

**MINUTES OF WORKSHOP MEETING  
ARBOR GREENE  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

The workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Arbor Greene Community Development District was held on Thursday, April 18, 2013 at 6:30 p.m. in the Gathering Room, Arbor Greene Community Center, 18000 Arbor Greene Drive, Tampa, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Adam S. Tanenbaum	Chairman
Toby P. Thomson	Supervisor
Steven Eckhardt	Supervisor
Michael S. Candella	Supervisor

Also present were:

John Ricciardi	District Manager
Bob Farrell	General Manager

*The following is a summary of the minutes taken at the April 18, 2013 Arbor Greene Board of Supervisors workshop meeting.*

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

Mr. Tanenbaum called the meeting to order and the Supervisors identified themselves at roll call.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Review of the March 2013 Financial Statements**

Mr. Thomson asked about the Trend Report, under Landscape, R&M Pump Station, on page 9 of the financials; have any more issues come up? *Mr. Farrell answered yes, we had more issues and it will be included in his report on Monday.*

Mr. Thomson also asked about page 10, under Tennis Courts, what did we have done in March for R&M Court Maintenance? *Mr. Farrell answered we paid Borrell \$744 for lamp repairs, we paid Stewart an extra \$800 for the extra wiring and painting the extra poles we agreed to; we paid Borrell an additional \$1,200 for 7 light repairs and we paid Stewart Tennis the agreed upon amount with a small deduction 6532; they paid for some of Borrell's time.*

Mr. Tanenbaum asked about the Trend Report, page 9, Under Landscape, R&M Renewal Replacement; does the \$6,300 actual include the Viburnum? *Mr. Farrell answered it does not. It includes we replaced a damaged tree and we had the seasonal color installed for \$6,000. The Cross Creek Beautification with the new Viburnum for \$4,000 is not there yet.*

Mr. Tanenbaum asked about the Revenue; seems like we are petering out at almost at 93%. *Mr. Ricciardi answered we are right about a tenth of a percent different than last year at the same time. It will come through tax certificates. Your next set of financials may reflect a little bit more. We are right on trend of where we always have been.*

### **THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Discussion of Preliminary Draft Fiscal Year 2014 Budget**

Mr. Tanenbaum stated here's how I thought it would proceed: Everyone has a copy of the budget that either Bob passed out last month or the revised version that was sent out two days ago. I thought we would go around the Board and give each person a chance to state where your thinking is as we enter this budget process. Bob Farrell has a wish list of items discussed but not in the budget; he will remind the Board of the list and we will go section by section, suggesting increases, decreases and other changes. If there is consensus then Ricciardi will make the tweaks and provide a new budget for Monday. If there is a consensus then you can bring it up on Monday and if you can get a majority vote to direct Severn Trent Services to make the tweak then great and if you don't, then you'll have another shot in May to make a motion to formally amend the proposed draft or draft proposed, whatever its called budget.

Mr. Ricciardi stated the budget we are working on Bob and I have been through a number of times with the accountant going thru and tweaking both the projected numbers and the budget column for 2014. We have done that in all areas of this budget and the one I sent out a day or two ago is the newest version of that; not much change except some very minor tweaks.

Mr. Tanenbaum asked which tweaks?

Mr. Ricciardi stated basically the changes from the 2013 budget, those are the ones. I can run through them all very quickly:

- On the Revenue side, we tweaked the Concession Revenue because Alan's contract included some revenue in there.

- We tweaked the Swimming Fees just slightly.
- The Assessments are obviously a little bit lower than last year. If you were to adopt this budget, unchanged, without anything added, the assessments would actually be down. Any changes you see within the 2014 as compared to 2013, there are very minor tweaks; some up, some down.
- On Administrative Expenditures, you will see Under Professional Services Management, that's us, it went up; not the fee but it is only adjusted for the transcription of the workshop minutes.
- Under Auditing, we just increased that by \$200.
- The Insurance Risk Management, you will see a fairly substantial increase there. We predict insurance rates will go up again; this is built in there. They are recommending at least a 15%.
- Printing and Binding was reduced based on we are trying to control printing costs and getting away from printing and do scanning.
- Legal Advertising is down a few hundred dollars from last year.
- Miscellaneous Bank Charges is down a little from last year as well as Office Supplies.

Overall, from an administrative point of view the Administrative Budget is up primarily due to the insurance and the transcription for the workshops.

- Under Water & Sewer, an adjustment in the Electricity, Main Fountain, we are increasing that from \$8,000 to \$9,500 based on projections for year end.
- Contracts Lake & Wetland went up about \$100 based on experience.
- No change under Landscape; it is the same budget as last year.
- Under Gatehouse, we decreased the Contract Security.
- We slightly increased Telephone and decreased Utility Water for a net decrease in Gatehouse costs.
- Road & Street, we decreased Electricity Street Lighting based on our experience. It did not go up as high as we thought. We know TECO is proposing an increase but the amount we have in there should be adequate based on projections; a reduction in Roads & Streets by about \$2,000.
- Swimming Pool – a reduction in Pool Maintenance Services to the actual, which is a \$300 decrease.

- No change in Tennis Courts – stays the same.
- Under Common Area, Contracts Air Conditioning, we decreased it to the actual contract rate.
- Fuel Gasoline and Oil we decreased by \$300, based on actuals.
- Communication Telephone, we decreased about \$600.
- Utility Refuse Removal, we increased based on projections and actual costs.
- Utility Water & Sewer, we increased by \$1,000.
- We eliminated the \$1,000 for Rental Lease Vehicle Equipment because we no longer have the lease.

With all those changes, in Common Areas the costs are within \$10 of last year.

- Under Newsletter, Postage and Freight went up slightly about \$60; a net increase of about only \$100.
- Under Personnel, Life and Health Insurance went up about \$1,000. Workers Compensation is up a little bit, about \$600; based on actuals and projections.

Overall, total Personnel from 2013 is up about \$1,400.

Total Expenditures in this budget is slightly down; about \$12,000 + since last year.

Mr. Eckhardt was asked for his comments on the budget.

Mr. Eckhardt stated the things I would like to see us focused on are the main asset, the Clubhouse, Swimming Pool, getting the clubhouse painted, worried about the roof and worried about the age of this place and the way it looks. We need to think about that instead of spending money on painting crosswalks and all these other things that I voted against. In my opinion the budget looks good, we just have to realize this is an aging facility and we will have to put money into it to get it back up to where we need to be to compete with the rest of the communities in the New Tampa area.

Mr. Thomson stated the only thing of concern to me in the budget so far, based on how it was presented, is just the Risk Management Insurance; we are looking at basically a \$10,000 increase, which is the biggest chunk in our budget.

Mr. Ricciardi was asked to explain why he expects this item to go up.

Mr. Ricciardi stated \$6,000; the actual is \$36,000 and we are budgeting at \$41,705.

Mr. Thomson stated I was looking at 2011 and 2012.

Mr. Ricciardi stated what we are seeing in the insurance industry right now is remember last year what happened is very few insurance companies wanted to quote CDD's because of all the defaults in the bonds and the potential for D&O suites that were coming out. As a result this year our D&O insurance went up significantly. This year we are projecting that we may have that problem again because of what is happening in the defaults. We also suspect property insurance will go up; it may not.

Mr. Candella stated over the last couple of months I have been here, we have enough on our plate with the Clubhouse between the painting and the structural and everything else, I am more concerned about that than anything else at this point.

Mr. Tanenbaum stated I went through the entire budget and using some of my institutional memory, such as it is, or memory from being through a bunch of other budgets, I think there is some over-budgeting in some of these line items and I think probably even enough to accommodate a bunch of what we would probably want to spend for next year for the clubhouse repairs and that kind of thing. Before just going to the bottom line and trying to raise assessments to cover some of the increased expenses, it would be to reallocate, become more efficient in areas where we have been budgeting in the past to accommodate priorities that have risen from sort of mid level to way at the top; including the clubhouse.

Mr. Farrell was reminded by Mr. Tanenbaum that lengthy explanations are not needed for everything.

Mr. Farrell passed out to the Board a list of items that were put together as requested; items that have been discussed; items that came up this year and we were asked to look into and get some quotes, etc.

Mr. Ricciardi interrupted and stated through March of this year our expenditures on this current budget are 49.17%, which means we are almost right-on budget. We are not usually that close. This year, because we made some adjustments in last year's budget, we are running better than perhaps we have done in the past.

Mr. Farrell continued the numbers on the list are very rough; low and high. We have different quotes and different quotes.

Mr. Farrell's list was discussed.

Mr. Ricciardi noted there are reserves for some of the items on the list and the reserves can be used for funding.

Mr. Farrell noted the item not on the list is the painting and re-doing the building because that is already in the current budget.

Mr. Ricciardi reported and explained the Projected Column; the projects April thru September which dovetail into the Total Projected.

The Revenue section of the budget was discussed. Mr. Tanenbaum noted the following:

- o The club membership and tennis fees; we have *seventeen five* budgeted for 2014? Is that a good number? Does that number include a 7% increase right no? *Answer: that includes your sales tax within that line item because your Projected for year-end is eleven three.*

Mr. Farrell noted we thought *thirteen* was an ok number.

Does anyone have a problem with lowering that to *fifteen six from seventeen five*?

Answer: no.

On the other side, Rents and Royalties, in 2011 we did *fifteen*, in 2012 we did *thirteen three*. Is there any reason to think it will go down to *ten* in the next year?

Mr. Farrell explained we are down some, it is not quite as busy and there is no way to sort that out.

Mr. Ricciardi: there again you can either be conservative or aggressive; pick a number and go with it. I would rather go conservative on that.

Mr. Tanenbaum asked what about the pool, the swimming fee thing? Is it likely they will try to lower their contract?

Mr. Farrell: I think that's a good point; it is very likely they will ask for a reduction. Wharton High School is moving their practices from Arbor Greene to Pebble Creek and they told us they only want to have their meets here and they have not discussed finances yet. It should be dropped \$1,000 to *sixty two*.

#### Administrative

There were no suggestions for this section of the proposed budget.

#### Legal Services

Mr. Thomson suggested moving this item to *ten* instead of *eight*.

Miscellaneous Services – bring it down to \$300.

Capital Outlay

Capital Outlay projects are projects over \$5,000 with an anticipated life of at least two years.

From Mr. Farrell's list air conditioning and pump station should go into this line item.

We can just add money for the pump station in that line item or we can add a new Reserve line item; then there would be an Assigned Reserve line item that can be drawn on down the road.

The Board discussed whether to keep the clubhouse under R& M Buildings or put it under Capital Outlay. *Answer: keep it under R&M Buildings to track what it is.*

Does anyone want to increase Capital Outlay for now? Answer: No.

Water Sewer

No changes at this time.

Flood Control

NPDES could be reduced from \$6,625. *Answer: Leave as it is right now; the \$1,500 for Maggie's report stays.*

R&M Storm System

We have \$10,000 budgeted and we have carry over from last year. Do we need that much next year?

Mr. Tanenbaum proposed bringing it down to \$1,000 for now.

Take Markings down to \$500.

Landscape

Do you want to bump up Pump Station to \$12,000 from \$7,000 just to cover the maintenance of that, not the whole replacement?

Mr. Farrell stated I am stuck at the moment because we have lost faith in our technical vendors opinion and I don't know what to tell you until I get Citrus 7 to give an evaluation of where we really are. There is no technical answer at the moment.

Mr. Ricciardi stated remember we have a Reserve that is Reserves Irrigation System; which encompasses the pumps as well.

We don't need a separate line item. It was suggested to do the entire thing from Unassigned.

Mr. Tanenbaum stated I think we should increase the R&M Trees and Trimming and be a little bit more aggressive on trimming some of the trees in the Villages. There are easily identifiable spots within the Villages where OLM could probably say that tree or this tree really needs some help; plus as a pure asset per preservation issue, I disagree with the approach we have taken in the past about the lamp post. I have a problem with telling the homeowner the light will not be replaced without the tree being trimmed by them because we are responsible for the safety within the Villages, those lights are ours, we own them, we are responsible for maintaining them and we should engage in self-help to protect the trees and not try to make the point.

Mr. Thomson asked how many street lights do we have like that. *Answer by Mr. Farrell: I don't know, I can find out; somewhere between none and ten.*

Mr. Farrell shared that we are with an increasing frequency, having trucks rip off limbs or partially off and then either we or Greenview have to go out and do something.

Mr. Ricciardi asked Mr. Tanenbaum how much was he thinking about putting in? *Answer: as a trial balloon, an extra twenty to see how it goes. Have OLM identify spots that need to be trimmed for danger or just clearance issues.*

Mr. Tanenbaum stated I am willing to put it in even if we had to increase assessments for it. Another idea would be to split it across two budgets, some this year and some next year or some after that.

Valley Crest gave us a proposal. They counted all the trees in each Village. Paul said that the number Valley Crest used is toward the very high end of what we should be able to get for a quotation for that much work. He thinks we can get a significantly better quote.

For now, for the budget we should keep it open as an option. Mr. Tanenbaum proposed to a rough half and splitting it across two budgets; *thirty five* increase; I guess it could be *thirty* going up to *forty*.

There was no consensus on the tree trimming issue and Mr. Tanenbaum will bring it up on Monday; leave it at *ten* for now.



Gatehouse

R&M Contingency – Mr. Tanenbaum stated every line item is a contingency because we don't know what the outcome, except for contracts and I think its false budgeting.

Mr. Farrell stated contingency is to cover things that you don't know.

Mr. Tanenbaum stated which is the entire budget, minus contracts.

Mr. Tanenbaum explained his issue with contingency in a budget; we should put it in a specific line item and be honest about it. Just to fudge it and put an extra five grand in and say we really don't know what we are going to spend it on is not right.

Mr. Ricciardi stated you don't need to call it contingency, I understand that, but then increase R&M Gatehouse to *eight*, or leave it at *eight* and reduce it down to *three*.

Mr. Tanenbaum: if there is a reason to reduce it to *eight*, I'm all for it, we should have a discussion about it.

Mr. Thomson: I agree with John in moving that *five* or however much you want to keep that into R&M Gatehouse and we no longer budget for contingency. Do you want to change R&M Gatehouse or do you want to completely eliminate that \$5,000 contingency?

Mr. Tanenbaum: I'd like to eliminate the line item contingency just for starters and then we can talk about gatehouse; I think gatehouse is probably a little low; we have been getting lucky this year based on experience.

Mr. Ricciardi: how about bringing it up to *five*?

Mr. Tanenbaum: I think that's great; we should.

Mr. Thomson: so we're looking at R&M Gatehouse from \$3,000 to \$5,000 R&M Contingency from \$5,000 to zero.

Bar Codes – an expense, \$3,500; do you think that is realistic?

Mr. Ricciardi: usually with bar codes you can't just buy a small amount.

Mr. Farrell: they last us about a year and we buy them in a batch and we bought them early in 2012; we go thru about 100 per month.

Mr. Tanenbaum: the total cost is about \$3,400 and the chances are we are not going to spend \$7,000 on bar codes in the next 18 months:

Mr. Farrell: No, it's an annual expense.

Mr. Ricciardi: maybe we could reduce the bar code number for 2014 by \$1,500 or \$1,000.

Mr. Tanenbaum: all right \$2,000.

Mr. Tanenbaum stated I don't want to let our budget cycle get by without mentioning Hartnagel, once again, and the bottled water delivery for the ..... ok, does anyone want to reduce or eliminate the bottled water for the gatehouse? No response.

Mr. Tanenbaum: the money we spend on Communication Telephone, the \$2,600, roughly, or whatever it is we spend, does that include the lines for the individual village gates?

Mr. Farrell: I forget which ones are in which category.

Mr. Tanenbaum: the only other category they would be in is in the individual gate budgets.

Mr. Farrell: the phone charges for each gate when the bills come in get allocated and charged to each gate.

Mr. Tanenbaum: ok so the \$2,600 is net of the individual gate costs.

Mr. Farrell: Should be.

Mr. Farrell stated someone had brought up a conversation that we currently have 6 TPD patrols per week.

Mr. Thomson noted he previously brought up the TPD patrols but had nothing further at this time.

#### Road and Street Facilities

Mr. Farrell reported we paid just over \$800 for our first road cleaning/sweeping to do the entire community. This was also a NPDES requirement.

Mr. Ricciardi suggested bringing it down to \$2,000 instead of \$3,000.

Mr. Thomson asked if Carriage Homes was part of the sweep. *Mr. Farrell responded I don't think we swept Carriage Homes.*

Mr. Ricciardi: we should go to them and ask them to sweep their streets, he will check with Maggie.

Mr. Tanenbaum: the sidewalks, I propose that we lower the budget for next year and here's why: I think that we are chasing our tail or it is a bottomless pit or some other metaphor; we are never going to completely eliminate unevenness of the sidewalks inside Arbor Greene. Assuming that is the case, and I think I'm on solid ground on that assertion, what we do every year is really a matter of margin, it's how much do we do and what are the standards by which we abide by it and I think that just trying to throw *forty five, or 80 or 90 or*

whatever at smoothing of sidewalks and doing it cart blanch per village, or doing it, I don't know, we don't have a standard right now. That's point one; point two is you can spend \$200,000 and eliminate what you think is every possible step or bump in the sidewalk, you won't get sued on any bump that you smooth-over, you're going to get sued on the bump that was missed or the bump that was the smooth over from the grinding; someone's going to trip, you always have exposure, it doesn't matter what you do. So you can't ever buy immunity from exposure; instead I think we should be more focused on actual safety, identify spots that are truly safety hazards either identified by resident or by staff. I propose we go in the other direction, instead of increasing this every year and spending more and more on sidewalks, I propose lowering it and using the money targeted to address the most serious hazards on sidewalks.

Mr. Thomson: my preference is completely opposite. I feel we should continue what we are doing.

Mr. Candella: as these tree roots get bigger and reaching out further it is only going to get more pronounced. I don't think that is one of those things we can afford. It would be better if we had a long term solution, but I don't think it's one we can afford to throw by the wayside right now.

Mr. Tanenbaum: I didn't propose throwing it by the wayside; I didn't even say zero funded; I'm saying I propose moving it down to *thirty* instead of *forty five*.

Mr. Thomson: I would also add that with the rear tennis court parking project, that we added \$10,000 or a little less than that in that line item, correct me if I'm wrong, for that project, for the new sidewalk that was put in as part of it and the ADA ramp and so on and I don't know if on the landscape we put new sod, I don't know that should have hit landscaping, I don't know how we were doing that last year but we did add some money, roughly \$10,000 for that project so if you brought it down to *thirty five* I think we more or less get back where we were because we're not doing that project again.

Mr. Tanenbaum: I think the Board approved, that was the end of the year meeting in October, *forty five* for the grinding, that was that big list; so whatever additional; I don't know what I think the balance of that would be.

Mr. Thomson: the number was much higher when we started the 2013 budget; that was...

Mr. Tanenbaum: are you talking about what we budgeted this year, I'm sorry.

Mr. Thomson: it was like *fifty five or fifty two* and we brought it down, but I know that *forty five* includes some money for that project, I don't know exactly, if I find out, but we can take that amount out.

Mr. Ricciardi: if you take the ADA ramps and such, it's probably in the range of at least *five*; I would say *five*.

Mr. Thomson: that *forty five* and then you have 2014, we should take out whatever that number is maybe you can get that exact number, at least *five*.

Mr. Farrell: some portion of 2011 was replacing sidewalks which cost more than the grinding.

Mr. Ricciardi: *thirty five* going once.

Mr. Thomson: I feel we should leave it at *thirty five*; the majority wants *thirty five* now.

Mr. Farrell: I'm not sure how to address it exactly, but the comment on the record that we don't have any standards I disagree with. We have been using 3/8ths, we have a no go gauge for 3/8<sup>ths</sup>; if it is 3/8ths or more they get marked and they have been repaired.

Mr. Tanenbaum: that doesn't explain what happened at Preserve where Dorsey went back and painted, anyway so.

Mr. Ricciardi: do you want to leave it at *forty five or thirty five*?

Mr. Candella: How much of the community has been done so far?

Mr. Farrell *Answer: A significant amount, it's in my report; my recommendation is that we fund and fix the remaining 150; that's all.*

Mr. Thomson: Are Miami Curb repairs hitting R&M Sidewalks? *Answer: some of them had been, we are working to get that moved out to some Street something, Roads and Alleyways, because they are obviously not sidewalks.*

Mr. Ricciardi; on the projected, if in fact the Board does approve this *ninety seven* at the next meeting, that would push this *fifty* up to *sixty*. It is not a big impact but it will change your projection.

Mr. Eckhardt: before 2011 how much of that was done? Was there anything spent on R&M Sidewalks? *Answer: I think we were doing some but would have to go back and look; not much.*

Mr. Farrell: we have been doing sidewalks for years and as the Oak trees have matured, they get bigger roots and they blow up sidewalks.

Mr. Tanenbaum: was 3/8<sup>ths</sup> always the standard? *Answer: 3/8<sup>ths</sup> has always been the standard for the last six years.*

Mr. Tanenbaum: who came up with that? *Answer: there are some ADA guidelines on what is considered a trip hazard, they define it as a quarter or more than a quarter and so we used the next easily readable mark and we have used 3/8ths.*

Mr. Thomson: if we are planning to move out Miami Curb repairs and site sanding and we can remove that tennis court project, then I'm fine with bringing it down *thirty five*.

Mr. Ricciardi: all right we'll bring it to *thirty five*.

Mr. Tanenbaum asked if anyone is interested in lowering the street lights item by a little bit?

Mr. Farrell noted street lights have come down, we just did this month's audit, I believe they will be fixed tomorrow and there were only 3 that were out, so it's better.

Mr. Thomson noted he was planning to propose having all the street lighting poles repainted. It would hit that line item if we did it and asked that we leave it at \$20,000 for now; not to say the rest of the Board will agree to do the painting.

The Preserve Monument Signage – we just did the monuments.

Mr. Ricciardi: we don't have any Reserves in Monuments, that's a new item. That's why Bob and I put it in there because we don't have any.

Mr. Tanenbaum; why did you pick \$3,500 as opposed to .....

Mr. Ricciardi: because we know your Reserve adverse. We felt we needed to start that step and get it in there as a line item; it could be \$15,000. We just did a monument down on Bruce B. Downs for area 6, area 3 and it was \$40,000+ and that was just putting new granite and now we're doing lighting. It's very expensive.

Mr. Tanenbaum: what are we creating reserves for, for replacement of monuments?

Mr. Ricciardi: they are not going to last forever just like any other asset, you have to ultimately redo your monuments and when you do it is a lot of money.

Mr. Tanenbaum: what will happen to those monuments? *Answer: the letters start to deteriorate* and you have to replace them, if you have a reserve you don't have to hit your R&M.

Swimming Pool

It was proposed to go to \$1,000.

R&M Fountain

It was proposed to drop the amount to *five* instead of *eight*.

R&M Pools

We have *ten* in there, why is 2012 at \$2,300? Answer: *that's when we painted the decks*.

It was proposed to take R&M Pools to \$5,000.

Tennis Court

Can we lower supplies to \$500? Answer: *Yes lower to \$500*.

Common Area

Lower to *three*.

Contracts Air Conditioning

This is a PM. The current vendor is Airite. We pay \$525 per quarter to look at the system and clean filters.

Looking for other proposals for air conditioning maintenance was discussed; this will be further discussed at a later date.

Common Area

Under Utility Refuse Removal; the City or the County has renegotiated and they are changing the overall month waste management to Republic and Waste Management was told by the County that they had to tell all their customers they are free of their contract. We are working on getting new quotes from Waste Management and Republic.

R&M Air Conditioning

Is there any reason not to lower the R&M for next year?

R&M Electrical

Mr. Tanenbaum wants to bring this down to \$1,000.

R&M Equipment

Go up to *eight*

R&M Parks

How about \$4,000?

Miscellaneous Contingency

Do the same thing to this that we did to the other.

Mr. Ricciardi noted we could eliminate this.

Mr. Tanenbaum asked for an explanation of why we can't buy food and drink but we can give birthday parties and lunches for staff. \$500 for Miscellaneous Contingency (that would be \$1,600).

Office Equipment

Can we lower this *three to two*?

Health Club Supplies

Can we take it from \$1,000 to \$500? Yes.

Uniforms

Is \$1,500 consistent? Yes. It's for shirts hats and some lifeguard tops.

Newsletter

We need a revised number. It was *seventy nine* for her, but somebody somewhere has to give .....

We could bring that down to \$1,000 which would be covering her \$79 to \$80 per month for the .....

Go down to \$1,000.

Personnel

Mr. Farrell noted this budget includes no increases for anyone.

The current line item is just for Claudia Mayo.

Part-time Administrators was discussed.

Mr. Tanenbaum asked Mr. Farrell when was Gary out last? Answer: maybe December.

Mr. Tanenbaum stated Gary is the highest paid person in Arbor Greene; health, pension, sick leave, everything; this way exceeds the General Manager's salary. It is way out of line to have a Maintenance Manager paid with total benefits, close to 10 higher than the General Manager for what that job is. We could make some cuts on that.

Gary is the Maintenance Manager, John Hussey works 30 to 32 hours per week doing maintenance, there are tennis court maintenance people working Monday thru Friday and someone else does the tennis courts plus all of the parks, the trash cans etc. We have another one in Buffington who walks around.

Mr. Ricciardi suggested leaving it where it is for now, we can spend the next couple of months having Mr. Farrell do an analysis of the maintenance and are there ways to reduce that expenditure for maintenance employees and bring that down.

Mr. Tanenbaum asked can we terminate his health insurance. Or switch him to some sort of HSA or some alternative? *Answer: There is some discussions with Mr. Robin looking at benefits and issues we are facing with some of these people. We will have that answer within the next month as to what benefits we should or should not give.*

Mr. Thomson noted there are other areas we could look at cutting before we look at changing a long time employees benefits.

Mr. Tanenbaum expressed his disagreement with Mr. Thomson's point.

Mr. Eckhardt questioned why \$19,000 is spent for the Club Manager or is he an Assistant Manager or a Maintenance Manager.

Mr. Ricciardi noted Arbor Greene has a big operation and if something should happen to Mr. Farrell the remaining staff does not know what he does.

The current title of Club Manager may be an incorrect title.

There was no change proposed at this time for part-time maintenance or part-time club.

The need for lifeguards was discussed; they are called Pool Attendants. Since 2005 we used only certified lifeguards.

Mr. Ricciardi noted the gate budgets are all pretty much the same; Devonshire is down a few hundred dollars; Estuary is the same, Enclave is down about \$600 and the rest are the same.

Mr. Tanenbaum proposed \$1,000 for the Devonshire gate; Estuary should be increased to *eight; eleven five*. Propose *nine* for Enclave. Parkview, propose *seven*. Retreat, propose down to *thirty five*.

Mr. Ricciardi stated we are down \$48,000.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Alan Williams Tennis Contract**

Mr. Farrell reported there were no substantive changes in terms of intent; there were words missing.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Telephone Costs**

There was nothing to report at this time.



**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Non-Resident Tennis Court Use**

Mr. Tanenbaum noted there is an existing policy; \$25 per daily usage and we do limit the number of passes people can get for the tennis courts; which will be circulated to the Board.

The following item and discussion was not included on the agenda that was provided to the Board in advance:

Mr. Farrell handed out a copy of an extract from Paul's report on the Cross Creek beautification, which included ideas and suggestions he had. Ms. Dorothy Baron Clark has been waiting to discuss this issue.

Ms. Clark briefly expressed her displeasure with the "beautification" project.

Mr. Farrell continued to explain the handout, which was an extract from Paul's report.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

The workshop meeting was adjourned at 10 P.M.