

MINUTES OF MEETING  
NARCOSSEE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Narcoossee Community Development District was held Monday, February 25, 2008 at 3:00 p.m. in the offices of Governmental Management Services, 201 E. Pine Street, Suite 950, Orlando, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Allan Goldberg	Chairman
William W. Cole, Jr.	Vice Chairman
Eric Wills	Assistant Secretary
Michael Amsterdam	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

George Flint	District Manager
Roy Van Wyk	District Attorney by telephone
Rey Malave	District Engineer
Barry Roy	District Engineer
Alan Scheerer	Field Operations
Jason Showe	Assistant District Manager
Stephen Giercyk	Resident
Marianne Smith	Boyle Management

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

Mr. Flint called the meeting to order.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of the Minutes of the November 27, 2007 Meeting**

Mr. Flint stated the next item is approval of the minutes of your last meeting of November 27, 2007. Those minutes were provided to you in your agenda packet. Are there any additions, deletions or corrections to the minutes?

There not being any,

On MOTION by Mr. Goldberg seconded by Mr. Cole with all in favor the minutes of the November 27, 2007 meeting were approved as submitted.
---

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS****Discussion of City of Orlando Letter  
Regarding a Wall Encroachment****A, Ratification of Proposal with F & S Land Clearing, Inc. for Removal of  
Dowden Road Screen Wall**

Mr. Flint stated the next item is a letter from the City of Orlando that we received on January 9, 2008 advising the district that there was a screen wall on Dowden Road that was basically located in the wrong place. There is an X10 tract and a city right of way and when that wall was constructed it was apparently constructed in the wrong location. Because of the construction and the widening of Dowden Road they advised us in that letter that the wall encroachment must be removed. As a result of that we tried to investigate why the wall was located where it was but in the interim because of the construction on Dowden Road we didn't want to be in a position where we were holding that contractor up and possibly causing any incurrence of delays we asked the district engineer to get a proposal for removal of the wall and constructing a new wall. There is a proposal from F & S Land Clearing for \$3,750 and the next lowest price we had was about \$6,000. It was a very competitive price and we had to go ahead and instruct the contractor to move forward with the work of removing that wall. What we are asking the board to do today is to ratify the proposal from F & S Land Clearing for removal of the wall. That is the first item we are asking the board to consider. It is out of order and is under the manager's report but there is a proposal dated January 25, 2008 from F & S Land Clearing for that amount.

On MOTION by Mr. Goldberg seconded by Mr. Cole with all in favor the proposal with F & S Land Clearing, Inc. was ratified.
--

**B. Consideration of Proposals for Construction of the Dowden Road Screen Wall**

- i. Proposal from Seminole Masonry, Inc.**
- ii. Proposal from UCC Group, Inc.**

Mr. Flint stated now that the wall has been removed we asked the district engineer to get proposals for reconstruction of the wall. There are two proposals in your agenda packet. One actually our field service manager got and the other the district engineer got. There is a proposal from Seminole Masonry for \$14,417.14 I think their original proposal was approximately \$19,000 and after a request for them to review their bid and sharpen their pencil they came back with \$14,717.14. UCC Group that we work with in a number of other districts also provided a

proposal for reconstruction of that wall of \$26,000. We have two quotes. As far as the budget to pay for this in the LaVina budget there was \$15,000 set aside that was not earmarked for any specific project and the district overall had an operating reserve of \$97,000 so the combination of the \$15,000 in the LaVina budget with the \$97,000 would more than cover any costs associated with tearing the wall down and reconstructing it.

Mr. Van Wyk asked what part of the budget should the cost of this wall come from? Is this a LaVina cost or is this a cost to the whole district?

Mr. Flint responded that is a question. This section of the wall is in the LaVina section. That area as far as the landscape maintenance goes and the other costs associated with the LaVina area are paid for out of the LaVina portion of the budget.

Mr. Van Wyk stated for the purposes of maintenance but this is a section of wall that the district paid for out of bond funds. All the property owners within the district are paying a portion of the bonds so it sounds to me like this would be more of a district-wide commitment than it would be a LaVina commitment.

Mr. Flint stated with that in mind we do have a budgeted operating reserve of \$97,375. The board can choose to take it all out of that portion of the budget which is spread across all the sections of the district. I will also mention there is another item under my report, discussion of excess funds in revenue account. There is \$185,000 in the 2002A revenue account. The indenture for the bonds says that prior to the closeout of the project any excess money in that revenue account would flow to the acquisition and construction fund. After the closeout of the project it basically goes to prepay the principal on the debt. The project was closed out in 2005 by resolution we went back and looked at that. We were going to talk to bond counsel to see if there was any ability to use any portion of that \$185,000 for the wall but since the project has been closed out we may be limited in our ability to do that.

Mr. Van Wyk stated for the board's information I did call Danny he is out of town but I left a message and even though we did close out the project I am going to see if there is a way we can use some of that money to pay for the wall because the wall was part of the original project and it had to be demolished because of a construction error or something to that effect. Maybe there is a provision he can cite to where we can have at least enough for that wall put into our construction account to pay for this and not have to tap into our reserves.

Mr. Flint stated I think it was Bob Gang that was bond counsel.

Mr. Van Wyk asked have you spoken to him?

Mr. Flint responded no I haven't. We will investigate that on a parallel track and if there is any ability to use that money we will do.

Mr. Cole asked can we ask Warren because it is the same firm?

Mr. Flint responded yes.

Mr. Cole stated we will get a quicker answer.

Mr. Flint stated we can consult with Warren Bloom and Julio and see if they are comfortable giving us an answer. That brings us back to the issues of the proposals for reconstructing the wall. I did ask the district engineer to advise on the proper timing of the reconstruction of the wall. We don't want to do it too early and we don't want to do it after they put sidewalks and stuff in so we are going to need to time the reconstruction of the wall with the widening of the road.

Mr. Van Wyk stated also in the proposal it says it does not include surveys, site preparation, etc. How are we going to handle that? Will our district engineer provide the surveying services? That is the best way to handle it because if not we have to go through the CCNA. If we can use our district engineer we can use our existing contract and not have to do that.

Mr. Goldberg stated that would make sense.

Mr. Van Wyk asked are we going to need engineering drawings for a masonry wall, are they required?

Mr. Cole stated the contractor is going to provide them.

Mr. ----- stated on his original proposal he was going to provide the engineering and permitting.

Mr. Goldberg asked do we need engineering or permitting or can we just lap it up? This definitely does not include it.

Mr. ----- stated it was included in the \$19,000 proposal.

Mr. Goldberg stated I guess we already have engineering for it because it got put up once. Nothing has changed and we are putting up exactly the same wall. The question is do we need to get it permitted?

Mr. Malave stated I would think the city is going to require it.

Mr. Flint stated I didn't call the city and ask them that because I wasn't sure I wanted to bring it up.

Mr. Goldberg stated I know what the answer is going to be if you call the city.

Mr. Malave stated we sent somebody looking for the permit for the original and we can't find it at the city. We don't know if there was a permit or not we couldn't find it and neither could the city.

Mr. Goldberg stated it was definitely part of the engineering. It was the hardscape and landscape plan as part of the engineering plan.

Mr. Malave stated there was a permit but not specifically for the wall so it was harder to trace so we were trying to see if we could get a replacement for that and use the same permit and that is something that is possibly still valid. I didn't go any further because they couldn't find anything.

Mr. Van Wyk stated if you are going to approve this proposal you might want to authorize our district engineer to do the engineering and surveying services and have a not to exceed number.

Mr. Malave stated I think all we can do now is stake out the right of way and the limits of that easement and they will build the wall within the 5 foot area.

Mr. Goldberg stated I suggest that we have the district engineer do the survey layout and we should go back and take a look to see if we can use the original engineering plans and permit just for that section of the wall.

Mr. Flint stated in the event that we can't, authorize the engineer to pull the required permit.

Mr. Goldberg stated with the existing engineering plans.

Mr. Flint asked do you have a not to exceed estimate on what we should include?

Mr. ----- stated you may want to include Seminole at a little bit higher fee in case they have to do the permitting.

Mr. Malave stated I would say a total of \$1,000 for everything included, surveying and our effort to get a permit.

Mr. ----- stated I think we should let the contractor do the permitting.

Mr. Malave stated the pulling of it and we will assist in whatever he needs in drawings, etc.

Mr. Flint asked do you want to say \$17,000?

Mr. Goldberg stated that would be fine.

On MOTION by Mr. Goldberg seconded by Mr. Cole with all in favor the proposal from Seminole Masonry, Inc. was approved with a not to exceed amount of \$19,000 to include all permitting, engineering and surveying a portion of which will go to the district engineer for surveying to be paid first from the excess revenue in the 2002A bond issue and if it is not available then it will be paid out of the operating reserve in the general fund.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Staff Reports**

**A. Attorney**

There not being any, the next item followed.

**B. Engineer**

**Consideration of Proposals for “No Swimming” Signs for the Stormwater Ponds**

Mr. Malave asked did you want to bring up the signage?

Mr. Scheerer stated we did get two bids, Sign Essentials the company we use as well as Fast Signs off of Orange Blossom Trail. I looked at about a dozen “no fishing” signs. I tried to get each company to send me sort of a mock up but they couldn’t but they will say “no fishing”. Sign Essentials came in at \$1,200 for a dozen signs and poles and Fast Signs came in at \$729 for a dozen signs and poles. In our other communities we put them on every access easement and then with respect to the lakes that are on Dowden Road we have enough let over that we can put one or two or three extras depending on the size of the lake not to get it looking too cluttered but a couple on the main road side.

Mr. Goldberg asked what is the material?

Mr. Scheerer responded it will be an aluminum sign with vinyl lettering.

Mr. Goldberg asked are the poles also aluminum?

Mr. Scheerer responded they will be galvanized U channel posts. Staff will put those in.

Mr. Giercyk asked did you include the lake as well?

Mr. Scheerer responded there is enough to do the lake.

Ms. Smith asked so you can swim in there.

Mr. Scheerer responded no but I can add no swimming if you would like. The original request was to get no fishing signs.

Mr. Goldberg asked what do the policies say?

Mr. Giercyk stated first of all in the lake itself you can fish but there is no swimming. You are supposed to catch and release. The main thought behind these signs was for the retention ponds not for the lake itself. I don't know if you want to put no swimming on retention pond signs.

Mr. Goldberg stated we should.

Mr. Scheerer stated we can do the exact same sign that is here except for boating. We can have no boating on the retention ponds and not the lake.

Mr. Goldberg stated it sounds good to me.

On MOTION by Mr. Cole seconded by Mr. Wills with all in favor the proposal from Fast Signs for a dozen no fishing signs in the amount of \$729 was approved.
--

**Settlement Area by Sidewalk**

Mr. Flint stated this is a fax that Marianne Smith sent us earlier today.

Mr. Roy stated ----- went out there to repair the sidewalk settlement area, they did that work and there was a depression filled adjacent to the curb so there was a thought that there still may be a leak or some void area at the curb line. They went back, dug it back up investigated the underdrain they couldn't get down as far as the sewer lateral in that area so they don't know for sure if the sewer lateral is leaking. They found the underdrain to be basically in tact with some of the filter fabric disturbed but they didn't notice any substantial voids that would have caused the settlement from the underdrain. It wasn't very conclusive, the excavation and backfill. I don't know if there has been any additional settlement in that area.

Ms. Smith stated since then yes there has been. This is the picture from February 13 and it is back again and still an issue after the second repair. This is what it looked like in October before they did the repair. We have a proposal to put in a TV line through the sewer in that area. We put in more dirt to see whether that dirt would be sucked down to see if there is a problem for sure and I guess you have to go in with a TV.

Mr. Roy stated we are not seeing actual soil deposits in the inlet and that is the way it should be happening unless it is from a different direction versus 3 feet away from the inlet.

Ms. Smith stated I was going to get more bids.

Mr. Roy stated I contacted Vacuum Jet Services to give us a proposal see if they could run a camera through the lateral itself or through the main and look up the lateral and see if the actual sanitary sewer is the culprit. The city says they don't own that sewer system.

Ms. Smith stated that is right and Roy was supposed to look that up for me. I'm pretty sure that Mirabella owns their lines. He was supposed to check for me but I haven't had it verified. I'm worried that maybe some of the damage happened when we were putting underdrains in before because it is all really close right there in that area.

Mr. Roy stated it is right where the sewer lateral crosses too. You have a storm underdrain and a sewer lateral right below it right at the inlet. It is one of those two causing it.

Mr. ----- stated so you have to go all the way to the sewer lateral to determine that.

Mr. Roy stated either that or dig up the road and try to investigate it from the surface. You have to undermine the curb and the road to do the excavation. Marianne checked with the city and they basically told her the city doesn't own that sewer system. It was my understanding that the city owned that system.

Ms. Smith stated it says on the plat unless otherwise stated on this plat all property shall belong to Mirabella at LaVina. It doesn't say anything about the sewers on the plat.

Mr. Cole stated they are conveyed by separate instrument.

Mr. Goldberg stated let's see if we can find the bill of sale to the city.

Mr. Cole asked did you call the wastewater section?

Ms. Smith responded yes.

Mr. Roy stated it should have been part of the FDEP clearance on the sewer as to who is going to own and maintain that.

Ms. Smith stated that is why I didn't order the \$2,000 check on the lateral lines because I want to make sure we own them before we do that because we would be trespassing if we didn't.

Mr. Flint stated the city probably has their own TV truck.

Mr. Scheerer stated Nona Crest owns their sewers. I had some dealings with them as an HOA they had some damage to that and the city refused to come out and it cost that community \$10,000 to get it fixed.

Mr. ----- stated a lot of times when it is gated they won't take maintenance responsibility.

Ms. Smith stated that is what they said.

Mr. Cole stated I thought they took it all because they took the lift station so you would take the system in its entirety.

Ms. Smith stated that doesn't makes sense then if they took the lift station.

Mr. Cole stated probably the bill of sale was for the whole thing too, not just the lift station.

Ms. Smith stated if the dirt is going into the sewer system wouldn't you think they would have some issues?

Mr. Roy stated there is not all that much dirt going in. It can continue to flow without a problem.

Mr. Cole stated more likely there is a leak in the lateral and at some point in time the road will cave in because the water is coming out and the bottom will fall out. Dirt is not going into the sanitary system it is the sewage leaking into the surrounding dirt and it will continue to push away and form a void and everything will collapse.

Ms. Smith stated I know when the company that dug down there I don't think they saw very much water and when I had the maintenance guy go out and put in extra soil he dug down really far and just felt and he didn't feel any moisture. I'm wondering how you cannot have any moisture and where is it going?

Mr. Goldberg stated if there is a leak there is going to be moisture.

Ms. Smith stated we never saw any moisture.

Mr. Roy stated if we can determine who owns the sewer system and if the city does push down the TV and if they don't TV the line and if that is not the culprit then it is that underdrain system right at the inlet and we can take whatever excavation is required to dig it up and find out where the hole is.

Mr. Flint asked does the board want to defer action on this request by the HOA until we determine whether there may be a problem with the lateral and the sewer line?

Mr. Goldberg responded yes.

**Lake Levels**

Mr. Malave stated another thing that came up at a previous meeting is the lake levels at LaVina and after that meeting we went out there and found the outfall at the deep end of the lake is torn and the corrugated pipes instead of discharging into the wetland stream and the water levels were the same on both side of that outfall structure so it is not like the lake is backed up artificially above the adjoining wetland. We went over to Dowden Road at the culvert crossing there and the water levels were identical on both sides of the road so there wasn't any indication of obstructions at the equalizer pipes. The lake level is being controlled by the overall wetland stream of which there is no maintenance that occurs within that stream.

Mr. Cole asked could it be downstream construction backing it up?

Mr. Giercyk stated so the fact that it seems to be a little high at this point you are saying it is due to something downstream that you really don't have any control over.

Mr. Goldberg stated that is a correct statement.

Mr. Giercyk asked how do we as homeowners feel comfortable that it is not going to get too backed up?

Mr. Malave stated I think there is a safety factor within the drainage calculations that are required to provide an extra foot over the 100 year storm so it definitely should not with the way the situation stands today. With a major storm you are talking about 10"+ to get to the 100 year level. You could have water in the streets and that is probably it. But not cause any flooding in the houses. None of them were at the minimum grade, they were higher than that as I recall on the elevations.

Mr. Goldberg asked did you ask South Florida to do an investigation?

Mr. Malave responded we did not. We could do that.

Mr. Goldberg asked could you?

Mr. Malave stated we could send them a letter on behalf of the district.

Mr. ----- asked doesn't the city have a stormwater department?

Ms. Smith responded the city does, they can go out there and check it and see if there are boards they can take out or something.

Mr. Giercyk stated the only thing that concerns me is I know what the levels were the first year I was here. If I had to guess I would say it is staying a foot higher than it used to. I don't know what that means because I don't know what the system is.

Ms. Smith asked isn't there a weir at the end of it?

Mr. Roy stated that is basically half the pipe diameter. The pipes are a little bit staggered so there are a couple at the same invert one is a little bit lower.

Mr. Cole stated those pipes are preconstruction so they were not set to the designated grade so there is not a design grade on those pipes.

Mr. Malave stated let me verify the normal water and see what the elevation is today and should we as the district write a letter to the city's stormwater department and also to South Florida current construction department to verify if there are any impediments on the system that could be causing the higher normal water.

### **C. Manager**

#### **i. Consideration of Check Register for December and January**

Mr. Flint stated we have the check register in your agenda packet from November 1 through December 31.

Mr. Goldberg stated the \$125,000 check is that just a payment to pay down?

Mr. Flint responded that is moving money from the general fund to the debt service fund. When we receive it from the county it comes in one check so we have to write a check to the debt service fund. The total amount of the check register is \$167,636.49.

On MOTION by Mr. Goldberg seconded by Mr. Cole with all in favor the check register for December was approved.
--

Mr. Flint stated then we have the check register from January 1 through February 15 for \$36,142.74. The reason that is in two sections is that we had a meeting scheduled and we ended up canceling that.

Mr. Goldberg asked how did you code F & S Land Clearing? I suggest we go back and use the excess surplus and reimburse the operating account for that.

Mr. Flint responded we will do that because that is the same situation as the wall construction.

On MOTION by Mr. Cole seconded by Mr. Amsterdam with all in favor the check register for January was approved.

**ii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement for December and January**

**iii. Discussion of Excess Funds in Revenue Account**

Mr. Flint stated the memo is in the front of the book under section 3 tab A. Basically we have hired Vivian Cerecedo who used to be the trustee with U.S. Bank and before that Wachovia to go in and look through all of our trust indentures, all of our bond issues and one of the things that she found in the Narcoossee 2002A is that there is \$185,092.63 that is in the revenue account that as we discussed prior to project completion it would go to the acquisition and construction and after it would go to pay down the principal on the bond. There is no action by the board I'm just bringing that to your attention for information.

**iv. Discussion of Investment Options for the District**

Mr. Flint stated the next item is investment options for the district. As reported to you previously the SBA which used to be the vehicle that we used to invest any funds we had in excess of our operating needs has some significant problems. We withdrew the district's money that was in the SBA account and at this point it is sitting in the operating account which doesn't earn any interest. We are recommending to all of our districts at this point that the districts consider two things. One is approving a sweep agreement with SunTrust where we have our operating account so the money would be swept into an interest bearing account every night. We have a sweep agreement negotiated with Wachovia but we don't have one with SunTrust yet. In the future we will be coming back to the board and asking you to consider a sweep agreement with SunTrust. The other is the money in excess of what we need for our operations we are suggesting that the board enter into what is called a custody agreement and we provided you two examples one with U.S. Bank and one with Regions Bank. We are actually recommending the custody agreement with U.S. Bank. Basically those two entities do the majority of the trustee

work in the State of Florida with CDDs so they are used to taking bond funds and investing those funds in very conservative instruments so there is interest being earned on the bond funds. What we are suggesting here is that we enter into a custody agreement and these funds would basically be treated as if they were bond funds and depending on the actual fund that was chosen with U.S. Bank would depend on what the return would be. It would be anywhere from 4  $\frac{3}{4}$ % down to 3  $\frac{1}{2}$ % depending on the conservative nature of the fund. We are recommending the board consider the custody agreement with U.S. Bank which would allow us to move money into an interest bearing account.

Mr. Goldberg stated it says different available options of money market funds. Do you have ones you are suggesting?

Mr. Flint responded it goes from First American Tax Free Obligations which is the most conservative and those are basically treasuries and those earn the lowest return but in our case we look at several things. One is the safety of the investment, one is the liquidity of the investment and probably the last is the return on the investment because we are not necessarily concerned with maximizing our return but we are concerned with protecting the funds and our ability to access it. The next is First American Treasury Obligations Fund which is basically federal agencies that issue bonds. It is not as secure as the tax exempt money market fund it earns a little better interest and then it goes up from there.

Mr. Goldberg asked taxable money markets shouldn't affect us because we don't pay taxes, correct?

Mr. Flint responded right.

Mr. Goldberg stated so it doesn't make any difference if we do it taxable or tax exempt.

Mr. Flint responded no, it is just the security of the investments. It is really up to the board as far as your risk aversion on the investment. The safest would be to put it in the First American Tax Free Obligation. You could choose to put a portion in that and a portion in some of the other funds. We feel comfortable with all of the funds that they are fairly safe. We are going to be monitoring them. I don't think the district has a lot of exposure on any of these.

Mr. Goldberg stated I don't see much difference between the taxable money market treasury obligations or the tax free obligations because they are both treasury instruments. The taxable money market would pay a higher rate of return. That would be my first choice.

Mr. Flint stated we can put a portion in each and then just monitor it.

Mr. Cole stated put it all in the taxable we don't have a negative arbitrage.

Mr. Flint stated the First American Government Obligations which is the top one a 12 month yield was 4.78% that is the Z shares and that is what the trustees have been putting most of the bond funds in. First American Prime Obligations earned 5%, first American Tax Free Obligation was 3.3% and First American Treasury Obligation was 4.46% and First American U.S. Treasury Money Market was 4.2%.

Mr. Cole stated I would think the prime or the government.

Mr. Goldberg stated let's include it in the prime, what is that made up of?

Mr. Flint stated it would be U.S. Government obligations and the treasury would be treasuries.

It is relative at this point but they are all AAA rated by Moody's, S&P and Fitch. There were some sub prime mortgages that were AAA rated as well. The prime obligation is AAA rated money market fund it doesn't say what the specific investments are. The government obligation is invested in U.S. government backed agencies. It does include Fannie Mae and federal home loan bank and direct treasury notes and treasury bills. If those were to go under I think we would have a problem because they are backed by the federal government.

Mr. Goldberg stated I suggest we put it all in government obligations fund.

Mr. Cole stated I concur.

On MOTION by Mr. Goldberg seconded by Mr. Cole with all in favor the custody agreement with U.S. Bank was approved with the funds to be invested in the government obligations fund.

#### **v. Discussion of Qualifying Procedures for November General Elections**

Mr. Flint stated some of the election laws have changed in the last legislative session. The qualifying requirements and some of the qualifying dates have changed. We are also required to run an ad two weeks before qualifying period in the paper to let people know. As a practice we are announcing in our board meetings the qualifying dates and locations. This November you have two seats that are coming up for general election which are Mr. Goldberg and Mr. Cole. You have a landowner elected seat and in two years you will lose two more. The qualifying period is noon on June 16 through noon on June 20. You can qualify by paying a fee of \$25 or you can get 25 registered electors in the district to sign a petition.

Ms. Smith asked do you need a special form?

Mr. Flint responded you go through the supervisor of elections. They are the point of contact for anyone who wants to run for office.

Ms. Smith asked could it be any of the members?

Mr. Flint responded they have to live in the district and be a registered voter.

#### **vi. Discussion of Nona Crest Entry Landscaping**

Mr. Flint stated the next item is discussion of the Nona Crest entry landscape. I think we had the request from the Nona Crest HOA for the board to consider certain landscaping improvements at the entryway.

Mr. Scheerer stated I met with the president of the HOA for Nona Crest and another member of the board. They said that their residents have expressed interest in a new look on CDD property at the entrance. They have a board meeting on February 28<sup>th</sup>, they contacted Girard, REW and Woods Property Management and asked them all to submit bids. They were all over the place so what the board president asked me to do is to make you aware that they would like to see a change and that they would be looking to put a landscape plan together in their February 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. Once they do that they will get back with us and try to finalize what their look would be and we would assist in at least getting costs and see if it is within the CDD budget to do this year and if not add it to the budget for the next fiscal year. Rough estimates are around \$6,000 and none of them are etched in stone but they did want me to make the board aware of that. This is for informational purposes only. I am not asking for any action today, it will be a budget item.

Mr. Goldberg asked do they pay for their own entrance individually?

Mr. Scheerer stated there is a budget for Nona Crest, LaVina.

Mr. Goldberg stated it would be included in their budget for next year for which they pay the majority of.

Mr. Scheerer responded yes.

#### **Nona Preserve**

Mr. Scheerer stated Nona Preserve stormwater ponds have been deeded to the district and we finally had a meeting with the new property manager, Chris Anderson with Leland. Chris is

going to terminate the contracts for aquatic management and landscape contract for the stormwater ponds. He sent me an email today and he would like us to start April 1. Girard Environmental is the landscaper for the district, however, REW Custom Landscaping is doing the landscaping for the whole community of Nona Preserve and it is Chris' wish that they continue to use REW rather than mix landscape companies. REW does happen to be the low bid, we have \$18,000 budgeted for this year that has not been spent so both these \$11,000 bids fall within the budget guidelines that we have.

Mr. Flint stated for the board's background the Nona Preserve stormwater tracts were never conveyed to the CDD. That was something that Roy brought up to you at a prior meeting and got approval. The warranty deed was approved and filed and now those tracts have officially been conveyed to the district. Prior to that the HOA and Nona Preserve was maintaining and mowing and doing the aquatic management. We budgeted in anticipation of maintaining that for a full year and the estimate we had gotten from REW when we were doing the budget was \$18,000. There was some competition going on here between REW and Girard that got them a little more competitive on their prices. We don't have a problem with REW doing the maintenance in Nona Preserve because they are maintaining the rest of the community and a lot of those areas adjoin each other and it makes sense to continue to use them. Our recommendation would be to approve the REW contract for \$11,590.

On MOTION by Mr. Goldberg seconded by Mr. Cole with all in favor the proposal from REW in the amount of \$11,590 for landscape maintenance of the Nona Preserve stormwater ponds was approved.
--

Mr. Flint stated then we have the aquatic maintenance. Applied Aquatic is the company that we use elsewhere in the district and we are suggesting that the board approve an agreement basically it is amending that contract to add the areas within Nona Preserve. It is an annual cost of \$3,300.

Mr. Cole asked do we know what they are paying now?

Mr. Scheerer responded I do have that information but not with me and I know it is higher than what is quoted here.

Mr. Flint stated they are using another company.

Mr. Scheerer stated we have \$3,600 budget for this year and the cost for this contract is \$3,300.

On MOTION by Mr. Cole seconded by Mr. Amsterdam with all in favor the proposal from Applied Aquatic in the amount of \$3,300 for aquatic maintenance of the Nona Preserve stormwater ponds was approved.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Other Business**

There not being any, the next item followed.

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Supervisors Requests**

There not being any, the next item followed.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Audience Comments**

Mr. Giercyk stated first of all I want to say thank you for the attention you paid to the district. It looks very nice at the moment. I have a question dealing with the silt fence that was along the LaVina side of Dowden Road. For some reason it was taken down. I want to understand why and do we want it back up there?

Mr. Scheerer responded I don't have an answer as to why but I can get with Jr. Davis and find out.

Mr. Giercyk stated it has been removed from Narcoossee and Dowden back to the last community.

Mr. Scheerer stated I will call them and I will call you personally or email you.

Ms. Smith asked do you know when the LaVina sign is going to come down?

Mr. Scheerer responded no, I did have a meeting out there a couple of weeks ago just an impromptu meeting with Jr. Davis about the Capri walls and they told us they were going to start taking out the middle island in anticipation of correcting the approach of the road out to Narcoossee but they have not given a timeframe on the wall.

Mr. Flint stated I'm glad you brought that up. One of the things I meant to mention is the City of Orlando is requiring the developer to get a four party agreement between Randal Park CDD, Narcoossee CDD, East Park CDD and the city dealing with the signage. The city is

requiring that so right now the developer widening Dowden Road and doing Randal Park is developing a sign plan and a proposed interlocal agreement that East Park CDD, Narcoossee, Randal Park and the city would all have to approve. I think the idea is the agreement is going to obligate the developer or the Randal Park CDD to fund the signage plan but all the parties would have to agree to the signage plan. At this point there is no draft of that agreement but I will circulate that when we get it.

Ms. Smith asked will that just be signs for Randal Park or LaVina?

Mr. Flint responded it is going to be an offsite signage plan and I haven't seen any of the details on it.

Mr. Giercyk asked is this sign being in the center isle is that a new regulation by the city? The reason I'm asking is if you drive around this whole area especially down off Colonial you see several other situations that are identical to what we have.

Mr. Goldberg stated it is project specific based on traffic and safety.

Mr. Malave stated it has to do with the ability to drive at a certain speed and be able to recover and not hit that and if it is too close based on minimum requirements then they will not allow the sign.

Mr. Flint stated I think that is being designed for a future six lane isn't it?

Mr. Giercyk stated there are some comments that Narcoossee is going to six lanes, is there any truth to that?

Mr. Malave stated originally it was designed for 6 lanes and they only built four.

Mr. Giercyk stated if we run six lanes from the corner of Dowden and Narcoossee all the way back to 417 what happens when that traffic hits Narcoossee and it crosses over to Dowden being one lane in each direction?

Mr. Flint responded it probably wouldn't be six lane until Narcoossee was six lane. It is just being designed for the future six laning, it is not going to be constructed that way right now.

Ms. Smith asked is the center going to be landscaped?

Mr. Scheerer responded I believe it is.

Ms. Smith asked will the CDD maintain it?

Mr. Scheerer responded I believe we expressed an interest to continue to maintain that.

Ms. Smith asked would the CDD be paying the water?

Mr. Scheerer responded we have been already.

Mr. Giercyk asked are there any plans for additional landscaping between the edge of Dowden Road and the two retention ponds in front of Ziani?

Mr. Scheerer responded there are currently no plans that I am aware of.

Mr. Giercyk stated one of the things we asked about at the city meeting was consideration for additional noise abatement. There are all kinds of landscaping plans but I haven't seen anything that has landscaping and this is the board that would probably be involved with that.

Mr. Flint stated I think we have a set of plans that are old.

Mr. Giercyk stated about the only thing you could do is some kind of shrubbery.

Ms. Smith stated on Nona Preserve you said they had a certain amount set aside in their budget for landscaping. Does Ziani have a certain amount set aside in their budget?

Mr. Scheerer responded it is all of LaVina together it is not just Ziani. You all four make up LaVina.

Ms. Smith stated so there is not an individual budget for each one of the subdivisions. If Ziani wanted to do that landscaping it would come out of the whole LaVina Phase 2?

Mr. Goldberg responded correct.

Mr. Flint stated we have the budget and Nona Crest, LaVina, Nona Preserve and Parcels G & H.

Mr. Giercyk stated so Ziani is going to help Nona Crest redo their front.


Mr. Scheerer responded no, they have a separate budget. Nona Preserve is separate, Nona Crest is separate and the four communities in LaVina are their own budget.

Mr. Goldberg stated if you wanted to do yours they would help pay for yours.

Mr. Giercyk stated I just think the whole area should be well landscaped.

On MOTION by Mr. Goldberg seconded by Mr. Cole with all in favor the meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

  
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

  
Chairman/Vice chairman