

**SUN’N LAKE OF SEBRING IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
REGULAR MEETING**

A meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Sun ’n Lake of Sebring Improvement District was held on Monday, March 13, 2023, at 9:00 a.m. at the Community Center, 3500 Edgewater Drive, Sebring, FL 33872.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Craig Herrick	President
Beverly Phillips	Vice President
Ray Brooks	Supervisor
Michael Gilpin	Supervisor

Also present were:

Dan Stegall	Interim General Manager
David Schumacher	District Attorney
Coral Benka	Admin and Board Secretary
Dane Garlinghouse	Finance Director
Cynthia Carman Kramer	Director of Community Services
Ariel Fells	Human Resources Director
Mike LaMere	Sun ’n Lake Golf Club General Manager
Jimmie Murphy	Golf Course Superintendent
Drew Jones	District Engineer
Scott Kirouac	County Commissioner, District 3
Residents	

*The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken.*

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Call to Order**

- Mr. Herrick called the meeting to order. A quorum was established.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Pledge of Allegiance**

- The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Announcements**

- The next regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors will take place Monday, April 3, 2023, at 9:00 a.m. at the Community Center, 3500 Edgewater Drive, Sebring, FL 33872.
- Please silence or turn off your cell phones.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comment (00:03:07)**

- Mr. Chad Skelcher addressed an issue he is having to access high speed internet. He mentioned available grants to bring the section where he lives up to the rest of the community. Ms. Kramer stated they have had ongoing discussions with Comcast requesting they expand into the areas that are not served. As of a week or two ago, Comcast was internally evaluating the cost and will make the determination whether it is a business decision for them to move forward. She said staff can look into grant opportunities if it helps the cause. She does not see why they would not want to expand.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consent Agenda (ats: 00:06:40)**

- A. Minutes of the Board of Supervisors Regular Meeting Held February 20, 2023**
- B. Golf Financials – January 2023**
- C. Treasurer’s Report District Financials – January 2023**

On MOTION by Mr. Gilpin seconded by Ms. Phillips, with all in favor, the consent agenda was approved as presented. 4-0

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Message from Commissioner Scott Kirouac (ats: 00:07:09)**

- Commissioner Kirouac reported the following:
  - He is aware Mr. Stegall and Mr. Garlinghouse have been working with County staff about the modification of the District’s request the County approved last year. They are trying to use some of the money to make the backup pump stations mobile so they can be moved to locations. They have not seen any issues with it from what he has been informed.
  - The County will continue to work with their budget this year. He will get with Mr. Stegall to get with Liz regarding funds for internet expansion.
  - The sidewalk project discussed last year is still scheduled for July this year. Some bids came back considerably higher than what they were last year; however, they put in an amendment for those increased funds which was approved.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Action Agenda (ats: 00:09:59)**

**A. Active People, Healthy Nation Proclamation**

- Ms. Kramer reviewed the Active People, Healthy Nation Proclamation.
- It is an initiative which comes out of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Their goal is to help 27 Million Americans become more physically active by 2027.
- Part of this initiative is to engage decision makers like the Board to become Active People, Healthy Nation champions to achieve strategies that work.
- There is no financial cost to the District associated with this proclamation. It reaffirms the District's commitment to support and provide recreational opportunities for the residents.
- It would be a good source of recognition for the community. There are only another two or three communities in Florida who have signed on to this program. It can be a benefit to the District in the future, securing grant applications and partnership for future recreational improvements and activities.
- There was no Board or public comments.

On MOTION by Mr. Brooks seconded by Ms. Phillips with all in favor the Active People, Healthy Nation Proclamation was passed. 4-0

**B. Dog Park Policy**

- Ms. Kramer stated the Board previously approved installation of a controlled access system for the dog park gates so only residents can access the dog park.
- The system will tie into the existing registration and membership card system used at other recreational facilities within the District.
- Staff proposes the following registration procedure.
  - Residents would be required to fill out an application form and liability waiver at the Recreation Office. The applicant would need to provide a copy of the current rabies vaccination certificates for each dog as required by State Law.
  - The expiration date of the dog park membership would coincide with the expiration date on the vaccine certificate. Memberships would be renewable on an annual basis with proof of annual vaccination.

- They also proposed the Dog Park Rules and Regulations be amended to state all users must enter the park using their own membership card, and members may not allow others to enter the park without swiping their card. Staff will emphasize any violations of the park rules and regulations will be subject to loss of park privileges.
- Mr. Brooks asked if members will be provided with the rules and regulations when they register. Ms. Kramer responded yes.
- Mr. Brooks suggested they also be provided with the information stating after three violations, their membership will be revoked.
- Mr. Brooks discussed the signs all over the place near the dog park. He questioned whether they need all those signs. Ms. Phillips clarified they were installed at the Board's request.
- Mr. Gilpin asked if they had the same regulation regarding three violations for the pickleball courts. Ms. Kramer is not sure if that is written anywhere, but staff has been more observant.
- The floor was opened to public comments.
- Ms. Kristine Ritz stated she has been using the dog park for three years. She loves the improvements to the dog park. Regarding the signs, people do not know where to park their carts and their cars. There are big dogs coming into the little dog park. People need to understand they cannot come in through the ADA entrance to cut to the big dog park. Signs indicating where to park are necessary.
- Mr. Herrick suggested putting this information into the packet that will be provided when residents register for the dog park.
- Mr. Bob Homily stated when he initially heard discussion on the dog park, it was his understanding that residents from Tanglewood would not be permitted to use the dog park anymore. Mr. Stegall has since provided clarification. He requested assurance from the Board that residents from Tanglewood will be eligible to use the dog park. The Board explained Tanglewood is part of the District and are therefore permitted to use the dog park.

On MOTION by Ms. Phillips seconded by Mr. Brooks with all in favor the proposed policy for the dog park registration was approved as recommended. 4-0

**C. Playground Location**

- Ms. Kramer reported the plans are moving forward for the new playground project.
- The current proposed location is between the basketball court and the parking lot; however, the proposed location was found to have muck starting at 4.5 feet down to 10 feet down. The cost to de-muck is \$80,000 to \$85,000.
- The District Engineer has proposed an alternate site on the other side of the detention pond. They tested the area, and it only has about 15 inches of muck under 28 inches of full material. The estimated cost to de-muck, clean fill and site preparation is \$42,000 to \$51,000.
- The current projected cost is almost \$665,000. With the \$108,500 RPAC funding expected from the County, and the \$200,000 FRDAP funding approved by the State, the District is still looking to be slightly over the original capital budget of \$350,000 for this project.
- The budget currently does have some room in it for contingencies and they will not be spending the full amount of \$20,000 originally proposed for picnic tables at the adjoining pavilion.
- Staff is requesting the Board's input on whether to move forward with the project at the current location or look to reduce costs by moving it.
- Mr. Brooks stated the original project was \$350,000 for the total cost of the playground. The District assumed they would get funds, but at the time it was put in the budget, they did not know how much money they were going to get. They thought \$350,000 would be the top number, but now they are at \$650,000 in a matter of a year and a half. They also do not know were to put it now because they have a problem. It does not make any sense to him. There is no difference between \$650,000 and \$700,000 at this point when they started at \$350,000. His recommendation is to put it where it was supposed to be placed, pay the extra money to do it correctly and

be done with the project. He is very concerned about moving it to Edgewater. He would vote to spend the extra money. If the vote goes against that, he would like to have a public meeting and get the residents of Edgewater involved so they are aware.

- Mr. Herrick agrees it should remain in the current location. He did note the area Mr. Brooks is concerned about is zoned for condominiums.
- Mr. Gilpin agrees they should place it in the current location. He is disappointed in how this project is going.
- Ms. Phillips also feels they should place it in the current location and spend the additional \$40,000. This way there is consistency that all the playground items will be in the same place.

<p>On MOTION by Mr. Gilpin seconded by Mr. Brooks with all in favor staff was directed to install the playground in the current location. 4-0</p>
---

**D. Speed Bump Recommendation – 4514 Myrtle Beach Drive**

- There was a request from residents on Myrtle Beach Drive to do a traffic study for a speed bump.
- Based on the high-speed limits and number of readings exceeding the speed limits, security is recommending a speed bump be installed in the area of 4514 Myrtle Beach Drive.
- Mr. Herrick stated there was 47% on one study and 50% on the other study of people going over the speed limit.
- Ms. Phillips asked if anyone asked the residents if they want the speed bump in front of their house. Mr. Herrick responded they requested the study.
- Mr. Stegall explained someone came to us and said they had a lot of speeders, and it is dangerous. That is why the speed monitor was put there. They could put the speed bump directly in front of the requestor if that is what the Board wants.
- Mr. Herrick stated they have always made the decision based on the road and the area as to where staff thinks the most effective spot will be. Directly in front of that resident's house may or may not be the best place for it.

- Mr. Brooks and Ms. Phillips noted in the past they have asked residents whether they want a speed bump in front of their house.
- The floor was opened to public comments.
- Mr. John Hunter, a resident, is not in favor of a speed bump. He thinks it cheapens the neighborhood. People who have speed bumps near their homes have said a tremendous amount of noise is made when utility vehicles and other service vehicles go up and down the road. He suggests they poll the residents who live on that street to see if they are in favor of it or not before deciding.
- Mr. Herrick asked if they had previously required the applicant to get signatures from the neighborhood to have a speed bump installed. Mr. Stegall responded he was correct.
- Mr. Herrick asked Mr. Hunter if he could get signatures to see what the preference is before the Board decides. Mr. Hunter responded he would.
- Mr. Schumacher stated his recollection is there is a policy. He does not remember the policy being waived, but he will look into it.
- Mr. Brooks suggested they redefine what a petition should be for because the last time people who did not live on the affected street, signed the petition.

On MOTION by Ms. Phillips seconded by Mr. Gilpin with all in favor installation of a speed bump at 4514 Myrtle Beach Drive was tabled. 4-0

**E. Strategic Action Plan**

- Ms. Fells reviewed the Strategic Action Plan.
- They worked very hard on this document when Mr. Stegall was previously with them.
- Recently they met with director level staff several times to go through this document and update it.
- It contains a list of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, otherwise known as a SWOT analysis, for the District.
- There are no changes to the mission and vision statement. Most of the changes will occur in the strategies for improvement under the SWOT analysis.

- This is mostly a guide for internal staff to be able to use for decision making and other operational purposes going forward. It is like a road map of where they need to go and how to get there.
- Mr. Brooks stated some of the items have already been done or are being done. He needs some clarification on why they list what has already been done.
- Ms. Fells stated the staff feels all the major improvements listed under strengths have been completed so they do not see a financial looming situation for those.
- Mr. Brooks stated under weaknesses, manholes, water hydrants and valves are listed but he believes they have been addressed this year. He does not see them as a weakness. Mr. Stegall clarified they are more in the stage of being addressed than having been addressed. They have done as much as they can, but they still have multiple hydrants and valves needing attention as they go forward. It will need to be put into next year's budget. Mr. Stegall stated they also looked at approximately half of the manholes. Mr. Brooks still sees them as a strength because a program has been developed to address them.
- Mr. Stegall stated this is a living document that tells them what they need to be working on.
- Ms. Fells stated once those items are completed, they would move over to more of a strength saying these areas of infrastructure have been recently updated and staff feels they are in a good spot.
- Mr. Brooks commented on the Recreation Masterplan and said it is for all intents and purposes worthless. There is nothing left they said they would do. He is not sure, aside from the swimming pool, what is there. Mr. Stegall responded the swimming pool, continue to develop additional trails and walking paths. Mr. Brooks stated maybe they should be more specific or eliminate it totally.
- Mr. Stegall stated in a community like this one, they always need to be looking forward as to what additional recreational opportunities are available. Mr. Herrick questioned whether that becomes a weakness if they are constantly looking forward.



- Ms. Fells stated as this serves as an operational guide for staff, it is also a guide for recreation.
- Mr. Brooks suggested revisiting the Recreation Masterplan and update it to include it in the Strategic Plan. A lot of the things which were in there, they found out they could not do such as the walking path.
- Ms. Fells stated the original idea of the walking path was for it to loop all around the lake. That was squashed. There is still some opportunity to keep that within the recreational complex area. There are still plenty of opportunities for walking trails and Ms. Kramer has said on multiple occasions that grant funding for walking trails are plenty. Ms. Fells agreed that the Recreation Masterplan needs to be updated as it is also a living document.
- Mr. Herrick asked how much the muck in the area affects a pool if they want to put one in. Mr. Stegall responded they will not know until they test it. Mr. Herrick would like to have it tested because it may affect whether they have a pool there.
- Ms. Fells stated it will be a good opportunity to test it in tandem with the updates to the Recreation Masterplan. It may be helpful to do the survey for the whole property so they know what they can put where and what it will cost.

**F. Meeting Schedule (Change Option)**

- Mr. Herrick stated he found out when they changed their schedule to meet every three weeks on a Monday, it created issues for some of the people who must do the setups. He would like them to discuss the problems they are having.
- Ms. Benka stated having the meetings on Mondays is complicated on the IT part as well as the recreation center. Coming off a weekend does not allow staff to prepare for an early Monday morning meeting. There was an incident recently where the agenda had to be changed over the weekend and it does not give them enough time to post it in a timely manner.
- Mr. Stegall stated this facility is rented a lot of weekends by residents for parties; therefore, someone must come in at 5:00 a.m. to set up.

- Ms. Benka noted they have been not renting it on the weekends before so it could be mostly set up; however, this is a loss of revenue.
- Mr. Stegall noted an additional issue of having a meeting like today on the 13<sup>th</sup> of the month, means the Board is looking at January numbers. It would be a more efficient use of the Board's time if the meetings were held the last week of the month.
- Mr. Brooks suggested going back to Fridays, one meeting a month at the end of the month. He suggested adding an extra meeting from April through August, or possibly September, which would be solely budget meetings.
- Ms. Phillips prefers Tuesdays. Mr. Brooks noted the County has their meetings on Tuesdays. Ms. Benka stated if the Board chose to meet the last Tuesday of every month, it would not conflict with the County meetings. Also, no holidays fall under the last Tuesday of each month either.
- Mr. Herrick likes having one meeting a month, but also agrees they should have budget meetings. He opened the floor to public comments.
- There were no public comments.
- It was noted there are several comments in the Facebook pages asking for meetings to be held at a time other than 9:00 a.m. in the morning so people who work can attend.
- Mr. Herrick stated they tried having evening meetings and there was no change in attendance.

Mr. Brooks MOVED to approve having one meeting a month for District business and Ms. Phillips seconded it.

- Mr. Gilpin asked if cities and counties have only one meeting a month. The response was several do only have one meeting a month. It often depends on the size and how much business they need to conduct.

Mr. Brooks MOVED to amend his previous motion approving one meeting a month at the end of the month for District business and Ms. Phillips seconded it.

- Mr. Bill Norcross stated they have had a lot of meetings at the Sun 'n Lake Clubhouse. He suggested on the alternate meetings, if there is a conflict with the meeting dates, that they be held at the restaurant. Mr. Herrick noted they have had meetings at the restaurant when they changed them to evening meetings and had the same amount of attendance.

On VOICE vote with all in favor the motion as previously stated passed. 4-0

- Mr. Brooks asked when the budget process begins. He was told in April. Mr. Brooks noted the budget needs to be submitted in September so they should be done with it in August.

Mr. Brooks MOVED to have a budget meeting separate from the regular meetings from April through August on the second week of the month on a date to be determined and Ms. Phillips seconded it.

- Mr. Herrick stated the summer is the time of the year when most vacations are scheduled. He suggested having only a business meeting in July and add on at the end of the business meeting something about the budget.
- Mr. Brooks stated if the budget process goes smoothly, they can cancel a budget meeting.
- Ms. Phillips clarified staff creates the budget and then brings it to the Board. Mr. Herrick noted the Board gives them direction on the budget.
- Mr. Garlinghouse stated there are typically multiple steps. They will likely originally bring them something with staff's recommendation and then work with the Board to change accordingly.

- Ms. Phillips asked if they will be ready for the first budget meeting. Mr. Garlinghouse responded he believes they will have something for the Board.
- Mr. Herrick asked what the requirements are to cancel a meeting. Mr. Schumacher responded once they come up with a new schedule, they will have to publish it and it will all be part of the same process. Any scheduled meeting can be cancelled.
- Mr. Herrick asked how much notice to they need to have to cancel a meeting. Mr. Schumacher responded he does not think they need to publish a cancellation but will check to see if there are any publication requirements for a cancelled meeting. He does not think there is a requirement to publish a cancelled meeting in the newspaper. They can post the cancellation on the District website and bulletin boards.
- Mr. Herrick noted they still need to have the landowner meeting on the last Friday of January.

On VOICE vote with all in favor the motion as previously stated passed. 4-0

- Mr. Brooks stated he would like to make a motion to select Tuesday as the meeting date if it does not conflict with the County meetings.
- Mr. Gilpin stated they need to look at everyone's schedules. He has vacation already planned based on the current meeting dates. He does not want to miss a meeting because they changed the meeting dates.
- Mr. Herrick suggested everyone check their schedules to see if Tuesday works out. If Tuesday is a good date for everyone, he requested staff place it on the agenda as an action item.
- Mr. Brooks stated they can start in May if it works out for everyone.
- Ms. Benka requested clarification on the regular meetings. The Board voted for the end of the month. She asked on the months were there are five weeks instead of four, do they want the meeting to be on the fourth or fifth week. Ms. Phillips responded it should remain the last week of the month.

**G. Meters – Sustainability Partners**

- Mr. Garlinghouse stated the Board received the first contract with Sustainability Partners. They made a couple of small changes. Nothing substantial, just clarification for the District's sake.
- They would like to get the contract signed so Sustainability Partners can start the process of getting the meters into the ground, most likely in mid-April. They do not foresee an issue with getting meters.
- There is a monthly fee of \$25,294, which includes a cost for having a project manager providing oversight for the meters going in the ground and will be assisting the District's office staff that handles utilities with the different programs. There is another option for \$19,341 per month, which does not include the project manager's assistance. Mr. Garlinghouse and Mr. Stegall agree they need his assistance now, but in the future, they can look at reducing the monthly fee.
- Mr. Herrick stated instead of outlaying the capital on this project all at one time, this allows us to get the meters replaced and get accurate readings on the water usage by using Sustainability Partners. They are the ones outlaying the capital. The District can exit the program with them at any time and take over the meter project on the value left to the system. He thinks it is a win/win situation since they do not have to outlay over \$2 Million to get this implemented. They had a meeting with Sustainability Partners and if they are as good as they say they are, there are many ways they can be used in the future on some other project. He thinks it is in the District's best interest to move forward with this.
- Mr. Stegall stated this can be looked at as an operating lease. They are buying the meters, putting them in the ground, and the District is only paying monthly for the use of each meter. The District is basically paying a little over five dollars per month for each meter. It will go up as more meters are installed and the District grows. The District does not have to put out capital at one time. This is probably the best option currently. The only other option is to borrow \$2 Million and pay the bank. There is no penalty in exiting this agreement. It is a 20-year lease, but you can get out at any time.

- Mr. Brooks stated the cost is \$303,000 a year. They only budgeted \$185,000 a year. Mr. Garlinghouse responded that is correct. The prices have gone up like everything else. They would adjust future budgets.
- Mr. Brooks asked how long this agreement lasts for. Mr. Stegall responded the lease is for 20 years unless the District exits prior to.
- Mr. Brooks asked if it stays at this price for 20 years. Mr. Garlinghouse responded it does. The only thing that can change on this is what they call the MMC/MMR. If they incur any extra unforeseen costs such as having to repair the system, this is a reserve for them to pay for those costs. Staff discussed this with them. They do not foresee any of those costs at this point. These meters have a ten-year lifespan for full replacement warranty and then another 10 years prorated. Staff does not see any additional cost at this point.
- Mr. Brooks asked if something happens to the meter the District does not have to pay for them. Mr. Garlinghouse responded for ten years, 100% warranty. Mr. Brooks asked who pays for it after that. Mr. Garlinghouse responded it is prorated.
- Mr. Garlinghouse stated it is a Kamstrup warranty, which is the manufacturer. This will pay for the employees to come out and replace them.
- Mr. Brooks asked where in the contract does it say they can backout. Mr. Stegall responded it is a monthly lease so you can backout in a month if wanted. If the District decides to get out after one year, there is no penalty. The fee to them would be 19/20<sup>th</sup> of the initial cost.
- Mr. Brooks asked if they will no longer treat this item as capital in the budget. Mr. Stegall responded that is correct. It is an operating lease.
- Mr. Brooks did not understand when they said the District will be paying an additional amount of money initially. Mr. Garlinghouse responded \$5,000 a month for the "project manager". He is based out of Avon Park. They have worked with him in the past. He is qualified on both the install side as well as the software side. His fee is included in the \$25,000.

- Mr. Herrick noted there are other places where they are doing this type of work as well.
- Mr. Brooks asked if they start getting accurate readings, do they anticipate any problems with the customers. Mr. Stegall responded the District's meters are over ten years old, they are mechanical, and they are probably not reading accurately. The District probably has water going out that it is not getting paid for. These are sonic meters. They do not wear out because they measure the sound as the water goes through.
- Mr. Stegall stated one of the issues they think they will have to deal with is as the meters go in, they will not go in the first of the billing cycle so they will have to make an adjustment for the people who are getting new meters. They need to make sure they are fair with the residents.
- The floor was opened to public comments.
- Mr. Daniel Garvin asked if the individual cost for this project is included in these figures. He asked what it will cost the residents. Mr. Herrick responded that the only cost the residents will have is an accurate water bill. There would only be a fee for new construction.
- Mr. Daniel Garvin stated he has the agenda from the District's website, but he wants to know if all the documents discussed are available. Ms. Benka responded the full agenda package with all the backup is online.

On MOTION by Ms. Phillips seconded by Mr. Gilpin with all in favor the contract with Sustainability Partners for the installation of new Kamstrup water meters was approved. 4-0

**H. Roofs – Hail Damage**

- Mr. Garlinghouse stated they have reviewed all the bids received. There are about 1,000 data points they looked at. There were 46 locations on the bid. They looked at the different bidders and how closely they followed the scope of the work. If they deviated, they checked if the deviation was acceptable. They were going to originally look at splitting this work up with multiple vendors because of the number of different

locations. After reviewing with Mr. Stegall, Mr. Jones, and some other decision makers, they decided to go with one vendor, Quality Roofing and Sheet Metal of Central Florida. They are at a substantially lower cost than the other vendors. The gentleman is not too far away from the District office and did work on this building a few years ago. He comes with some high recommendations and can start mid-April, with an expected completion date of August or September. They do not foresee him doing some of the paint work as it is not his specialty, but they do not foresee this being issue given the cost.

- Mr. Herrick asked if the insurance company would cover District staff doing that type of work. Mr. Garlinghouse responded yes.
- Mr. Stegall stated this was a complicated process. The District's insurance is covering the costs. The intention is to have the District engineer make sure it is done properly.
- Mr. Herrick noted he has personally had this company do work on his property and he is satisfied with their quality. He has also seen other places where they have done work and it was satisfactory.
- Mr. Brooks stated the original list was \$975,000 worth of damage. This company is going to take care of approximately \$870,000 so there is \$100,000 left that the District must do or get someone else to do. Mr. Garlinghouse responded there is some pressure washing, painting and some light fixture replacement, which he does not do.
- Mr. Brooks asked if the District is planning to do the rest of the work in-house. Mr. Garlinghouse responded the building maintenance group will likely do it. If they cannot, it is a small amount, and they can outsource it.
- Mr. Brooks requested they get together with Mr. LaMere and his people so when the roof is done on the Clubhouse, they can start right away with the painting they have to do and the finishing of the columns.
- Mr. Daniel Garvin stated he had Quality Roofing and Sheet Metal of Central Florida do work on his roof due to the hail damage. One of the reasons is because Mr. Austin Hedrick has made a substantial investment in his own equipment. He is rolling his own



panels and they were excellent. He was pleased with how they handled the work and like that Mr. Hedrick was available to talk with him.

- Mr. Garlinghouse stated he does have his own fabricating machinery, which he does not believe the other bidders have. He stated the Board can visit the company prior to work being done.

On MOTION by Mr. Gilpin seconded by Ms. Phillips with all in favor awarding the bid for the hail damage repairs to Quality Roofing and Sheet Metal of Central Florida was approved. 4-0

**I. Unit 23 Pond Cleaning**

- Mr. Stegall recommended tabling this item. Currently the ground water level is too high for them to do the pond cleaning. They tried to dry one of them up, but water keeps coming through the bottom. They could possibly do it in a few weeks and he had a bid for \$104,000; however, he thinks it is better to wait until next year to do this.
- Mr. Brooks asked if this is in the budget or if it would be an add-on. Mr. Stegall responded it would be an add-on.
- Mr. Brooks asked if there are any other ponds that need to be addressed as well. Mr. Stegall responded this is four ponds at Unit 23. The issue is a bulldozer needs to go into the pond and that cannot be done with too much water. They will probably go in and use the skid steer to break up the crust.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Add-on Items**

There being none, the next item followed.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Petitions and Communications**

There being none, the next item followed.

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Staff Reports (ats: 1:32:27)**

**A. Golf – Mike LaMere/Jimmie Murphy**

- Mr. Murphy stated they will be doing some knockout roses up front and do a royal poinciana behind the sign on US Highway 27. They will be planted this week. They are going to put a matting down and some rocks there as well. On Friday they planted

viburnums outside of the maintenance facility and put the three foxtails behind #5 Tee. They also planted oak trees. There are approximately 20 pine trees he will put on the left side of 18, which is one of those hotspots where they do not have irrigation.

- They are getting ready for MGA Member Guests this week. Some of the greens have slowed down because of the growth, but they are close to getting them lowered down. After this month, they will get on a full maintenance program.
- Mr. LaMere reported they have a lot of their large events coming up. They had their two-day St. Patrick's Day show at the Clubhouse last week. It was the first time doing it since pre-Covid. It was well attended, and everyone had a good time. They are preparing for MGA Member Guest. After that it will slow down a bit until they get through Easter.
- They are getting ready for their summer maintenance program.
- The next couple of weeks will be very busy.
- The February figures looked solid, right at budget. Twelve days into March, they are tracking ahead of budget. The only thing which may affect the financials in March is there is a lot of repair and maintenance going on. They had a little issue with some electrical things and dishwasher went down so it had to be repaired.
- Mr. Brooks requested the results from the Chen Dental Golf Tournament.

**B. General Counsel – David Schumacher**

- Mr. Schumacher stated they have a Shade meeting scheduled in about 30 minutes to discuss the Avanti lawsuit. Mr. Rhodes is here. He does not know if the Board wants to hold the meeting here or in the conference room. They are just waiting on the court reporter.
- He looked up the speed table policy the District has and they need to have a petition with at least 20 District lot owners adjacent or within the vicinity. Mr. Brooks thinks that is too much and he suggested coming up with a different number. Mr. Herrick thinks 10 should be sufficient. There was consensus. Mr. Schumacher will revise the policy manual to reflect that.

**C. Finance Director – Dane Garlinghouse**

- Mr. Garlinghouse reported as of today, the District has collected \$3.24 Million, which is 77% of this year's assessments. March will be the big indicator to see what their collection ratio is.
- AARPA has been submitted to the County. They have a meeting on March 21, 2023. He will be attending that meeting and Mr. Stegall may attend as well. It will likely be a consent agenda item, but they will be there to answer any questions.
- Ms. Fox-Dickerson continues to work with the FEMA representative on a daily/weekly basis. FEMA will be on site March 20, 2023 to inspect the racket club fencing. They will also be here on April 11, 2023 to inspect some of the roads such as Columbus, Boston, Minorca, Caballero, and Cortez.
- Mr. Herrick asked if FEMA has requested an RFP for all the road repairs. Mr. Garlinghouse responded they will. Mr. Herrick asked if it is being repaired. Mr. Stegall responded yes; they are working on the specifications for it now.
- Mr. Brooks asked when it is anticipated that FEMA will be done conducting their inspections. He asked how many they have left to do. Mr. Stegall responded he believes the inspections scheduled for March 20, 2023 and April 11, 2023 are it. Mr. Garlinghouse stated he can foresee more, but those are the big ones. They can always come back and do some small inspections.
- Mr. Brooks stated the Board approved \$350,000 for drainage four or five months ago and it is still not in the budget. Mr. Garlinghouse stated he requested Inframark put it in. There are a couple of other things. They are in their Audit timeframe so that may be holding them up. There are some other things he asked, and they are working on it.

**D. General Manager – Dan Stegall**

- Mr. Stegall requested Ms. Fells provide an update on his replacement.
- Ms. Fells stated the application window for candidates to apply for the General Manager position with the recruiting firm closed on March 10, 2023. There were 25 total applicants who applied for the position. They have been narrowed down to six,

with potentially two more they are teetering back and forth with. The next step in the process is they will begin with the background checks before they send over a list of candidates to review their resumes with the results of the background checks. She expects a full report this afternoon.

- Mr. Brooks asked how much this will cost the District. Mr. Stegall responded \$35,000. Mr. Brooks asked about the additional costs when the candidates visit the District. Mr. Stegall responded it depends on how many people they want to bring in and how much they want to talk to them.
- Mr. Brooks asked if the intent is still once this person is hired, they will hire an operations manager. Mr. Stegall responded that is the way he understands it.
- Mr. Gilpin asked when the recruiting company will turn it over and be done with it. Ms. Fells responded the end of May. Mr. Stegall stated they will assist them in negotiating with the applicants.
- Mr. Herrick stated he does not want Mr. Stegall to leave for some time after they hire the new general manager. He expects the new candidate to pick Mr. Stegall's brain for two to three months before he leaves. He expressed appreciation for Mr. Stegall's help. Mr. Stegall stated he will remain for the time the Board wants him to.
- Mr. Stegall stated he intends to put money in the budget to extend the sidewalk along Columbus to tie into the sidewalk Commissioner Kirouac discussed. They also discussed finding grant money to cover at least part of it. He does not know how much it will cost so he requested Mr. Jones provide an estimate.
- They continue to pour pads along the hydrants. They are somewhere between 45% and 50% through with the process. There are over 400.
- Calatrava water management project is almost complete. They are pouring concrete today. They have done a nice job.
- They ran into some issues behind the dialysis center. They will not be able to put the culverts in as expected, primarily because there is a three-phase powerline back there.
- The Board was shown drone footage of the Calatrava project.

- There are some projects they are still working on such as the skimmers that need to go into the stormwater ponds. They need to dry some areas up before they can get things done.
- All the generators have been inspected. Any issues were repaired. The only one that is not in operational order now is Tanglewood’s lift station. They have a Thompson Pump they can use if needed.
- Roads and drainage cleared every ditch east of Cortez. They are now working west of Cortez. They cleaned all of them in the southern Unit 16. They will finish the rest of those and then go to Gerona to start working back towards Cortez with a primary emphasis on any houses that are going to be built along Gerona so we make sure we get those ditches cut in.
- The lights on the north sign continue to be problematic. There are drivers that go with LED lights, and it is a supply issue. They have been ordered and will be installed as soon as they arrive.
- Mr. Stegall recognized Ms. Fells for her work on the HR policy and Mr. Garlinghouse for his work on the three projects he discussed today.
- *The recording cut off at the 1:55:38 mark so the remainder of the meeting could not be transcribed.*

**ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Follow-up Items**

**TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**New Business**

**THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Discussion to/from Board**

**FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**


**Sunshine Law Workshop**

**FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

There being no further business,



  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Craig Herrick, President