we have our DEP permit now?

Mr. Maggiore stated we do, yes.

Ms. Beaugrand asked can we get rid of the porta potties?

Mr. Maggiore responded yes. We will do that within the next week or so. The only thing I can add is I did see a DOT meeting, the secretary of the DOT did talk about your sidewalks and it was only two sidewalk projects in St. Johns County that were funded.

C. Recreation Facility Manager

Ms. Hernandez stated we are moving along very smoothly. We are still taking classes and hours as needed. We had a very successful lifeguard training class, the swim lesson registration and also tennis registration. All registrations continue to be ongoing. We will be sending out another blast at the end of the month on activities during spring break. The 5k is coming up this Saturday. Morgan Ragland has been working on this for about a year and I'm not sure if anyone here has ever volunteered or organized an event like this but it is very time consuming and very intense. I'm sure if you see Morgan in the next few days, go out of your way to tell her thank you. She is working day and night on this and what we thought might be 100 people has blossomed to over 250 now. We hear that we will get 20% to 30% additional people on the day of registration. The race has blossomed quite a bit. That is really great for us. The first time 5k's usually generate about 150 people and we are well over that.

Ms. Beaugrand asked what is the course?

Ms. Hernandez responded starting around the skate park area going left to the four way stop then another left. It is very short. We wanted to bring it into an actual community and you run through a neighborhood but we are so far away from a neighborhood it is not possible.

Ms. Beaugrand asked how far down Flora Branch does it go?

Ms. Hernandez stated all the way to the four way stop and hang another left by another quarter.

Mr. Hill stated you go over the little bridge and the next development you make a U turn there and come back.

Ms. Hernandez stated I hope you are going to show up and volunteer or run. It is our first really big event. The Olympian is speaking Friday night. That is also a great thing. His record still holds.

Mr. Pincket asked the floor what is the timing on that?

Ms. Hernandez stated the floor is done and we still have to do the insulation on top of the tiles and that will be done tomorrow evening.

D. Manager

There not being any, the next item followed.

Ms. Beaugrand stated my only request is that if you are not going to run on Saturday find out what kind of volunteer needs there are. I am going to walk/run so if you need me to come out earlier and help out just let me know what you need me to do.

Ms. Hernandez stated I think from time to time it would be nice if the board actually came to the event and make yourselves aware because they know I have a boss.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I think it would be great to pay and run because we need the money or volunteer. We have to be out there for the big events.

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Audience Comments

Ms. Behrmann stated just because I missed a couple of meetings I am still not clear on what it is I heard you say lights for the existing pool. Was there anything else other than repairing furniture and things? What else did you decide?

Ms. Beaugrand stated just read it.

Ms. Behrmann stated my whole philosophy of putting a slide or doing something at the existing pool is to help alleviate what is going to be happening here. It wasn't specifically to get people to go there. I just felt that this is going to get so overwhelmed if we had somewhere else for them to go maybe that would help alleviate. I do know there is lifeguard additional costs and what have you but I think anything to help alleviate this pool would be helpful. I was hoping we had asked for the heating cost of the competition pool so I don't know if that is in there.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we approved the lighting but we didn't heat the pool. That has been the expensive part of our budget every year.

Ms. Hernandez stated I don't foresee keeping that pool open year around, we have a pool up here.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I don't think you would have the use that would justify the cost to heat that pool.

Mr. Behrmann stated my only thought was to alleviate what was going to happen here. I have been coming to class since November and every night the temperature goes up we get more and more people coming to the pool. I can just envision what it is going to be like when it does totally open.

Mr. Pincket asked on that point, there must be some kind of load capacity, bathing capacity or something like that.

Ms. Hernandez stated we are not getting anywhere near capacity.

Mr. Pincket asked not now but are you tracking that?

Ms. Hernandez responded yes. It is one lifeguard per 25 people so we are constantly counting.

Mr. Pincket asked is that our only limitation, the number of lifeguards?

Ms. Hernandez stated it is listed, I can't recall what it is.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we dealt with this two years ago when the YMCA wanted to shut us down.

Ms. Behrmann stated you talked about closing out the \$3.2 million. I understand you want to close it out but my only concern is because like the storage issue came up because now that we are living in it we are seeing what the problems are. Because we haven't gone through the season yet, is it advisable to close this out? What if something comes up that we didn't think about?

Mr. Haber stated I would say at some point.

Ms. Behrmann asked could we wait to June or something and see?

Ms. Beaugrand stated it is either do it now or we have to wait a year for the budget purposes.

Mr. Haber stated I don't know what type of things you envision coming up. The funds need to be used for capital improvements such as the addition of a storage facility. It has to be a pretty big capital project. If you see an issue that is an overall annual cost that is not something the \$3.2 million could be used for.

Ms. Behrmann stated I just didn't want to close it out.

Mr. Pincket stated I think it is a good point.

Ms. Beaugrand stated it is a valid point but at the same time we are probably going to have some money left over from our money.

Mr. Pincket stated everything on that list is more than \$1.6 million. There is the \$1.6 million plus there is sidewalk cost.

Ms. Beaugrand stated the sidewalk is \$200,000 right there and potentially less the \$150,000 for the slide.

Ms. Behrmann stated I just wanted to make sure we weren't closing too soon and then get caught, like we need more bathrooms. The airnasium just to clarify we originally brought up the

airnasium for the existing basketball court not for the new basketball court. We were trying to beef up that side of the community and that is where that airnasium came in. My son likes to play basketball in the summer at 10:00 p.m. or 11:00 p.m. after he gets off work and a group of them will go there but they can't do that here because this facility is closed and that court really needs updating.

Ms. Beaugrand stated it is on there to be updated.

Ms. Minnis stated to Ms. Behrmann's point I remember that conversation and I remember the minutes where you said there is this nice group of kids and she was mentioning that one not this one.

Ms. Beaugrand stated through the whole ad hoc committee process the airnasium was on discussion here.

Ms. Behrmann stated that kind of convoluted but that is where I was going for it was the existing basketball court. My whole goal has been trying to improve that to help alleviate what we get here. Thank you for doing a good job.

FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Financial Reports

A. Balance Sheet as of January 31, 2009 and Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for the Period Ending January 31, 2009

Ms. Beaugrand stated I do want to point out behind 14 A page 4 we are in excess revenue position of \$1,055,000. Of course we have still not reached our potential where our revenue exceeds our expenses. There are a couple of areas that will be interesting to watch. Stacie, I don't know if you are running any kind of budget internally that is comparing income and expenses for the different areas like fitness and tennis and swim team. There is no way to track it on here because all of the personnel expenses are lumped together. I think it would be an interesting exercise especially as we get closer to the budget to show us the numbers by department and break it out with the main areas to give us an idea of what really is profitable and what isn't and get feedback from the board as to maybe some tweaks here and there if necessary.

Ms. Hernandez stated it would be beneficial. It could be more helpful to you if you came into my office and I have each manager responsible for their department, each manager has a budget, each manager is responsible for generating revenue. If this class doesn't work then they come up with a different class or program and then you can share expenses because they do have a lot of departments and it is broken down and right now we are in the budget process looking at

our projections for the year as well. Now it is for me to go through and review it and change up a few things and then also to start the 2009/2010 budget based on the projections.

Ms. Beaugrand stated I do have one question. On the swim team program the revenues are ahead of budget by about 11 ½% but the expenses are ahead of budget by 28 ½%. What is the reason for that?

Ms. Hernandez responded there are more entry fees that we are responsible for, there is more travel associated with that.

Ms. Beaugrand asked why would we be responsible for the entry fees versus the swimmers?

Ms. Hernandez responded they are and it is a reimbursement type of thing. We have to fill out forms and we get reimbursed and that is put back into the revenue.

Ms. Beaugrand asked is part of that a timing difference?

Ms. Hernandez responded part of it is a timing issue but it is more expensive to run the swim team than we had anticipated.

Ms. Beaugrand stated we just need to watch that pretty close.

Ms. Hernandez stated right and we are also making a lot more than we had anticipated.

Ms. Beaugrand stated true but our expenses are still running well higher.

Ms. Minnis stated I had a question about the tennis courts. What is the capacity and the use?

Ms. Hernandez asked capacity, meaning?

Ms. Minnis asked how often are they used, are people paying fees, are there leagues?

Ms. Hernandez responded we are doing great. We don't have any complaints about not enough space for people but is it getting used. Tennis is doing great.

B. Treasury Report – January 31, 2009

C. Assessment Receipts Schedule

D. Check Register Summary

1. General Fund

Ms. Beaugrand stated behind tab D 1 is the check register for the general fund.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Mr. Pincket with all in favor the general fund check register was approved.

2. Recreation Fund

Ms. Beaugrand stated behind tab 2 is the recreation fund.

Mr. Pincket stated the rubber flooring we paid \$3,500 is going to be paid for by our vendor.

Ms. Beaugrand stated just the demolition was.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Mr. Pincket with all in favor the recreation fund check register was approved.

FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Scheduled Meeting – April 14, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. at the Julington Creek Plantation Club Multi-Purpose Room, 350 Plantation Club Parkway

Ms. Beaugrand stated the next meeting is April 14, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. here.

On MOTION by Ms. Minnis seconded by Mr. Pincket with all in favor the meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Secretary Assistant Secretary

Chairperson/Vice Chairperson