

**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 May 12, 2004 at 10:00 a.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
Bill Wood	Assistant Secretary
Mike Gratz	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

John Daugirda	District Manager
Chuck Adams	District Staff
John Ricciardi	District Staff
Barbara Koscinski	Arbor Greene Staff
Allan Williams	Arbor Greene Staff
Frank Choy	Resident
Craig Smallwood	Resident
Numerous Residents	

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. Daugirda called the meeting to order and called the roll.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of the April 13, 2004 Meeting

Mr. Daugirda stated you have received the minutes of the April 13, 2004 meeting and asked for comments, additions, or deletions.

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

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS Distribution of the Proposed Budget
and Consideration of Resolution 2004-5
Setting a Public Hearing**

Mr. Daugirda stated you have received copies of the proposed budget and a Supplemental budget concerning special assessments on the villages. After going over the highlights, I will ask you to approve the draft budget and adopt the budget at a public hearing on July 15 at 10:00 a.m. in this same location.

On page 1 the Fiscal Year 2004 General Fund budget was \$1,308,890 and staff proposes next year's budget as \$1,336,466. Some elements driving the increase include required implementing of accounting and engineering rules for GASB-34; increased part-time facility staff for the Recreation Center; repairs and maintenance for the tennis courts, the grounds and park, and the pool. Capital improvements are recommended at \$53,000; the landscaping and irrigation section includes maintenance contracts at \$195,000 and landscape replacement at \$50,000; and the Contingency Fund has dropped to \$15,000. Mr. Adams recommends continuing with the existing contractor and the budget reflects those cost savings. The Debt Service Fund is a function of the amortization schedule and assessments, principal, and interest payments which are set forth in those schedules. The Supplemental Budget document corrects and clarifies earlier documents listing total annual assessments per village but not the unit cost. Last year we set gate and village assessments at \$5,107 and we propose to increase it to \$6,454 for each of the villages with the per unit amount being a function of the units in each village: Devonshire (Fund #2, 74 units at \$87 per unit) Estuary (Fund #3, 172 units at \$38 per unit), Enclave (Fund #4, 118 units at \$55 per unit), Parkview (Fund #5, 198 units at \$33 per unit), and Retreat (Fund #6, 22 units at \$293 per unit). Those numbers are amendments to what was previously distributed to the Supervisors. The copies I have made available to the audience have up-to-date numbers. Accordingly, these numbers will affect overall assessments.

Mr. Adams stated I will highlight our proposals for next year's field programs. Page 1, Part-time Staff for the Recreation Center: This is staff to work with Mr. Allan Williams to oversee the Center and pools. The number trues up

payroll numbers so you see real costs based on current hourly rates and hours worked for a crew that works on a 7 day per week program.

Ms. Wood asked is this an increase in personnel or an increase in wages to existing staff?

Mr. Adams responded we are adjusting this line item to reflect your real costs at this time and we have projected a small increase for each of the part-time employees.

Ms. Nelson asked what is their hourly wage?

Mr. Adams responded that varies by position and time at Arbor Greene. At a previous meeting we thought the budget was underfunded. Last year's draft budget incorrectly reflected amounts needed and was not adjusted prior to final adoption of the budget.

Mr. Funk asked is there an increase in the service?

Mr. Adams responded no, this is an adjustment of your hourly rates to reflect actual costs.

Ms. Nelson asked did we need additional personnel? Based on the growth at Arbor Greene is the staff adequate?

Mr. Allan Williams responded we have one staff person and as I am here all the time, we really have two people overall. Usually, only one staff person is in the office except during the summer when we have lifeguards who are treated as a separate budget item. Last year's budget did not reflect the fellow who worked four hours daily per week for morning maintenance.

Mr. Adams stated that morning maintenance person is included in the number presented here. Page 2, Repairs and Maintenance to the Recreation Center: There is a significant increase for anticipated resurfacing of the tennis courts. The budget for Repairs and Maintenance to the Grounds is to refinish the black iron fence surrounding the entire complex (sandblasting, priming, repainting). Pool maintenance was at zero and the number you see is to redo deck surfaces around both pools. The budget allows redoing both pools at the same time. The Maintenance Contract budget reflects a reduction from last year's \$215,000 to

\$195,000. That takes out the \$15,000 item you had set for a third party audit of your existing landscaper. We removed that and reflected a real number related to your upcoming contract with Greenview. Staff recommends renewing that contract for next year.

Ms. Nelson asked did we utilize that money?

Mr. Adams responded we did not so I am pulling it out of that budget. This more accurately reflects your real contract.

Ms. Nelson asked with so many complaints about landscaping deficiencies should we not apply that money? I have seen many dried patches and trees and flowers not being trimmed according to schedule.

Mr. Adams responded I applied a lot of pressure to the contractor during the last month. At first I thought many of the items you cited were related to extended winter dormancy. Finally, I realized these were not dormancy issues, they needed to be addressed. Some of the patches you thought dry were the result of spraying activity for turf weeds as good turf normally yellows for four to six weeks after spraying. The turf has greened up in the last few weeks and we have fertilized and added new turf to areas where it was impractical to rely on the summer growing season for the Floratam to fill back in. We have the right contractor here and I probably need to apply more pressure more frequently. A third party contract is an unneeded expense; I will provide that service to you under the contract you already have with us.

You have a multi-million dollar landscape program at Arbor Greene but your \$15,000 budget is inadequate. Much of your plant growth has been there for eight years and has aged and deteriorated according to normal plant life expectancy. It is time to dedicate better numbers to your Landscape Replacement program. I recommend moving from \$15,000 to \$50,000. Year-to-date costs are about \$25,000-\$30,000 simply to replace deteriorated materials. This does not include making any real additions to your programs but only addresses existing growth such as buffer hedges of wax myrtle, turf, and shrubs. I am not sure \$50,000 is the right amount

but it is more realistic and recognizes the Board's commitment to addressing the matter in the future.

The Contingency Reduction numbers take the difference of what you budgeted for your contract and gives you a contingency in case the contract does not perform and also builds up a capital operating reserve fund. We are more comfortable with the money we project to have in that fund for you this year and based what we actually ended up borrowing against your line of credit last year to get us through the first three months, I think we can safely reduce that amount.

Mr. Funk asked was the original contract last year \$215,000 plus \$100,000?

Mr. Adams responded it was \$350,000 to \$360,000. We took \$100,000 of that and put it into Contingency and took another \$33,000 and put it under Field Services. Last year's total contract was \$191,000 and we had the extra \$12,000 to \$15,000 in there.

Ms. Funk asked is the landscaping contract the same cost?

Mr. Adams responded it is basically the same. I have added a few extra things for the Board to consider doing more frequently than what current specifications indicate. For example, increasing trimming schedules for Washingtonian Palms from two to three times a year as I do in my other communities to prevent unsightly hanging palm fronds or adding fresh color by mulching more frequently with pine bark nuggets that do not discolor as quickly as cypress or pine straw. Because of the way we bid this contract we have a grocery list of scheduled activities but we can have the contractor perform a specific task more frequently for the same price.

Ms. Nelson asked is that in the contract?

Mr. Adams responded it is already in our contract shopping list. We are simply telling the contractor he needs to do something again for the previously agreed-upon price. The way we have the contract set up we know what it will cost for each particular item on our shopping list and we can add activities at the same cost or delete activities from the monthly charges. The Lakes and Wetlands Maintenance Program functions well for what it is and what we pay. We have

already started our second year option with this contractor. Our complaints on lakes and wetlands have significantly reduced from past years and the overall appearance is definitely good.

Ms. Nelson stated you are proposing a huge jump for the telephone bills at the Recreation Center—from \$1,800 to \$4,700.

Mr. Adams stated last year you did not prepare for having Ms. Koscinski move from the joint venture trailer and bringing the telephone line with her. The CDD now pays for the telephone line that the developer once absorbed so that bill is now on the CDD's telephone bill.

Ms. Nelson asked is our \$3,700 bill to date due to the computer?

Mr. Adams responded it is for the telephone. The telephone line gives a computer connection as well but the charge is for shifting the administrative assistant. You shared payroll costs in years past but were not necessarily picking up all the associated operating costs and are now looking at the real cost. The breakout we did one or two months ago showed you the true expenses.

Ms. Nelson stated you explained the numbers but that still does not tell me how the amount can jump so much.

Mr. Adams responded it is based on real costs, like any of your other utility bills. On page 3, the Gatehouse Attendants costs are increased to reflect the possibility the Board will change contractors. That completes the highlights for the big items. The proposed budget has some reductions and minor increases that result in an overall General Fund increase of 2% on everyone. Factoring in all the funds combined, the CDD assessment increase across the board is 2% in some neighborhoods and 1% in others. These increases are relatively insignificant.

Mr. Gratz asked would you incorporate a page to the budget showing existing contracts and rates? Create a kind of contract matrix?

Mr. Adams responded we will do that.

Ms. Nelson asked does this budget have any input from the Renovation Committee? There are no numbers in here whatsoever.

Mr. Adams responded you are still carrying your financing amount under Recreation Center Capital Improvements and \$29,000 of the \$53,000 is related to that. You budgeted \$39,000 last year and \$29,000 was related to \$125,000 of anticipated financing on improvements to this facility. The increase is to replace pool furniture when we resurface the pool deck. The furniture has been out in the sun and elements for almost seven years and re-webbing them will not work. Ms. Nelson has worked with me on upgrading chairs, tables, and umbrellas and we got our pricing from Tropitone.

Mr. Gratz stated Tropitone gives us a 30% discount. Call Judy in my office.

Mr. Adams stated this is a working budget number. When we get ready to finalize we always do our due diligence and shop the pricing.

Ms. Nelson asked have you heard anything about enlarging the facility?

Mr. Adams responded I have not heard a word. The committee's original leader has stepped down and there is a replacement. I told the new leader I would attend meetings if needed to help push the process along so we can start design and permitting this summer in order to move forward this winter when there is less use of the facilities.

Ms. Nelson stated last meeting we voted to proceed with cameras at the gatehouse but you only have \$5,000 in next year's budget.

Mr. Adams stated that is for redoing some gatehouse interiors, floors, furniture and blinds that have been here from Day One. It is time to give them a face-lift.

Ms. Nelson stated but for the remainder of this year you have \$2,500 of the original \$5,000 we had budgeted. Based on the proposal, the cameras were \$3,200. Are we not moving forward?

Mr. Adams responded that number is incorrect. The camera has been installed but the numbers have not hit your financials yet. There is a photo of the camera in place on the back of the handouts I just gave you. The camera is fairly unnoticeable as you enter and will become even more invisible after we paint the housing dark green to match the pole.

A resident asked where is the camera? What is its purpose?

Mr. Adams responded it is on the streetlight pole just before you enter the gate. Its purpose is to identify drivers who blame the CDD for operator error when the gate comes down on their cars because they are tailgating.

Mr. Meehan asked has the camera been announced to the public? It is a good news item to put in the newsletter.

Mr. Adams responded we have not announced it but Mr. Williams can write up something about the camera.

Ms. Nelson asked when will we have workshops on the budget?

Mr. Adams responded in June. If you have something in mind that was not addressed here please call me so I can prepare numbers and include them in your next draft budget.

On MOTION by Ms. Nelson seconded by Mr. Wood with all in favor the Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2005 was approved and Resolution 2004-5 Setting a Public Hearing for July 13 at 10:00 a.m. at the Arbor Greene Gathering Room was adopted.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Staff Reports

A. Attorney

There not being any, the next item followed.

B. Engineer

There not being any, the next item followed.

C. District Manager

Mr. Daugirda stated all Board members should also be officers. Mr. Gratz was sworn in as Supervisor and I would like to appoint him as Assistant Secretary. We have Director and Officer insurance and doing this gives you double protection. The Board presently has Mr. Funk as Chairman, Mr. Meehan as Vice Chair, and Ms. Nelson and Mr. Wood as Assistant Secretaries. If the Board wishes to retain that officer structure we can proceed to appoint Mr. Gratz as Assistant Secretary.

On MOTION by Mr. Funk seconded by Ms. Nelson with all in favor Mr. Mike Gratz was appointed Assistant Secretary.

- **Security Guard issues:**

Mr. Adams stated I have a proposal from US Security as a potential replacement for Fox Security. US Security knows that any reduction in service is not acceptable for the price proposed. My analysis of Year 1 and Year 2 pricing shows the company is willing to reduce their original rates from \$13.40 per hour to \$13.05 per hour. In this 35-cent reduction the company absorbs 10-cents in overhead and reduces officer pay by 25-cents. Your revised value gives a savings of \$3,000 in both Year 1 and Year 2. I said in earlier meetings that US Security has the slimmest profit and overhead markups I have seen in this business. As a result, they can provide the best service for the price. US Security also has the contract at Hunter's Green and the company indicates these revised rates are comparable to your neighbors with the only exception being that their lead supervisors receive \$15 to \$15.50 per hour.

If you wish to replace Fox Security with US Security I recommend going with these proposed negotiated prices but keeping the original amount in our budget for contract purposes. This is in the event we need to work with US Security to increase guard pay to retain quality personnel for us. This way, you will have a safeguard.

Ms. Nelson asked have you talked again with Fox Security?

Mr. Adams responded no, but I have heard good things about them. They seem more responsive these past two months with the threat of losing the contract hanging over them. After our defective work notice and the talk Supervisor Wood and I had with Fox we seem to have good service but this does not mean it will not deteriorate again. No matter what company you have, the quality of personnel on your site speaks for the program and the company. When you enter into these

contracts, always keep in mind the company's ability to pay better and therefore to get better employees. It is important to know what a company pays its guards.

Mr. Wood asked what is the time period for terminating contracts?

Mr. Adams responded 30 days without notice. With a defective work notice already on file for Fox you can terminate at any time for similar causes.

Ms. Nelson asked how soon can US Security get up and running?

Mr. Adams responded they need a few weeks to gear up. They can move a guard here or there from their existing personnel to fill any void but typically, unless existing guards have non-compete agreements with their company, the new company tries to retain the better guards because of their on-site history and relationship with the community.

Ms. Nelson stated I have not heard complaints recently. We seem to go in spurts on complaints.

Mr. Adams stated that is true so perhaps we should table this matter for now. US Security's proposal numbers are quite solid and they will honor them for a time. We can table this and if we get another round of complaints we can act on it then. Right now I have positive feedback and things are not as bad as it was before with Fox.

Ms. Koscinski stated I have not really had many complaints.

Mr. Wood stated we have no objective way to measure guard quality other than when people call in to complain. With the Fox contract expiring in January and their awareness of our defective work order, should we set up monthly meetings with Fox or have their representative attend Board meetings? If being in the spotlight after our defective work notice and talk were driving Fox's improved performance and if residents are happy and have no complaints with the present service, then we need to keep the pressure up.

Mr. Adams asked shall we table this matter and have regular monthly meetings with Fox and continue with pressure? You have set out performance criteria and outside of monitoring the guards it is very difficult to rate their performance unless there are complaints. Our new camera gives us a secondary

benefit. If you receive a complaint at a certain time and date, we can review images from the camera. We cannot see faces but we can certainly see if the guards came out and took the time to scrutinize visitors or if they just waved people through. The guards know the camera is there.

Mr. Wood asked can we pull out random photos to give us feedback on the quality of guard work?

Mr. Adams stated there are thousands of images. If you can muster a volunteer to screen photos, it is possible. It is very, very time-consuming to run through images to find just one instance.

Ms. Nelson stated if the images are downloaded to computer storage can you program in a date and time stamp to narrow the number of images if we need to find one for an incident on a specific date?

Mr. Adams responded images are already date and time stamped. The problem is weeding out a specific image from hundreds of images if you are only given a time range for a specific incident. This gate is busy, especially at certain hours, and it is very time-consuming to sort through all those images. We are asking for a proposal to move the storage unit back to this office so that images can still be seen at the gatehouse but will be stored here. The main antenna is in the cupola of the main gate and gives great signals. Images will be wirelessly beamed here for storage in our computer.

Mr. Wood stated I see no compelling reason to change security companies as long as Fox know it is still under the spotlight.

Mr. Adams stated we will table the matter.

- **Sump #88 in Parkview Park:**

Mr. Adams stated the issue is how to prevent toddlers from entering the sump area and potentially causing liability for the CDD. Johnson Engineering reviewed the area and provided options, time frames, and pricing. Option 1 is to erect a 6-ft. fence around the existing sump area and hide the fence with plants along the roadway section but leave the other sides open so people in the park can observe the sump area. Options 2 and 3 are variations of Option 1: Relocate the

sump into the preserve area and hard pipe it, leaving the collection point in the park itself or relocate the pipe into the preserve area and remove the sump.

I advise against landscaping around any section of the fence because if children are in trouble, the view is blocked for passing vehicles as well as anyone sitting in the park. I recommend 4-ft. fencing as it still meets the aim of preventing toddlers from climbing into the area. Black chain-link fencing is an eyesore, which is the cause of our wrangling about the fence. Adjacent homeowners must be advised if you go ahead with the fencing. For Options 2 and 3, either choice can run \$25,000 to \$50,000 and involves taking away preserve property and adjusting mitigation requirements, SWFWMD easements, previously provided credits, and application fees. This is not where the Board wants to go with that kind of money.

Mr. Craig Smallwood stated that area is full of toddlers. The fencing matter appeared in the October newsletter and I cannot believe you are still talking and not doing anything and it is being pushed further back. My yard is fenced and I see many other fences going up. My neighbors with young kids express concern about the park and they would say something but cannot come to a 10:00 a.m. meeting. Many people do not know whom to call to give their opinion.

Ms. Nelson stated there are many other avenues to give opinions if people cannot make the meetings. The newsletter asks everyone to call us with any problem. It does not help for people to complain to each other; they have to let us know. This is a safety issue and needs to be addressed.

Mr. Meehan stated one homeowner said he wanted the lake filled in. That is not possible but maybe he will settle for a 4-ft. fence. This is not private property but the CDD tries to get all opinions before taking care of the problem. Still, whether the homeowner agrees or not with the suggested solution, something will be done.

Mr. Frank Choy stated you can remove the source of exposure to liability of having a playground next to a sump by moving the playground to the center area where the model homes are. This removes the source of exposure while expanding the playground in an underutilized center area park.

Ms. Nelson stated that has never been brought up as an option.

Mr. Adams stated the most feasible and quickest way to address this is to put the black chain link fence around the sump with a 4-ft. access gate. Prices have increased since I gave you the quote last month and steel prices continue to climb daily.

A resident stated I live in the center area and the little park there is well utilized. Homes are being developed and there is a lot of traffic in that circle. A playground here is not a good option.

On MOTION by Mr. Funk seconded by Mr. Gratz with all in favor Erection of a 4-ft. black vinyl fence with a 4-ft. access gate for maintenance around Sump Pump #88 was approved.

Mr. Meehan asked how much did the Johnson Engineering review cost?

Mr. Adams \$2,500 for several site visits, review of permits, and researching agency opinions. I had to turn this urgent item around quickly to give the Board information to work with.

Mr. Meehan asked is our engineer still Dave Bartell, the one who did not return your calls?

Mr. Adams responded we have reached a renewed commitment from his standpoint.

- **Surplus Equipment:**

Mr. Adams stated at the Board's direction I have replaced the old exercise bicycles with new ones. We have an ad running now for bids on the old bikes. Resolution 2004-6 formally declares the old bicycles as surplus equipment and authorizes me to sell or dispose of them. I would also like to add to the list of surplus items an incline bench, a 50-lb. set of assorted weights and bars.

On MOTION by Mr. Funk seconded by Ms. Nelson with all in favor Resolution 2004-6 declaring certain tangible personal property as surplus equipment and authorizing

the District manger to sell or dispose of said equipment was adopted.

- **Traffic lights at Arbor Greene entrance:**

Mr. Adams stated Mr. Peter Brett with the County told me that presently the City and the County are each responsible for maintaining certain sections of Cross Creek and they are pursuing an agreement to delineate responsibility. The City now maintains the lights at Cross Creek and Bruce B. Downs but they want the County to assume all operations and maintenance for lights on the majority of Cross Creek. They have asked us to hold our request for a light at our intersection until they finalize which entity is responsible for our intersection. You have the list of 11 different warrants that Mr. Brett gave me. His opinion is that this is a self-serving signal on Arbor Greene Boulevard, which is a private road since it is not a County or a City road. They would therefore probably only consider our request only if we paid for the signals. I do not have an estimate on the cost for a signal at this point.

Ms. Nelson asked did they mention when they would start widening the road? That would alleviate some of the problems.

Mr. Adams stated I did not discuss that with them. I assume widening may enter into the agreement between the City and County. They are in the process of defining and clearing up the issues they have on Cross Creek and the various ownerships all the way down the roadway and expect to complete this within 60 to 90 days. Mr. Brett said both parties have very favorably received our request at this point. They appear to be in final negotiations on the interlocal agreement and once that is finalized, if we fall under the City, I will talk to Ms. Debbie Harrington about the process for a signal.

Mr. Funk stated I challenge their use of the public road/private road criteria. This is a traffic consideration and they are both trying to avoid paying for the lights. One of the warrants is the number of accidents and deaths, so if we have a lot of those numbers, we might finally get a light. The process will still take three to five years unless you create an uproar.

A resident stated if you start at the main road at Bruce B. Downs and come all the way through there is only one light on a public road. You can also enter by going back through from Morris Bridge and all entry points are CDD property or private roads. The condition you are discussing exists on this road here.

Mr. Adams stated Mr. Brett's opinion was the County would consider a light if we funded it.

A resident stated with 1,300 families feeding out to this road every day, they do not have a choice because the warrants are there.

Mr. Adams stated I do not disagree; I am just delivering the message.

A resident stated we will be glad to accompany you and tell the mayor or whomever that the County will not listen to us. We can let them fight it out.

Mr. Daugirda stated we can remind them that Arbor Greene families pay a lot of taxes that benefit the City.

Mr. Adams stated I will pursue this and we will soon know who owns which roads. In the short-term we will follow this up with the City.

- **Traffic Patrol:**

Mr. Adams stated a weekly patrol program is now in place for either Friday or Saturday evening. I will not say more so I do not undermine the program.

Ms. Nelson asked can't we get it for the morning?

Mr. Adams responded I cannot give you specifics. Patrols will occur for the next two months in 4-hour blocks at random times for one of those evenings. Feedback showed these as the most critical evenings with heavy traffic, kids coming in and out, and partying which leads to speeding.

Ms. Nelson asked will they write patrol reports so we can see if the time period is right?

Mr. Adams responded they must check in and out at the gatehouse and provide copies of all citations given.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor's Requests and Audience Comments

Ms. Nelson asked are the pool chairs paid out of this or the next budget? Can we move on this before October and have new equipment for the summer?

Mr. Adams stated I budgeted it for next year as it is a sizeable sum but you can move anytime. You have contingency money so it is the Board's decision. My budget recommends that you finance the replacement over a 4-year period, which is the normal life expectancy of the equipment.

Mr. Funk stated if we take it out of Contingency we can repay it.

Mr. Adams stated the number will be in the budget for you to repay yourself. By the time equipment arrives and we start our leasing program you will have incurred only three months of actual lease payments this fiscal year.

Mr. Wood stated do not forget to call Judy and pursue the 30% discount.

<p>On MOTION by Ms. Nelson seconded by Mr. Gratz with all in favor replacement of pool chairs, umbrellas and related equipment in the Fiscal Year 2004 budget was approved.</p>

Ms. Nelson asked on Page 4 of the financials, why did the electricity for the main fountain go from \$464 last month to \$1,251 this month?

Mr. Adams responded the main fountain was shut down for two or three weeks while we repaired the liner.

Ms. Nelson asked concerning Information Center Rental numbers, we did not get any additional rental fees compared to last month. Was the rental from Lennar who is now in the trailer?

Mr. Adams responded I believe it is Lennar.

Ms. Koscinski stated Lennar leased it for six months and paid in advance.

Ms. Nelson stated in April we had \$14,000 in the Operating Account but towards the end of May we have \$0. Was that \$14,000 for the swings?

Mr. Adams responded that was the Recreation Operating Account which covered the swings, borders, site preparation, irrigation modification, and mulch. The developer offset a large portion of the expense.

Ms. Nelson asked what is the status of planting greenery or hedges along Estuary Drive so homeowners need not look straight into the swings?

Mr. Adams stated I will take another look at it. I had smaller materials placed there so we could still see the children if they got into trouble. Let me know if you have specific requests from residents.

Ms. Nelson stated no one has complained.

- **Neighborhood Watch Program**

Mr. Wood stated Robert and Karen Shelton have don an outstanding job heading the Neighborhood Watch program. I have asked them to fill you in on what has happened.

Mr. Shelton stated the program was set up specifically for Trace neighborhood and kicked off in February. However, because of the importance of the Watch program we take responsibility for all of Arbor Greene which covers 13 villages. Once enough people from the other villages join, the Watch program leadership will move into each of the villages. Until then we have taken care of everything required by the program. The system is working very well. We started with 12 members and we are now at 65. The Watch is featured on the community website, is recognized in the newsletters, and people can easily sign up through Ms. Koscinski.

The “Stranger in Danger” program worked out well. Twelve families with quite a number of kids attended and representatives from the Tampa Police Department and the Community Officer gave presentations. This really allowed for people to ask pertinent questions. That meeting yielded nine new members to the program.

I have gotten to know better some of the other areas in the community, developed an excellent relationship with the Bonito School, and addressed a serious problem with kids burning palm trees on Bonito Boardwalk. Fifteen palms set on fire during a very dry period, a matter of great concern because 1.5 acres was burned almost to the ground in Corey Lake Isles when two 10-year-olds set fire to palm trees. The Bonito School is very focused on our activities and we have an

excellent relationship. We work diligently to keep an eye on things in Arbor Greene. The security cameras will be extremely helpful because I know I can ask for records for specific incidents. Several times I have seen the second shift gate guard not taking the time needed to jot down license numbers of entering vehicles. The critical thing is time frames. I recommend guards take down the make of the cars as well as the tag numbers.

Mr. Adams stated the guards are supposed to do that.

Mr. Shelton stated the gate arm on the truck lane at the exit side of the gatehouse is always up while the car lane is down. I chased a car that zoomed out of Arbor Greene right through the truck lane. The gate might have slowed them down. Why do we have gates if they are always up?

Mr. Adams responded the gates are up because as we scrutinize visitors entering, it is unnecessary to do so on exiting. Also, it is better for heavy morning traffic, wear and tear on the gate arm, and the inconvenience of having to wait to leave. It is locked down under the canopy because we had some conflicts with trucks leaving and hitting the canopy. Guards do not monitor exits so we cannot see cars coming fast enough to make them stop and so cars end up hitting it. The arm in the interior lane under the canopy is in the lock-down position for that reason. Only the outside arm is up. The data the guards take down plus the new security cameras will give you better identification of suspicious cars on the property.

- **Audience Comments:**

Mr. Smallwood stated service work goes on in Parkview at all hours of the day. A street sweeper comes in at 5:00 and 10:30 at night and there are garbage trucks also. Gate guards need to stay on top of visitors and get make, model and tag information. They have let me and another neighbor enter when we use different cars.

Mr. Adams stated the service trucks are not in CDD programs. Ms. Koscinski can talk to the builder on the street sweeper and Solid Waste Management about the garbage trucks. Please report such maintenance incidents

to us with specific dates and times. I have removed several guards from these posts for lax duty. Poor workers reflect on both the District and the company and we both have interest in quickly removing those kinds of individuals.

Mr. Choy asked will you look into the serious erosion problem at a Retreat berm? The berm looks good from the top down but there are exposed roots on lower groundcover and no mulch has been put on that berm for at least four years.

Mr. Adams stated we will do that.

Resignation of Supervisors

Mr. Daugirda stated this is Mr. Wood's last meeting. His term goes to 2006 but he is resigning due to relocation. The people with the most seniority and historical knowledge of the CDD are leaving soon in that Ms. Nelson and Messrs. Funk and Meehan have 2004 seats. Ms. Nelson can run for reelection but staff suggests you consider accepting both Mr. Wood's and Ms. Nelson's resignations and at the same time appoint her to Mr. Wood's vacated seat. She is a resident who has worked diligently and can maintain continuity during the major transition in November. This is not an uncommon action and has been done before.

Ms. Nelson and Mr. Wood stated they resign from the Board, effective at the end of the meeting.

<p>On MOTION by Mr. Funk seconded by Mr. Meehan with all in favor the resignations of Mr. Wood and Ms. Nelson were accepted and the appointment of Ms. Nelson to Mr. Wood's seat #2 was approved, effective at the end of the meeting.</p>
--

Mr. Daugirda stated Ms. Nelson's new term expires in 2006 and her Seat #3 is up for election in November.

Mr. Funk asked will that seat remain empty?

Mr. Daugirda stated you can leave it empty or appoint someone for the remainder of the term.

Mr. Funk asked how many seats are up in November?

Mr. Daugirda responded there are three seats under the election process and one seat under appointment.

Mr. Meehan stated I want as many homeowners as possible on this Board.

Mr. Daugirda stated after the November elections Mr. Gratz will step down and there will be five residents on the Board. That is a serious transition.

Mr. Meehan stated that is as it should be.

Mr. Daugirda stated we wish to acknowledge Mr. Wood for his service to the Board. He has worked hard for the community and we wish him the best for his future endeavors in the Atlanta area.

Mr. Daugirda being a Notary Public of the State of Florida administered the oath of office to Ms. Nelson who was appointed to Seat #2 which expires in November 2006. We will give you an oath to sign which will be made a part of the public record as well as necessary papers including the Sunshine Law. Welcome aboard again.

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Approval of Financial Statements,
Electricity Consumption Report, and
Invoices**

On MOTION by Mr. Funk seconded by Mr. Meehan with all in favor the Financial Statements were approved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Adjournment

On MOTION by Mr. Funk seconded by Mr. Meehan with all in favor the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

May 12, 2004

Arbor Greene C.D.D.

Jeff Meehan
Assistant Secretary

Charlie Funk
Chairman