

MINUTES OF MEETING
TISON'S LANDING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

A special meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Tison's Landing Community Development District was held Thursday, July 28, 2016 at 11:00 a.m. at England-Thims & Miller, Inc. 14775 Old St. Augustine Road, Jacksonville, Florida 32258.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Doug Maier
Fitch King
Dan Plourde
Carman Pagano

Chairman
Vice-Chairman
Supervisor (by phone)
Supervisor

Also present were:

Dave deNagy
Gerald Knight
Preston Doub
Brian Stephens
Sete Zare
Steve Sanford
Misty Taylor

District Manager
District Council
District Engineer
Riverside Management Services
MBS Capital Markets
Greenberg, Traurig (by phone)
Bryant Miller Olive (by phone)

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. deNagy called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments

No members of the public were in attendance.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Affidavit of Publication

Mr. deNagy stated a copy is in the agenda package.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of Minutes of the July 7, 2016 Meeting

Mr. deNagy stated a copy of the minutes is in your agenda package. Are there any revisions to the minutes?

On MOTION by Mr. Maier seconded by Mr. Pagano with all in favor the minutes of the July 7, 2016 meeting were approved.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Deferred Costs Agreement with CC Duval Property, LLC

Mr. Knight stated there was a discussion previously about the fact under the terms of the trust indenture, if there are funds available that the District would refund or reimburse the developer for costs the developer incurred in completing the District's capital improvement project that the District did not pay for and had not previously reimbursed. Now that we are refunding the bonds and generating some savings as a result of that, part of those funds would be available to pay deferred costs under the trust indenture. The District Engineer has indicated that there are deferred costs that were incurred in the range of \$700,000. This agreement settles that claim that the developer may have for deferred costs up to \$700,000. It provides that the developer will accept \$100,000 to set aside any claim that has deferred costs or payment of deferred obligations under the trust indenture. It provides that the funds will be paid out of funds available as a result of the refunding of the bonds, and he waives any further claims and indemnifies the District against any claims that he may have or other developers may have as a result of the construction of the CDD capital improvement plan. This agreement settles and satisfies any claims for deferred cost with the developer. If you are in agreement, I would like for you to approve the agreement in substantially final form. If there are substantive changes, we will bring it back to the August 10 meeting and have you re-approve it.

Mr. Pagano asked had we not done this bond refunding, would the CDD be responsible for \$700,000 or some amount?

Mr. Knight responded only if funds were available. We do have \$24,000 in the deferred cost account that had been generated over the year either through reduction in the debt service reserve or interest earned on bond funds or some other way that accrued in the deferred cost account. Those funds would be available. As a result of the refunding, we are generating

more of those funds or a source for further payment of additional funds to the developer. So what we are doing is settling for \$100,000. To answer your question, there would not be \$100,000 available, there would only be whatever is in the account today. This does not affect our construction fund.

Mr. Plourde asked with the construction fund, is that going right into escrow with the bank that is our trusted agent or is a different account that I don't know about or that wasn't mentioned in the pamphlet. The refunding that is supposed to go into a construction fund, is that supposed to go into escrow because I notice that all the funds that are coming out are supposed to go into escrow. Is there is separate account?

Mr. Sanford stated the \$200,000 for the projects is going into a separate acquisition and construction fund, and that money is not in escrow technically because all the District needs to do is requisition that money out. The two pots of money are different.

Mr. deNagy stated we will have access to that money once we close with the bonds. All that is required is sending a requisition to the trustee for whatever cost we determine we are going to use that money for.

Mr. Plourde asked the construction fund, what bank did that go to and who has access to that?

Mr. deNagy responded US Bank, and essentially the engineer, myself, and I think a couple of other people that can sign would have access to those funds and subject to board approval.

On MOTION by Mr. Maier seconded by Mr. Pagano with all in favor the Deferred Cost Agreement for \$100,000 with CC Duval Property, LLC was approved.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Hearing to Consider the Imposition of Special Assessments

A. Consideration of Resolution 2016-07

Mr. deNagy stated I have handed out to the board members a redline version, final version of the resolution. I also handed out a copy of the revised assessment methodology that I sent to all the team members yesterday. We are going to open the public hearing, and we can talk about the resolution and the methodology and rather than close the public hearing, we will

continue our public hearing to our meeting on August 10. At that time we will have the final numbers for the methodology, and we will have a tax roll that can be approved as part of the resolution on August 10.

On MOTION by Mr. Pagano seconded by Mr. King with all in favor the Public Hearing is Open.

Mr. deNagy stated the intent of this resolution is essentially to impose assessments based on the final assessment roll and based on final numbers from our bond refunding. I have handed out a copy of the methodology to you dated July 27. Table 1 of the methodology, you can see identifies there are 680 units within Tison's Landing; however, we have one unit who has completely paid off their debt, so they are not subject to the refinancing. Table 2 is an outline that shows the refunding bonds. The par amount is \$5,655,000. You can see the sources and uses of funds.

Ms. Zare stated the \$100,000 deferred amount is reflected in the numbers. It is coming out of prior funds, so it is already reflected in the savings that you are going to be presented.

Mr. deNagy stated Table 3 shows essentially the current debt morphing into the refunding debt. In the middle is the increase in the par debt that we talked about, which was the cause for the mailed notice and is over the remaining life of the bond. The other column of interest, off to the right, is the reduction in the debt assessments. The assessment reductions have come up significantly since the last analysis. We had a \$52.70 increase in our O&M assessments. We now have a net decrease for most properties amounting to as much as \$38 a year, and that is net of the O&M increase itself because of the debt savings on the refunding. Some properties will see an increase as high as \$12.69. So there is a swing of a \$12.69 increase per year and reduction of \$38.05 a year. The last table would be the assessment roll. That is all I have on the methodology.

Mr. Knight stated the resolution levies the assessments to pay the debt service on the refunding bonds. They are not extending the term of the bonds. It is the same as the original bonds. The Engineer's Report that describes the improvements is the same Engineer's Report that was originally approved by the board when the bonds were issued plus the additional project that is going to be funded by the District at \$200,000. That is described in a supplemental Engineer's Report that is referenced in here. The methodology for levying the

assessments is the methodology that you just had described. It is referred to in paragraph 8, and there was a date for that methodology of June 21, 2016. You now have a new methodology dated July 27, 2016.

Mr. deNagy stated we will change that to August 10 when we get the final numbers.

Mr. Knight responded we will see when we get there. If that changes, we will make the change in here before we adopt it. We are not going to adopt the resolution today; I am just explaining it. We will make that change if required. This resolution ultimately approves the assessments to be levied and levies them on the property within the District to fund the debt service on the refunding bonds. It also approves the final assessment roll, and that is the reason we are not doing it today because we don't have the final assessment roll yet. We will have it on August 2. On August 3 the final assessment roll will be prepared, and at the August 10 meeting we will have the final assessment roll, and it will be come Exhibit 1 of this resolution. When we get to the August 10 meeting you will actually adopt the resolution and levy the assessments.

Mr. Sanford asked are we not going to mail before that?

Ms. Zare responded we are going to mail. We are mailing tomorrow.

Mr. Sanford stated technically we don't have an assessment lien yet do we?

Mr. Knight responded not until this resolution is adopted.

Mr. Sanford asked why can't the resolution be adopted with a caveat that the final assessment roll will be attached when available. The lien will be in place.

Mr. Knight responded I don't know. The purpose of the hearing is to receive public comments on the proposed assessment roll, and we don't have it.

Ms. Zare asked can we adopt it in form?

Mr. Knight responded it can be adopted in form. We can't adopt it until after the public hearing.

Mr. Sanford asked does the public hearing have to be continued to August 10?

Mr. Knight responded yes.

Mr. Sanford stated I will get with Misty, but maybe we will have to do minimal tweaking to make sure that we are not representing something that is not completely accurate tomorrow when we mail the POS.

Mr. Knight asked is this a problem Steve? This is the only way we could figure out how to do this since the assessment roll isn't ready.

Mr. Sanford stated the preliminary official statement is supposed to be a final document unless the permitted omissions just really goes to the pressing terms of the bond, so they are saying that the POS is final, which means the lien is in place. I need to discuss that with Misty to see how she wants to handle that, but I am a little nervous about putting out something that represents that we have the lien in place when that is not true. Something could happen. We might not get a quorum on August 10 or whatever. We are not selling the whole package today.

Ms. Zare asked do you have a recommendation on how we should proceed so that we ensure that the bondholders know that there is a lien contingent upon eventually having the resolution adopted. How do you suggest that we would proceed so that we don't interfere with closing.

Mr. Sanford responded I don't have it right in front of me, but I would think that in a couple of places we may want to say that the bonds will be secured by the special assessment, something along those lines. It is still going to happen, but the delivery of the bond can't take place without the lien being in place. I can work with Misty right after the meeting and come up with something she is going to feel comfortable and I am going to feel comfortable with.

Mr. deNagy asked Steve, are you okay with us going ahead and continuing the public hearing?

Mr. Sanford responded let's just go through the schedule. We are going to mail it tomorrow. When are we going to sell the bonds?

Ms. Zare responded we are mailing tomorrow and pricing on August 2 and anticipate closing on the August 10 board meeting. We need to do so in order to ensure that the residents see the savings that are here, and it hits the tax roll this year. Pricing has to happen August 2.

Mr. Sanford stated we have to make sure that the bond purchase agreement has one of the conditions of closing is the final assessment hearing and adoption of the final assessment resolution. It has to be a condition of closing.

Mr. Knight stated anything else we do, we have to gerrymander something which I would prefer not to on an issuance of bonds. The only thing I can do is recess this meeting, but we still need to hold the hearing on the 10th. I don't think there is any way around that. I can't

recess it and hold the hearing. We have given notice of today as the hearing. What we have to do is for the 10th, we are going to public another notice of the rescheduled public hearing and hold the hearing on the 10th.

Mr. Sanford stated I missed the reason why the assessment roll is not available.

Mr. Knight responded because it required the final pricing of the bonds I guess, that is what I understood.

Ms. Zare asked can we adopt a preliminary roll?

Mr. Knight responded the preliminary roll has already been adopted. It is not the final roll. We don't have the final roll prepared.

Mr. Sanford asked isn't it the same as before?

Mr. Knight responded yes, but the assessments aren't.

Mr. Sanford stated we have done this a 100 times where we have validated the final assessment before we sold bonds. I am missing why this is different.

Mr. Knight responded there is no assessment roll here today. We approved a preliminary assessment roll, which was prepared. I have seen that. That was prepared with the earlier numbers. Now the numbers, I believe, have changed, and they need to change the assessment roll.

Mr. Sanford asked doesn't David have that assessment roll with that methodology?

Mr. Knight responded no. The final assessment roll?

Mr. Sanford stated I know we don't have the final Gerry, but we have a maximum amount. We are authorizing a maximum amount of bonds. We are authorizing a maximum of assessments. What homeowner isn't on notice of what their assessment is going to be?

Mr. Knight responded I can't tell you until I see the final assessment roll. I don't know if some owners' assessments have changed – if they are going up or down or how they are being affected. I have not seen the proposed final assessment roll.

Ms. Zare stated the preliminary roll was the maximum the residents could possibly be assessed, so anything else would be less than that. Is there anyway we can just adopt the preliminary roll that can suffice for the hearing and come pricing and close, we actually adopt a new methodology, the final methodology with the final roll?

Mr. Knight responded I don't think so. I haven't done it that way before. We have the preliminary assessment roll, and then we have the final assessment roll when we get to the

hearing. We don't have it today. This resolution approves the final assessment roll. It is attached as an exhibit.

Ms. Zare stated Steve, I defer to you. I can see if I can get Misty on the phone as counsel for the underwriter and see what her thoughts are on this.

Mr. Sanford stated I still don't understand, Gerry. We have adopted final assessment resolutions a 100 times, and the bonds haven't been sold you.

Mr. Knight stated the methodology that we have before us today does not have an assessment roll attached to it. What is the board going to approve? Part of the resolution approves the final assessment roll.

Mr. deNagy stated Steve, I don't know, in your earlier cases you probably had pricing to be able to have a final assessment roll. We don't have that here.

Mr. Sanford we accomplished the equalization meeting hearing and validated that way before the bonds are ever sold. I always thought the premise was as long as you in your public hearing set forth the highest assessment that can be levied, then everybody had an opportunity to be heard on that assessment. If it goes down, so be it.

Mr. Knight asked do we know that every home the assessment is going to be below what the preliminary assessment roll showed?

Mr. Sanford stated it doesn't have to be below. I can be equal to.

Mr. Knight stated or equal to, no higher than.

Mr. Sanford responded yes.

Mr. Knight stated I don't know that.

Mr. deNagy stated I think Sete said it earlier, the most conservative numbers were the preliminary numbers.

Ms. Zare stated we will not exceed anything that was in the preliminary roll because that was the maximum amount that the board approved for us to actually levy upon the residents. The preliminary roll would be the maximum amount. Everything that comes in will be at or lower, and according to this methodology, lower from where we are currently.

Mr. Sanford asked can we have a sentence in that resolution to say attached is the preliminary roll. The final assessment roll will be attached prior to the issuance of the bonds. Everything that is needed to be done is being done in that resolution. If the words say final assessment roll, why does it even have to say final assessment roll?

Mr. Knight responded because that is what the statute says, and that is what the methodology says.

Mr. Sanford stated I am for adopting the resolution. I want to protect the District. I don't want the District to put out a document that implies everything is done when it is not.

Mr. Knight stated we have always had the final assessment roll attached to the resolution. You may not have seen it, but it was there. It is always there.

Mr. Sanford asked how did you validate then?

Mr. Knight responded you can't validate the assessments until the final resolution is adopted, and that is how we do it. When the final resolution is adopted, we validate the assessments approved by the final resolution.

Mr. Sanford stated when we validate the bond that way, we haven't sold the bonds yet.

Mr. Knight asked why? You are just validating. We sometimes have to amend the complaint to once the final hearing is held and the final assessments are approved, we sometimes have to amend the validation complaint to add that in, but we don't validate until the final assessment resolution.

Mr. Sanford stated you do validate before you sell bonds.

Mr. Knight stated yes, that's correct.

Ms. Zare stated Misty is actually about to call in and weigh in on this. If we could actually resolve it together as a team before we move forward, I would greatly appreciate that just so that we don't interfere with the potential pricing and eventual closing. Counsels among each other can decide what the best route is for the District.

Ms. Misty Taylor joined the meeting by phone and stated I caught the tail end of the conversation from the point where you said you didn't want the District to have a document that indicated things were final, and then I heard discussion about validation, but I didn't hear what preceded that.

Mr. Knight stated sitting here today, we do not have a proposed final assessment roll in front of the board. So we were going to continue the hearing on the final resolution to levy the assessments and adoption of the resolution until the August 10th meeting. By then we would have the final assessment roll prepared, and we would be able to have the board approve it and attach it to the resolution and be done. Steve pointed out that that would create a problem for the POS, we would have to play with the words because the final assessment resolution and the

assessments aren't levied in final form because the resolution would not have been adopted by the time the POS goes out, which is next week.

Mr. Sanford stated so Misty, we are putting out a document that implies that the lien is in place, and it is not. The lien hasn't even been levied yet. So I am trying to get Gerry comfortable that we should adopt this resolution, if we have to tweak the language in the resolution, we should adopt the resolution. At least then the lien is in place. Unless you are not troubled by the existing language in the POS, that is doesn't really matter because the bondholders aren't going to get that bond until all of this is done. I am not used to that.

Ms. Taylor asked which resolution are we adopting today?

Mr. Knight responded the final equalizing resolution. The final resolution levying the assessments. We already adopted the preliminary resolution. Today is the public hearing.

Ms. Taylor asked you have held the public hearing?

Mr. Knight responded we have opened the public hearing. We are going to continue the public hearing and defer the adoption of the resolution until August 10 when the final assessment roll would be ready.

Ms. Taylor asked you want to do that because your assessment roll isn't ready?

Mr. Knight responded right. There was a preliminary assessment roll back when the initial assessment resolution was adopted. It authorized the preparation of a preliminary assessment roll, which they did prepare.

Ms. Taylor asked but we don't think we have an issue that there wasn't someone that wasn't noticed, we feel comfortable with all our notices?

Mr. Knight responded all the notices went out for today's meeting for the public hearing.

Ms. Taylor stated I seen this before where we have done this, and we did adopt the resolution, but once we price the bonds and you have your final assessment roll, you bring back what we call the ratifying resolution. It basically just confirms the final pricing information, the final assessment numbers in real time because now we know what the debt service is, and the final assessment roll is attached. When we come back and pre-close that day, we have a meeting beforehand, and we approve that resolution, and we pre-close afterwards.

Mr. Knight asked what assessment roll do you use to attach to the resolution that you are adopting, the equalizing resolution?

Ms. Taylor responded the preliminary one that you have. Like Steve said, if you want to tweak the language in the resolution just to say this is a preliminary roll, and the final roll will be brought back before the board upon pricing of the bonds, you could put that type of language in the resolution. We are not expecting massive changes to the assessment roll.

Mr. Sanford stated Sete said the preliminary assessment roll is a conservative roll, and the assessments are not going to exceed what was set forth in the preliminary roll.

Ms. Taylor stated I think as long as you are clear about that in your resolution, and you say it is a preliminary roll, but you will adopt the final roll on pricing, and we have that room for pricing, this is not unusual for it to happen in this order of events.

Mr. Knight asked do you have your preliminary assessment roll here?

Mr. deNagy stated I should have it, yes.

Mr. Knight stated that is what I am looking for. Has the board seen that previously?

Ms. Zare stated they should have seen it for the first resolution.

Mr. Knight stated it wasn't ready then. It just authorized the preparation of the assessment roll. The preliminary assessment roll has been prepared, but I wanted to know if it was available today if the board wanted to review it.

The board took a 10 minutes recess at this point.

Mr. Knight stated none of the assessments are going to be any higher than the preliminary assessment roll showed as a result of the pricing of the bonds or any changes that are being made prior to the levying of the assessments. The preliminary assessment roll assessments were all higher than what the final assessments are going to be.

Ms. Zare responded it cannot exceed it.

Mr. Knight stated it will not be any higher. Based on all that discussion, usually the pricing is done before the final hearing. Whatever needs to be done is done, so we know what the final numbers are going to be once we come to a final hearing. So let's go back to the resolution. What we will do is go ahead and adopt the resolution today with language changes Misty Taylor suggests and with the preliminary assessment roll attached as the exhibit. We

will come back August 10 and ratify the resolution, which will confirm and ratify the final assessment roll.

Mr. deNagy stated we are going to continue the meeting.

Mr. Knight responded no. We are still in the public hearing; we haven't closed it yet. So after the public hearing is closed, the board will sit as the equalizing board and consider any comments made at the public hearing, which there were none, and approve the preliminary assessment roll as the final assessment roll subject to tweaking or changes that are required due to the bond pricing. We will bring back the ratifying resolution at the next meeting.

Mr. Sanford stated Gerry, I don't think that is correct that it is a ratifying resolution.

Ms. Taylor stated Steve, I think it is really kind of a bring down resolution, it acknowledges the pricing basically.

Mr. Sanford stated I have closed deals where we have had three resolutions, the declaring resolution, the notice resolution, and the equalizing resolution. Some District Counsels do what you suggested that they have that final ratifying resolution, but I have closed deals where there hadn't been that because technically under the statute, if you adopt your final assessment resolution, you have the lien in place.

Ms. Taylor responded yes, and I agree with you that we do that often. We always have the equalizing resolution before we price because we need it to show that the lien is in place. That might be what you prefer to do Gerry is to come back and just confirm that these are the final numbers. It is a short one-page resolution and attaches the final assessment report.

Mr. Knight stated for today, we are going to adopt this resolution with the preliminary assessment roll attached as an exhibit, and we are going to include the language that you, Misty, are suggesting. She can repeat it for the board. We will amend the resolution and include it. We can go ahead and close the public hearing.

On MOTION by Mr. Maier seconded by Mr. Pagano with all in favor the Public Hearing is Closed.

A. Consideration of Resolution 2016-07

Mr. Knight stated we want the board actually to sit as the equalizing board now?

Mr. Sanford responded yes.

Mr. Knight stated even though there weren't any public comments on the assessment change, you sit as the equalizing board and determine whether there are any changes to be made in the assessment roll. We are now sitting as the equalizing board and making that determination. If you are satisfied with the way the assessment roll is, you are making it the final assessment roll, then go ahead and adopt the resolution. Are there any changes the equalizing board wants to make to the assessment roll? Not hearing any, you may go ahead and consider adoption of the final resolution.

On MOTION by Mr. Maier seconded by Mr. Pagano with all in favor Resolution 2016-07 imposing special assessments was adopted.

Mr. Knight stated that would include the changes that Misty suggested earlier, correct?

Ms. Taylor responded yes, you can add language that says District will adopt a resolution following pricing of the bond, acknowledging the final terms of the bond, and the final assessment roll.

Mr. Knight asked should that language be in this final assessment resolution?

Ms. Taylor responded if you want it in there, you can, but that is up to you.

Mr. Knight stated we will adopt the final resolution, 2016-07, subject to the change that Misty Taylor just described and subject to the attachment of the preliminary assessment roll as Exhibit 1.

On MOTION by Mr. Maier seconded by Mr. Pagano with all in favor Resolution 2016-07 imposing special assessments was adopted as amended.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Consideration of Resolution 2016-08,
Delegated Award**

- A. First Supplemental Trust Indenture**
- B. Escrow Deposit Agreement**
- C. Preliminary Official Statement**

D. Bond Purchase Agreement**E. Continuing Disclosure Certificate**

Mr. deNagy stated there are number of attachments to the Delegated Award.

Mr. Steve Sanford stated he is serving as the District's Bond Counsel. Resolution 2016-08 is called the delegating resolution. This resolution effectively does the final act of the issuance of the bonds, and it authorizes the issuance of not to exceed \$5,655,000 in special assessment refunding and improvement bonds. The bond proceeds from this issue will refund an outstanding amount of 2005 bonds and will also create a deposit of \$200,000 to be deposited into a construction fund. The amount of senior bonds and the amount of bonds that the District issues cannot exceed in totality \$5,655,000. In addition to the authorization to issue the bonds, certain documents need to be approved. The first is the Bond Purchase Agreement, and that is the contract between the District and the underwriter. The next document is the Preliminary Official Statement. This document is not the final document because we don't have the final pricing information. It is a tool that the underwriter uses to define the methods, and when the bonds are finally sold and the purchase contract is signed, it will be finalized. The next documents are the Master Trust Indenture and First Supplemental Trust Indenture. These were used in 2005 and are a little bit out of date. It will involve a number of amendments that are just too difficult to incorporate into an existing document. I made the decision that we would use a brand new Master Trust Indenture and a brand new First Supplemental Trust Indenture. This is the agreement between the District and the Trustee. The next document is the Escrow Deposit Agreement. That is the agreement where we are going to take a certain amount of bond proceeds, a certain amount of money that we made under the existing trust indenture and deposit that with US Bank. Now they are wearing a different hat not as the Trustee but as the Escrow Agent for the old bondholders. That money will be used to pay off the old bondholders. When the bond is finally priced and all the pricing terms are within the parameters in the resolution that is going to be approved by the whole board, the Chairman and Vice Chairman will have the authority to sign bond purchase agreement without coming back to the board. It is my recommendation to approve Resolution 2016-08.

On MOTION by Mr. Pagano seconded by Mr. King with all in favor Resolution 2016-08, Delegated Award, was approved.

Mr. deNagy stated one other item is to approve the methodology report dated 7/27/16. The assessment roll that will be attached will be the preliminary assessment roll dated 6/23/16.

On MOTION by Mr. King seconded by Mr. Pagano with all in favor the Preliminary Assessment Methodology dated 7/27/16 was approved.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

There being none, the next item followed.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

There was no report from the Attorney

B. Engineer

There was no report from the Engineer.

C. Manager

Mr. deNagy stated included in your agenda package is the FY17 meeting schedule. This was tabled at the last meeting. There was discussion at the workshop about holding the meeting at the Amenity Center. Do you want to change the meetings for FY17 to be held at the Amenity Center?

Mr. Pagano stated I would like the change the one on April 6 to either the Amenity Center or a facility near the community since that is the one where the preliminary budget will be the main focus.

Mr. deNagy asked how about the other meetings?

Mr. Pagano responded ideally the residents would like all the meetings to be up there. Maybe we can have two workshops up there next year like we did a few weeks ago.

Mr. deNagy stated we can schedule those any time. Do you want to leave the other meetings as noted to be here at ETM?

Mr. Maier stated I think the October 6th meeting should be at Tison's because that was the feedback.

Mr. Plourde stated I would agree with moving the April one to the Amenity Center or closer. As far as the other ones, you will probably see the participation like what you see right now, which is very low, but it might be easier for the other board and is not a problem for me. I think the April one has a lot of concern.

Mr. deNagy stated we will plan on having the April meeting at either the Amenity Center or another venue. Do you want to hold the October 6 meeting at the Amenity Center at 6:00 a.m.

Mr. Pagano stated can you make it 4:00 in the afternoon?

Mr. Plourde stated 4:00 works.

Mr. deNagy stated we will have the meeting on October 6 at the Amenity Center at 4:00 p.m., January 5th we will hold the meeting here at ETM at 11:00 a.m., the April 6th meeting will be at the Amenity Center or another venue at 6:00 p.m. to enable people who want to talk about the budget to attend that meeting, and the July 6 meeting will be at ETM at 11:00 a.m. Any workshops will be scheduled as needed.

On MOTION by Mr. Pagano seconded by Mr. King with all in favor the FY17 meeting schedule was approved.

D. Operations Manager

There was no report from the Operations Manager.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor Request / Audience Comments

Mr. Plourde stated at our workshop, it was noted that there were 12 outside entities that have access to our community, and they only pay \$1,200. We are talking about increasing that to the highest paid landowner in the community.

Mr. deNagy stated we can put that on the October agenda.

Mr. Plourde stated I think they were talking also about trying to raise the rates on the I-9. The ten dollars doesn't cover the damages that they do at the Amenity Center or the field. We can raise it from \$10 a person up to whatever might be more economical for us.

Mr. deNagy stated that will be on the agenda for October.

Mr. Pagano stated there was a situation that came up recently when someone rented the Amenity Center. There was some loud and off-color music being played. There were children present in the pool area and a lot of parents got upset. I would like to discuss maybe somehow changing the wording of the rental agreement regarding noise/language at Amenity Center.

Mr. deNagy stated that will be put on the October agenda.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Scheduled Meeting

Mr. deNagy stated there will be a Special Meeting on August 10, 2016 at 11:00 a.m. at England-Thims & Miller.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

On MOTION by Mr. Maier seconded by Mr. Pagano with all in favor the meeting was adjourned.

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

Chairman/Vice Chairman

