

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

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Arbor Greene Community Development District was held on July 13, 2004 at 6:30 p.m. in the Gathering Room of the Arbor Greene Recreation Center, 1800 Arbor Greene Drive, Tampa, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Charlie Funk	Chairman
Jeff Meehan	Vice Chairman
Christine Nelson	Assistant Secretary
David Bootcheck	Assistant Secretary
Mike Gratz	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

John Daugirda	District Manager
Chuck Adams	District Staff
John Ricciardi	District Staff
Tracy Robin	Counsel
Barbara Koscinski	Arbor Greene Office Manger
Allan Williams	Arbor Greene Club Manager
Gary Smith	Arbor Greene Maintenance
Craig Smallwood	Resident
Leslie Orso	Resident
Mark Russell	Resident
Richard Demmer	Resident
Mr. Mendelsohn	Resident
Numerous Residents	

The first 15 minutes of the tape of this meeting were inaudible and the following Minutes are a summary of that portion of the tape.

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order and the roll was called.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of the Minutes of the May 12, 2004 Meeting**

On MOTION by Ms. Nelson seconded by Mr. Gratz with all in favor the minutes of the May 12, 2004 meeting were approved.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Resolution 2004-7 Rescheduling the Public Hearing**

This Resolution changes today's meeting time from 10:00 a.m. date to 6:30 p.m., the usual time for the CDD's Wednesday meetings. This meeting has been correctly noticed for 6:30 p.m. to allow more public to attend.

On MOTION by Mr. Gratz seconded by Ms. Nelson with all in favor Resolution 2004-7 rescheduling the Public Hearing from 10:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. was adopted.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Hearing to Consider the Adoption of the Budget for Fiscal Year 2005 and Levying of Non Ad Valorem Assessments**

Mr. Adams reviewed the highlights of the proposed budget.

At this point the audiotape became audible.

Mr. Adams stated the budget highlights I just reviewed are identical to the ones that I discussed at your May meeting and there are no other major significant changes. We have only shuffled some funds within the budget to handle costs more appropriately with a resulting 2% increase to all your units in your General Fund 001. There have been some increases for gate programs in general funds that are neighborhood-specific. This was due to several costly incidents in those neighborhoods this year and we needed to quickly set up a capital reserve to address those incidents. These were unforeseen but will unfortunately continue to occur. We are also looking to replace the nets around the tennis courts, redoing the decks around both swimming pools, and redoing the iron fence work. We can finance all these projects. We have also just completed some woodwork replacement inside the fitness room. Additional highlights are:

- **Landscape & Irrigation**

Mr. Adams stated the Landscape Replacement budget was increased from \$15,000 to \$50,000 as a more appropriate number for this District because as your landscape program gets older you need to replace plant materials that have exceeded their life expectancy. This budget was originally set in the mid \$300,000s and then reduced to \$200,000. We managed this economization by having one contractor perform the work and consolidating a separate irrigation contract and a landscape maintenance contract). We structured this bid by drawing up a grocery list of activities such as pruning, mulching, flower replacement, palm trimming, etc. and a schedule for performing the work. We can increase the frequency of work (such as additional palm pruning) at the set amount that was originally bid. We can also delete activity from the contractor's monthly invoice and save when, for example, if flowers are doing well we can choose not to change them.

Mr. Gratz asked has the company reduced their price by another 20%?

Mr. Adams responded no. The first year price of \$215,000 was for 13 or 14 months; the \$190,000 is your actual second year price for 12 months. I have added \$5,000 extra for some items we should do more frequently such as palm pruning.

Mr. Gratz asked do we have a list of the maintenance contracts?

Mr. Adams responded there was a matrix in your last agenda package and those numbers are reflected in your budget. There might be a slight increase based on levels of service.

- **Contingency Fund**

Mr. Adams stated last year we had put the difference from your prior contract amount for landscape maintenance and what we were getting for a contract from the new contractor. We propose reducing the \$100,000 sum to \$15,000 for this upcoming year.

- **Lake Treatment**

Mr. Adams stated the Lakes Wetland & Upland Maintenance contract with Lake Masters has been increased from \$22,500 to \$30,000. We are about to

undertake another bidding process on that and we should include mitigation in some preserve areas that was left out of the current contract.

- **Signs**

Mr. Meehan asked did we allocated for signs and placement?

Mr. Adams responded they are in the 2004 budget. The new sign posts with framing and backings are due in this week.

- **Gatehouse Attendant**

Contract services for these attendants increased from \$103,000 to \$118,000 to change and upgrade those services when and if you think it is appropriate. This amount is based on numbers presented to you several meetings ago

- **Security Cameras**

These are already in place. An air bridge is in place allowing wireless communication from the gatehouse to Ms. Koscinski's office where all the images are stored. She can pull up files for certain days and times to view incidents at the gate.

- **Operating Capital Reserve**

Mr. Adams stated the Board decided last year to have a \$30,000 reserve in our General Fund 001 budget to meet first quarter operating expenses and avoid relying on a line of credit. The aim of this fund is to handle unforeseen events that you will no doubt encounter as this community continues to grow.

Mr. Gratz asked is it an average increase of \$3 per home per year in General Fund 001?

Mr. Adams responded it is a 2% increase across the board. There is a variance because each neighborhood has a gate operating at the same cost and the charge is unique and based on the density of the number of the units in the village. The cost is the same for each gate; the difference comes in how many units there are behind the gate over which to spread the cost. In some cases there was a significant financial impact because of the limited number of units behind the gate.

Mr. Funk stated theoretically, with fewer units behind the gates there is less use of the gate and thus maintenance cost would be less over time.

Mr. Adams stated this is not the case. The largest part of our budget is for replacement parts from incidents outside our control such as for circuit boards damaged by power surges or gates rammed by vehicles. If it were strictly a matter of gates opening and closing, less traffic would mean less wear and tear on the gates and lower maintenance costs as time passes.

On page 12 the "Miscellaneous" line item under "Expenditures" is increased to create a reserve for each neighborhood. It will cost thousands to replace the main circuit boards for the keypad operating system for the gate. If one of these funds is short at the end of the year you will supplement it from your General Fund 001. The neighborhoods will receive service but we will have to budget a catch-up item and increase their assessments the next year to pay back the General Fund 001 that subsidized their budget shortfall.

On MOTION by Mr. Funk seconded by Ms. Nelson with all in favor the hearing was opened to the public.
--

Mr. Craig Smallwood stated last meeting we discussed poor security service at the front gate. The problem may be particular guards but when I enter at 5:30 p.m. every day, the same guard time and again lets cars enter without scrutiny.

Mr. Adams stated the guard might let them in because she recognizes names and faces.

Mr. Smallwood stated this does not change post rules.

Mr. Adams stated we have increased this budget to allow the Board to upgrade service and/or change companies because of poor service. Later in this meeting we can discuss the security company but we should stay with the budget right now.

Ms. Orso stated the Design Review Committee is reviewing professional signage for various items. Do we need to budget for signs announcing various events here like the signs I see for TGIF?

Mr. Adams responded we can handle signs for ongoing or recurring events within the present budget; we just need a generic frame. Send me signage specs once the Board has agreed on them and I will work with you on that..

Mr. Russell asked where does the balance show up at the beginning of the year on the Miscellaneous and Contingency funds you are building up for the community? How do you know how much money is carried forward from last year?

Mr. Adams responded it is a roll-in amount that you will see each year. the books close on September 30 every year and after the audit, all unexpended funds are identified as surplus and placed in the fund balance. Then we can designate those funds for specific items. Last year we were under-budgeted at the end of the year and did not have surplus funds in our operating fund and we had to draw upon a line of credit, which we want to avoid in the future. Keep in mind that from October to the end of December the CDD receives no tax funds but still has to pay operating costs.

Mr. Demmer asked what is the status of the Parkview gate that was damaged by a resident? Will the resident pay for repairs?

Mr. Adams responded yes. We have all insurance and identification information and that resident is liable for costs incurred. The gate has already been removed and is being repaired. After it is re-installed we will operate it to see if the operating system was damaged and then list all damages on the invoice we send to the resident's insurance company for reimbursement.

Mr. Demmer asked has the 7.6% bond been refinanced?

Mr. Daugirda responded after analysis we determined it was not cost effective to refinance. We will track the bond and when it reaches the call period in a few years so that we avoid paying an extra premium to refinance.

Mr. Adams stated the difference in interest rates was not significant enough to warrant refinancing. We would have had to extend the payback period so that instead of having 12 years remaining we had to extend to 20 years to reduce the payment by a miniscule amount each year. We discussed this issue last year at this time and determined refinancing as unfeasible.

Mr. Mendelsohn asked have we enough money to do work at the Devonshire gate? We still have trouble there with speeding cars. We have police coming around but they do not stop anyone.

Ms. Nelson stated I know exactly what you are talking about. I was there at 6:30 a.m. and people speed there. It is a tough spot and we need to put bumps or a speed signal there to slow people down.

Mr. Adams responded we did not budget for speed bumps on the boulevard but we did increase the budget for additional City of Tampa police patrols. The police are here on Friday and Saturday evenings but we can certainly adjust that.

Mr. Mendelsohn stated we should do one of the things Ms. Nelson suggested. It is not a huge expense and anything you can do for Devonshire Boulevard would be appreciated.

Mr. Adams stated I am concerned about liability. If you want to review constructing bumps we can do it within the existing budget.

Mr. Daugirda stated the Board is charged with prioritizing the spending.

Ms. Nelson stated we can discuss this at the next meeting.

Mr. Adams stated any discussion on this issue should involve an engineer. Mr. Mendelsohn, the traffic engineer and I could meet to discuss the plusses and minuses and cost opinions on such a program.

Mr. Daugirda stated if there are no more comments from the public we will close the public hearing and go to Board discussion and action. Then we will adopt some resolutions and set the assessments.

On MOTION by Mr. Meehan seconded by Ms. Nelson with all in favor the public hearing was closed.
---

A resident asked how do homeowners learn about Board meetings and the budget?

Mr. Daugirda responded we have resident members on the Boar and announcement of meetings on signs at the front gate, newsletters and the website.

We can post information on the website in PDF form. I have done this with other districts.

Ms. Nelson stated residents always tell me the community needs this or that but they need to come to the meetings or call Ms. Koscinski. It is very frustrating that people do not show unless it affects them personally.

On MOTION by Mr. Meehan seconded by Ms. Nelson with all in favor Resolution 2004-8 adopting the Fiscal Year 2005 budget was adopted.

Mr. Daugirda stated you have just adopted the numbers for the General Funds, the special Village Reserve funds, and the Debt Service Fund. The next resolution transmits the assessment numbers in the exhibits to the County taxing authority so that budget assessments are placed on the tax roll and collected through the tax collector. The tax collector grosses the amount up 2% and the property appraiser receives 1% or 2%.

Mr. Adams stated if all residents pay their property tax bills early they receive a 4% discount and we will be 4% short on CDD revenue.

Mr. Meehan stated a correction should be made that there are 344 units on Parcel N.

On MOTION by Ms. Nelson seconded by Mr. Meehan with all in favor Resolution 2004-9 Levying Non Ad Valorem Assessments on the District was adopted.

Mr. Daugirda stated this completes the budget adoption process for Fiscal Year 2005.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Staff Reports**

**A. Attorney**

Mr. Tracy Robin stated the governor has allowed modifications to Chapter 190 that were made by the legislature this year to become law. As it affects this District, the modifications are very minor. The only noteworthy change is that

newly elected Supervisors will take office on a specific date in November following the elections. This date had not previously been in the legislation.

Ms. Nelson asked the term now ends in November instead of January?

Mr. Roberts responded correct, anything in the general election. The way it was phrased is that the new Supervisor takes office the second Tuesday after the election. It is not necessary to hold a meeting to install them if no meeting is scheduled. They would just come to the next Board meeting and assume their positions.

**B. Engineer**

There not being any, the next item followed.

**C. Manager**

**• Pool Furniture**

Mr. Adams stated two meetings ago the Board directed staff to proceed with the pool furniture issue. This budget includes annual payments for the lease purchase of this equipment with an anticipated 4-year life expectancy. The financing terms are \$25,836.30 for replacement of all the pool equipment for four years at 6.8% and \$617.48 monthly payments. We have had typical lease purchases like this in the past and we have a dollar buyout at the end, which means you own it. After the first year there is no prepayment penalty or upfront costs associated with the financing.

Mr. Gratz asked why don't we just buy the equipment for \$25,000?

Mr. Adams responded we want to keep costs down for residents by taking a capital expense and expanding the cost of the equipment over its useful life. Doing things this way is one reason the assessments are only increased 2% this year. Instead of asking present residents who may have accumulated part of your surplus to pay for the equipment upfront, as residents sell homes and new residents move in, their assessment will pay for some of those improvements you have financed and they will benefit from the equipment. This is an appropriate way for government to handle these kinds of expenses. The lease purchase is with Municipal Capital

Corporation. This is a fairly small amount over an extended period. I set it this way to mimic the life expectancy of the equipment.

Ms. Nelson asked why don't we pay with our revolving credit?

Mr. Adams responded you should not pay with your credit line. You would try to offset it with some contingency or surplus dollars within the existing budget.

On MOTION by Ms. Nelson seconded by Mr. Meehan with Mr. Gratz voting Nay staff was authorized to finalize the lease purchase of pool equipment for a total cost of \$25,836.30.
---

- **Preschool Program**

Mr. Adams stated several meetings ago we discussed the legitimacy of the preschool program at Arbor Greene and whether the Board would allow it to continue under existing terms, change the terms, or not allow it to continue at all. The manager of the preschool program offers a bilingual program limited to 18 children up to 5 years of age. All but two of the children in her current roster are Arbor Greene residents. She charges \$220 per month per child for a total annual revenue of \$35,000 if all 18 positions are filled. Her school mimics the school schedule so the preschool is in session nine months and is closed in the summer when regular schools close. She has three teachers with a 6:1 ratio, is licensed and insured, and anticipates restarting in August. She has been holding classes three days a week and would like to expand to four days per week.

This is a use of the Arbor Greene Community Center and it is up to the Board to discuss the appropriateness of her continued use of the facilities. There is some concern that the school is utilizing a community-wide facility for purposes of profit because the manager does not pay any fees to the District, just as there is no charge to anyone else who uses the facility. They pay security deposits but no fees and these are returned if there is no damage or cleanup costs. To a certain extent the preschool is a service to the community since all but two children are Arbor Greene residents however, the school is making money from the facility.

Ms. Nelson stated the school is a wonderful thing for the community and the children who go there love the school. I have a problem with the fact that there is no built-in storage available so all school equipment remains in the room and anyone wishing to use the facility has a room that looks like a preschool classroom. When the comprehensive plan to remodel the clubhouse is finished and something else is done with that room I am concerned about where the school will go. The school is putting wear and tear to that clubhouse room, minimal as it is, and the school manager should pay a fee for that. She has every right to be here but she has a permanent set up and is not paying a fee. She could build a storage area and put her equipment there when her class is over for the day.

A resident stated I am against building a nursery storage area. This building is open to all community members meaning that anyone at anytime can walk through the nursery school. The manager has stated that if she receives nursery school status she has requested that the facility be off limits to anyone else. She has told us that she needs an isolated facility that is not open to adults. If we are giving her a room that is an isolated facility and not allow Arbor Greene community members to use the room, she should be charged a fee. I would like the school to be gone completely but if it remains I strongly recommend you talk to her.

Ms. Nelson asked were you aware of the manager's stipulations about having an isolated facility?

Mr. Adams responded I was not.

Mr. Gratz stated we have to look at this preschool differently from other services previously offered at this facility. Whether it was the swim team or tennis programs none was set up on such a permanent basis. The community center is open to all Arbor Greene residents. Ms. Koscinski's office is located over there and accessible to the community. Having 18 children under age five in one facility will be less conducive to doing Arbor Greene business, whether it is Ms. Koscinski, Mr. Gary Smith, or Lennar Homes. You also have liability with young children and two large bodies of water immediately behind the building. The scope and magnitude of having such a facility here is different from the type of services that have been

made available to community residents. This facility is also open to non-residents of the community. The school manager is set to resume operations in two or three weeks and meanwhile, her materials continue to be stored there. Any time you want to do anything in that room you must navigate around the permanent equipment there, which I assume she owns but that we take care of and maintain while it is not in use.

Mr. Adams stated she has indicated to me that there is interest in her moving the school elsewhere. A decision should be made tonight. You have usage issues, liability issues, private financial gain issues, lack of access and use of the facility, and appropriate use of the facility questions. The usage may have been appropriate before but now it is getting more serious than the school was ever intended to be.

Mr. Funk stated even if she pays a fee it may be inappropriate use of the facility.

Ms. Nelson stated we should meet with the school manager about this.

Mr. Adams stated after the May meeting I told her the Board would be discussing the school situation. She indicated she had other locations to go to. I understand that this is short notice but it is important the Board make the decision tonight.

On MOTION by Mr. Meehan seconded by Mr. Funk with all in favor use of the Community Center facility for the existing private preschool was terminated.
--

- **\$7,500 Contingency Line Item**

Mr. Adams stated \$5,000 of this amount is related to acquiring the line of credit; the remainder is for several miscellaneous items.

- **Security**

Mr. Adams stated I continue to receive comments about the inability of our guard service to follow post orders on a reliable and consistent basis. Some guards do a relatively good job while others do not. I have mentioned before that security

is a service where you get what you pay for and the contractor's ability to hire higher-end and more competent staff is related to what they are paid. Guards can also make or break the program on their own because no matter how well they are trained, how clear the post orders and procedures are, if guards decide to ignore procedures the behavior reflects badly on the entire program. Performance is poor and we may have to consider dropping Fox Security. They are currently under a "defective work notice" and can be terminated immediately.

I have spoken with U.S. Security and Associates which has a contract with Hunter's Green and Westchase. They seem to provide a reliable service at the lowest cost possible and we have previously discussed their fees. What is important is the salary paid to the guard because the company can then hire higher quality personnel and retain them. Retention is very important in a program like this; you do not want constant guard turnover, particularly with our program that has specific requirements on how they scrutinize entry because of the public road status in Arbor Greene. The company is good at what it does and is highly regarded in Hunter's Green.

Ms. Nelson stated we switched from a more expensive contractor to Fox last year as the lowest bidder and pretty much from the start it has been a roller coaster on performance. We discuss performance with them and things get better, but then they get worse again. If we switch once more, will we have the same problems?

Mr. Adams responded there are no guarantees on consistency of performance. You have seen performance from higher end as well as lower end contractors. If you have an in-house security program with a limited employee pool, you will have to overbuild your program to have coverage in the even of sickness or vacationing staff. Your employee pool will be larger and that means more costs. I have some programs like this in other areas, a particularly large one in a three-gated system with a 24-hour a day patrol and 22 employees on the payroll. I end up constantly managing shift schedules and it becomes a human resource issue. In a program of that size it was important to have the manager as staff versus as an employee of the contractor so the manager could manage the quality control. At Arbor Greene you

do not have a manager and I recommend keeping with an outside contractor and work with him to search for and maintain quality guards. The key to the program is having guards who take pride in their work and remain with the company.

Ms. Nelson stated residents also confuse security with monitoring functions. Our guards are not security guards; their job is to monitor incoming and outgoing traffic. We must decide what we want the company to provide us.

Mr. Adams stated we have a greeter program. I feel monthly talks with Fox should end; they have had more opportunities to correct performance than I would normally give a contractor. Based on my experiences with U.S. Security on recommendations I have heard and their performance in Westchase and Hunter's Green I recommend moving on to U.S. Security at the increased rates we have already appropriated in your budget. Hunter's Greene does have a manager on staff but you do not. You will use staff from the corporate office of the security company, a kind of roving manager who oversees several area clients.

A resident asked do you get any complaints from residents at Westchase or Hunter's Green about their security company?

Mr. Adams responded I am directly involved with Westchase and have some periodic complaints but certainly not to the extent of the complaints I receive about Fox where one month things are fine and the next month things are not. This has been a roller coaster ride that is not fair to anyone. You are at a marginal point in terms of what you pay for your service and the service provided. There are no guarantees.

Mr. Robert Shelton stated it is time to change the gate guard. There is no guarantee but I believe you get what you pay for. If we must pay more for quality service, we should do so. On Ms. Nelson's comments that we have a monitoring and not a security service, residents looking at that gate believe it provides security and not a monitoring post. Our present company cannot even follow post orders, they do not question anyone who says, "I am a resident" and let them in. I do not understand how the front guards allow someone in who rams the Parkview gate because he cannot get in there. The new security company the Board chooses should

be able to unquestionably follow post rules and allow entry to only residents, take tag numbers, and so on, so we have some record of visitors. As coordinator of the Neighborhood Watch I have asked the post for records and they cannot provide it because nothing has been written down. It is atrocious.

Mr. Adams stated the Parkview gate was damaged by a resident who passed through the front gate with his clicker. When he could not enter Parkview and could not enter his correct code because he was inebriated, got frustrated and rammed the gate.

Mr. Meehan stated I agree with Ms. Nelson that this Board does not provide any security service. We provide access control and make no assurances of security.

A resident asked if we have no security, why have a gate?

Mr. Meehan stated I am not here to argue with you or anyone else. I am going on record that we provide monitoring only.

Mr. Funk left the meeting at this time.

Mr. Adams stated we have an access control program. In my other areas, I got tired of advertising for guards and am looking instead for greeters and I looked to the airline and hotel industry for people who have customer and personal service experience. The guards are supposed to subject both residents and guests to the same level of scrutiny by requesting identification and taking down vehicle information at the minimum. I recommend we move to another company.

A resident asked if we have a public street can anyone come in regardless of if there is a guard at the gate?

Mr. Adams responded the public roads are assets of the CDD and the public has access to our roads. This does not mean that we cannot scrutinize public entry. There are certain times of the day when we cannot deny their entry just based on criminal statistics—crimes taking place during certain hours. Our post orders are as strict as we can make them based on ownership and financing of the roadway system. I would like the Board to authorize me to enter into a contract with U.S. Security for service based on the rates currently at Westchase of a first year amount



Ms. Nelson nominated Mr. David Bootcheck to Seat #3 and Mr. Meehan seconded the motion. There being no further nominations, Mr. Bootcheck was appointed Supervisor.

Mr. Daugirda being a Notary Public of the State of Florida administered the oath of Office to Mr. Bootcheck and a copy of the signed oath will be attached to these minutes and made part of the public record. I will brief you after the meeting and provide you with a financial disclosure form and the Sunshine Law that essentially states that two or more Supervisors should not confer and make decisions about District business outside of duly noticed meeting.

A resident asked has anyone filed to run for the Supervisor seats?

Mr. Daugirda responded I do not know yet. Interested parties must file with the Hillsborough County Supervisor of Elections office. The qualifying period is July 12 through July 16 from noon to noon.

A resident asked is there still an opportunity to get on that petition?

Mr. Daugirda responded I do not think so. The Supervisor of Elections office is in charge so Mr. Buddy Johnson and Mr. Tim Bridge can answer that for you. The best thing to do is check with the Supervisor of Elections office.

A resident asked what is the update on the fitness room?

Mr. Adams responded the design committee has been working on ideas for the last six months and will meet this week with professionals from Recreational Design & Construction. They currently work with Westchase and will come to brainstorm with us and review some as-built drawings to determine what we can do given load-bearing walls, what can be moved and so on. We hope to wrap this process up in the next few months, bring recommendations to the Board, have this project at a design permitting point in the fall, and begin construction in the winter.

Mr. Shelton stated regarding Neighborhood Watch, I would like the Watch coordinator to have access to security camera tapes to locate suspicious activity. I asked for tapes after an incident at this Community Center so I could view the cars

parked here but I was not allowed to view the tapes. You previously stated the camera really was for CDD use but I ask you to consider allowing access to the Watch.

Mr. Adams stated I am extremely sensitive about access to the tapes' information. On other projects where we document activity I do not provide that information except to staff for purposes of ensuring quality control and to deal with specific issues such as motorist claims that our gates malfunctioned. I only release such information to the sheriff's department or the court system, never to the general public, groups, or committees because of privacy issues. If that information becomes public it can create major liabilities for the CDD—you never know who wants to track the movements of children or spouses. However, I will accede to counsel's advice.

Mr. Robin stated I am not prepared to speak definitively on this issue but generally speaking, all CDD records are open to inspection by any member of the community or the public. I am not aware today of any exceptions to the type of disclosure that Mr. Adams was just referring to. I will investigate this and report back to the Board.

Mr. Adams stated the Board can adopt a policy to address the dissemination of private information.

Mr. Shelton asked if a resident within the Neighborhood Watch sees a car speeding or damaging property but cannot get the tag numbers, why can we not use the tapes? I should be able to identify residents who act suspiciously or are inebriated.

Mr. Adams responded that is a police matter and they can ask for the tapes.

Mr. Meehan stated having people watching out for each other is one thing but having people chasing down residents is very different, The Board needs to work with Neighborhood Watch to ensure that what everyone is doing meets the goals of the Watch.

Mr. Daugirda stated we really should bow to counsel's advice on this because statutorily, the CDD does not have police powers. We must be very careful about

crossing that line if we enter into an understanding with Neighborhood Watch. The District's cooperation with the police is a different matter and the Watch can also cooperate with the police.

Mr. Adams stated there is no problem if the police or courts ask for files or tapes. Mr. Shelton brings up some very good questions but you must look to the City of Tampa police who have the power that the Watch and the CDD do not have to meet our needs under the situations he describes.

Ms. Nelson stated I suggest inviting your police liaison to attend the meeting when counsel reports back to the Board.

Mr. Shelton stated I will do that. She can also provide the police perspective to privacy issues and Neighborhood Watch's parameters. My aim is to increase resident safety, not to police our neighbors. All the villages are represented in the Watch and we have over 70 members now. If we have a situation where a particular car destroys property we can track that vehicle from the front gate through the front gate cameras. How does the Board want me to approach that matter—ignore it?

Mr. Daugirda responded the safest course is to contact the police and ask the police to direct the investigation. Counsel will advise us about this.

Mr. Robin stated if such a situation arises in the next few weeks, send Mr. Adams a letter giving him the date and time parameters so we can make sure those records are preserved.

Mr. Shelton stated fine.

A resident stated I understood that Neighborhood Watch was strictly for Trace. How and when did it expand to the whole community?

Mr. Adams stated the Watch is not part of the CDD. We appreciated their desire to organize and the CDD provided signage funding. That is the extent of our involvement.

Mr. Robin stated Neighborhood Watch is beyond the scope of the statutory responsibilities of this Board.

A resident asked is there a sign outside the gate about the surveillance camera? That could be a deterrent to speeders or vandals.

Mr. Adams stated there is a sign warning that the gate arm comes down after each vehicle but no sign indicating surveillance cameras are in use. On the greeter program for the front entry, I anticipate having the program in place by August 1 so there will not be enough time to analyze their effectiveness until the September meeting.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS      Approval of Invoices and Funding Request #**

Mr. Daugirda stated you have received your financial statements.

On MOTION by Mr. Meehan seconded by Ms. Nelson with all in favor the financials were approved.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS      Adjournment**

On MOTION by Mr. Meehan seconded by Mr. Gratz with all in favor the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

---

Christine Nelson  
Assistant Secretary

---

Jeff Meehan  
Vice Chair