

MINUTES OF MEETING CELEBRATION COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Celebration Community Development District was held Wednesday, June 20, 2007 at 7:00 p.m. at Town Hall, 690 Celebration Avenue, Celebration, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Cliff Akey	Vice Chairman
Paul Collins	Secretary
Richard Quinn	Supervisor
Tom Sunnarborg	Supervisor (<i>by telephone</i>)

Also present were:

Gary Moyer	Manager: Moyer Management Group
Jim Basque	Attorney: Shuffield, Lowman & Wilson
Randy Hanson	Engineer: Hanson Walter
Shawn Hindle	Engineer: Hanson Walter
Doug Draper	Prager Sealy & Company
Kim Hall	Celebration Independent
John LaRocka	Safety Committee
Dr. Scott Leftwich	Leftwich Consulting Engineers
Jim Parker	Walt Disney Imagineering
Denise Sacks	Safety Committee
Brian Smith	Severn Trent Services
Chuck Wellendorf	Safety Committee
Rick Woodville	Severn Trent Services
Brenda Wright	Moyer Management Group
Sete Zare	Prager Sealy & Company
Residents and members of the public	

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Akey led the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. Moyer called the roll and stated a quorum was present for the meeting.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments

Mr. Akey introduced three audience members from the Celebration Safety Committee: Denise Sacks, John LaRocka and Chuck Wellendorf. Mr. Quinn also does a lot of things for the community that we appreciate, as well as Mr. Collins and we want to take a moment to recognize these individuals.

Mr. Wellendorf stated Channel 12 provides reports of what is happening on the CROA Board. One of the programs they are considering is working with the Sheriff's department for a Citizens Assisted Patrol. They are considering installing cameras around the parks and pools. Some residents also want cameras at the entrances, which will involve The Celebration Company ("TCC") and the CDD. We will ask for your assistance and input into these programs if we desire to implement them. We are looking at several other items, not immediately, but we will keep you informed.

Mr. Quinn asked would you be amenable to having a regular place on the CDD agenda?

Mr. Wellendorf stated yes and I will attend these meetings when I am available. I am on another committee that happens to meet tonight as well.

Mr. Akey stated Mr. LaRocka will attend the meetings and meet with Mr. Smith to be sure we are up to date. Mr. Wellendorf is the liaison with the sheriff, Ms. Sacks is the liaison with Town Hall and Mr. LaRocka is the liaison with the CDD.

Mr. Quinn stated when we talk about issues related to sirens and cameras, we really need to be dealing with the County because it involves public rights-of-way, as opposed to what the CDD does or does not want to do,.

Mr. Moyer stated this involves two issues. First, the CDD can provide security under our grant of authority in Chapter 190, Florida Statutes. Second, if we provide that under our grant of authority, we also take on the liability. If the CDD installs sirens and a siren does not work and there is damage, then we ultimately are involved in a lawsuit. I think personally the County should be involved.

Mr. Akey stated we met with Ted Stone and the new county manager, Michael Freiling. I asked whose umbrella that falls under, and County staff will let me know. The safety committee will meet with them again and I will advise the Board.

Mr. Quinn stated if a private organization wants to put security cameras on private property to monitor private property, that is fine. Once you are on public property, the rules change and I do not know the rules.

Mr. Moyer stated we will look at that.

Mr. Basque stated I agree with Mr. Moyer about letting the County take on the liability issues for emergency sirens.

Mr. Quinn stated if the decision is such that the community wants this, we need to make sure we do it right and the liability is placed where it does not impact the CDD.

Mr. LaRocka stated I appreciate the welcome to be here as liaison with the safety committee. I want to get these issues resolved, and I will work with the appropriate parties to get the information we need.

Mr. Moyer stated you will interface with me regarding information that goes to the Board and policy issues. You will work with Mr. Smith regarding how to implement Board policy.

Mr. Akey stated beginning tomorrow, Mr. Smith will receive the report from Osceola County that comes to Mr. LaRocka and Mr. Wellendorf each day. It will list the fire from the other day and other issues.

Ms. Nancy Mazzone stated I have been a resident of Celebration since 1997 and I live on Redbud Street. My main concern is asking the Board to waive the non-ad valorem assessments for 100% disabled veterans. I am requesting these be waived for all disabled veterans. I am not doing this for just me but all 100% disabled veterans in this community. I am proud to say that I am a veteran and I would be grateful if you are willing to waive these assessments. I present my request with humility and will await your decision.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Approval of Minutes of the May 16, 2007,
Regular Meeting**

Mr. Akey reviewed the minutes from the May 16, 2007, regular meeting and requested any additions, corrections or deletions.

Mr. Akey requested clarification on the discussion on page 5 regarding a guardrail.

Mr. Smith stated it is intended to be a guardrail for vehicles.

Mr. Quinn stated it will redirect anything that hits it back into the roadway.

Mr. Collins stated I want to make a comment regarding the vote on the Resolution for the connector issue. The motion says unanimous approval and I had questioned that. I was agreeing that there needed to be additional study done before we were willing to go along with or disagree with this issue. From that we discussed next steps to begin the study process. In my mind, we should have a degree of study done before it goes to the County. In the interim we will do additional study and we will come to a conclusion as to our decision. We will not have all the information but we will have more than we had at

the time in order to take a final position. That was my understanding of the Resolution and I do not know if that is how everyone else understands it.

Mr. Quinn stated that is my understanding and what we need to make an effective decision. If we are presented with or acquire the information that says this is a non issue, then it is a non issue. We do not have the information and all the information that has been public with the County and community deals with everything but the issue. It deals with Poinciana Boulevard, US 192, and I-4 but not roads we drive on every day. That is the missing piece. If we can get this data, that eliminating the connector roadway will not cause failure of the roads, I have no problem with TCC's request.

Mr. Collins stated before the County is at the point of making a decision, we will study this and get as much information as possible. Based on that we will bring this up for another vote.

Mr. Quinn stated in a story in the newspaper, they indicate that they have that data and were trying to figure out a way to make that public.

Mr. Moyer stated after the approval of the minutes, I will ask Dr. Leftwich to give a tutorial on traffic studies and what information is in the public record and what we can do.

Mr. Akey stated our County representatives want the same information that we do. They want to be sure 20 years from now they do not have the same situation they do on Neptune Road or Narcoossee Road.

Mr. Collins stated as long as we can bring this issue up again.

On MOTION by Mr. Quinn, seconded by Mr. Collins, with all in favor, approval was given to the minutes of the May 16, 2007 minutes.
--

Mr. Moyer requested the Board move up the traffic study and refunding analysis to before the Manager's report.

The Board agreed to hear the two presentations next. The discussions are included where listed on the agenda.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

District Manager's Report

A. Financial Statements

Mr. Moyer reviewed the financial statements as contained in the agenda, which are available in the District Office for public review during normal business hours.

B. Approval of invoices and check register

Mr. Moyer reviewed the check register and invoices as contained in the agenda, which are available in the District Office for public review during normal business hours.

On MOTION by Mr. Quinn, seconded by Mr. Collins, with all in favor, approval was given to the invoices as presented.

C. Celebration CDD website linking with Enterprise CDD website and the Front Porch

Mr. Moyer stated thanks to Mr. Quinn and his work on our website and in mentoring Ms. Wright, she put together a website for the Enterprise CDD (www.EnterpriseCDD.org) which has information including rates and policies. If we have alerts to get to community, such as a boil water notice, we can do that on the website. She talked to Mr. Crow and asked if we could link the Enterprise CDD website to the Celebration CDD website and vice versa, and he thought that was fine so we did that. If you have a utility question or want to look at any policies or Enterprise CDD minutes, they are now available. We want to thank Mr. Quinn for his efforts. It is not as fancy as yours but it serves the community.

Mr. Quinn stated it is up, the information is available and I am happy with it.

D. Field Operations

Mr. Smith reviewed the highlight report that is included in the agenda package and is available in the District Office for public review during normal business hours.

Mr. Smith reviewed fire hydrants and repainting the bonnets and side caps and distributed pictures of a sample painted hydrant. The Enterprise CDD Board, knowing this Board is made up of home owners, asked for your opinion on what you think the overall reaction from home owners will be. That matters to them. The second page describes the colors and we do not have low enough pressure to get down to Class A in order to make them all green. Chief McAvoy wants us to go with the colored caps. Mr. Moyer made a point at the Enterprise CDD meeting that all our hydrant pressures are over Class AA. In order for the fire department here to look and say one is higher or lower pressure, they will all be blue, so why can they not all be green.

Mr. Quinn asked is there an issue that when the fire truck pulls up, they have to make an immediate adjustment depending on the pressure in the hydrant? If it is higher than they expect, will it cause a problem?

Mr. Smith stated if it is high enough, you can go from the truck directly to the hose.

Mr. Quinn stated if pressure is such that you can draw the line off the hydrants, you save time. If the color of the cap says you have to run it through the pump, you lose time and it can mean loss of life or house. I would like to be accurate for the truck when it pulls up. They should make decisions on the house, not the hydrant.

Mr. Moyer stated if they all knew that in Celebration that we are AA hydrants, they will know they have the pressures that are necessary.

Mr. Quinn stated Station 72 will know but if there is a second call or Station 72 is out and someone else is called, they will not know.

Mr. Smith stated they are also tagged.

Mr. Collins asked can the tags be blue?

Mr. Smith stated they can be removed and the fire department wants a simple notification for fire personnel.

Mr. Collins asked is this a new issue? We have had this community for many years and now they want us to change what was agreed to. We have had these roads for a long time and now they go buy bigger trucks and they want us to change our roadways to accommodate their new trucks. This community was designed for a reason and with a concept. I have not noticed this issue throughout the County. It seems like we are being singled out

Mr. Akey stated I would like to talk with them again.

Mr. Smith stated in the last paragraph regarding private hydrants, we might be able to consider ours private hydrants on public street because we maintain them. The County does periodically check them and if one does not work, they let us know.

Mr. Moyer stated we need to identify what "private" means. It is not something they are spending general public County money for, so in that sense, can they be considered private. As Mr. Collins mentioned, it is in the development order where they approved the hydrants can be green. Why are they changing the rules 13 years later?

Mr. Sunnarborg stated we will battle some of these things forever. It is the nature of government and we have to pick and choose our battles. This one is not on my priority list to fight.

Mr. Moyer stated ultimately the Enterprise CDD will make the decision but they wanted your opinion.

Mr. Collins stated there is one in front of my house and I think the blue color is ugly. One of the big things about this town is aesthetics. We have green poles, green signs and we spent extra money on the concept of aesthetics in the community. The fire department is not listening to the community.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated I totally agree. There are other issues that I am passionate about that you may not be. I will support it if you want to talk with the County about this.

Mr. Smith stated it was the consensus of the Enterprise CDD Board to go back to Chief McAvoy. Our hydrants are all over Class A but we want to paint them all green.

Mr. Akey stated I have a meeting with him and I would like to revisit this issue.

Mr. Smith stated the Enterprise CDD Board will agree with you. Regarding the retaining wall landscaping in Artisan Park, I sent a letter to St. Joe regarding the plantings. I have not heard from them but I called Bill Gardiner. He went to his landscape architect to provide a price for hedges on top of the wall. He will take information to the Artisan Park construction meeting and this item is on their agenda for Friday. Then Mr. Gardiner will respond as to what they will do about the retaining walls. Regarding the fountain, I placed a call to Mr. Foster at the health department but I have not heard back. I have received no direction yet and we are waiting for their response.

Mr. Quinn stated I noticed some repair work on manhole covers throughout town.

Mr. Moyer stated there were 12 of them.

Mr. Smith stated it is an Enterprise CDD project. There was some infiltration in some of the manholes, so they repaired the base and asphalt around those manholes.

Mr. Akey asked is the work complete?

Mr. Parker stated yes.

Mr. Quinn asked are you aware of a problem on the Rosemary median in East Village and why no one is maintaining it? As plantings died, they replaced it with mulch. The residents were not happy with that.

Mr. Smith stated I will look into it.

Mr. Quinn stated at the entrance to North Village, originally the road was striped with a sign in the median saying to merge left, roadway ends. The striping is removed but the sign is still there. Which one is right?

Mr. Smith stated I need direction from the County.

Mr. Akey stated we had a meeting with the County Engineer and we took him to a number of locations, including this one, and we pointed it out to him. He did not like it either. He will have the sign pulled out and put the striping back in.

Mr. Quinn stated the Architectural Review Board wanted to know why they did that.

Mr. Akey stated they did it and I did not like it. The County Engineer will get it fixed. The striping did not come out well. I will be sending him a letter and he will get a follow up letter with all the action items on it.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney

Mr. Basque provided an update on the title search project, showing all parcels owned by the Celebration CDD. We are still working through that process. At this point I have been working with First American Title Insurance Company and have gathered the documents: 60 deeds covering 600 tracts, over 40 plats, well over 100 easements and related documents. I have all the documentation but have not gotten all the way through it. I met with Hanson Walter to coordinate color-coded maps and plats. They are working on a map for all these 600 tracts. That work is ongoing. I did bring information on a few tracts that have been discussed and are listed under Old Business.

B. Engineer

Mr. Hindle stated we have been assisting in the title work and maps with the attorney. We will provide an estimate of the time and cost for Board to consider before authorizing us to do the work. Celebration Unit 1 had three replats and there is some confusion across those plats. Some were dedicated to the Enterprise CDD and then to the Celebration CDD. We need to follow up on some plat work.

Mr. Hanson stated these are mostly roadway shoulder areas, color coded for open spaces and wetland tracts.

Mr. Hindle stated we need to check the title work against the color coding. A GIS technician will cross check this map to make sure information is correct.

Mr. Moyer asked does that make any sense? If that ends up being a big project, based on work Mr. Basque did, if someone calls and asks who owns tract 25, do we need to look at a map or just a book that Mr. Basque can provide?. If there is no tract 25 on our list, then we will know we do not own it. Are there alternatives to doing a map?

Mr. Hindle stated if it is to define ownership for inquiries or information, no, you can go to the County property appraiser for that information. If you are using it to see what

you own, then it makes sense to have an overall planning document. We prepared an estimate. To go through 400 plats, it will take 80 surveyor hours plus 120 hours of color coding and drafting, then checking back title work for an estimate of \$20,000 to \$25,000. It will be an estimated \$5,000 to \$6,000 to create maps for a total of about \$25,000 to \$30,000. I have asked my assistant to make a request at the County to get a map from there for about \$140.

Mr. Akey stated yes, we should get that map.

Mr. Hindle stated we will get copies made and bring them back. We will tell you what we have not verified, and you have greatly reduced your costs. We have already made the request at the County for that map.

Mr. Basque stated of the 600 tracts, the majority are ponds, shoulders, and miscellaneous small tracts. If you eliminate those and look at the upland tracts, it is a much lower number. Perhaps you want to delve into those more.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated all the comments are right so far. Let me provide some examples of what we might do with this map. It makes sense that we all know what the CDD owns. It does not have to be with a great degree of accuracy. There are other facilities that we need in the future, like a maintenance facility. Do we have any land we own where that might go? Some items on the agenda include where some of our land holdings can prevent activity by others that we might object to. Occasionally we have encroachment on our property that we have to deal with but we are not sure where the property line is. To have tools to answer questions like that is what we are looking for.

Mr. Hindle stated the GIS base map will provide that information, plus a copy of the plats. When you look at the plats, you will see a plat for Celebration Unit 1 and then a replat of Celebration Unit 1 and a third replat. They did not replat all of it and you need to know what you are looking for. We can provide copy of the plats. Mr. Smith has copies of these plats for maintenance issues. We can correlate our map from the property appraiser's office to Mr. Smith's copies. That will give you a legal document plus a planning document that should address many of your concerns.

The Board agreed.

Mr. Hindle stated Katherine Hattaway is processing the PD amendment that you are following. It was brought to the Technical Review Committee ("TRC") and pulled or tabled by the applicant. Ms. Hattaway has not submitted anything further. It will be on

the July 11 TRC agenda. If anything is submitted by the applicant, they will provide it to us.

Mr. Collins asked after July 11, where does it go and what is the timing?

Mr. Hindle stated if it is approved at TRC, then it goes to the Planning Commission, which is about three weeks later. It should go before the first Planning Commission meeting in August, and the Board of County Commissioners meets two weeks after that.

C. District Representative

Mr. Akey stated in the area on Celebration Boulevard where everything was cleaned out, it was still clean. On Celebration Boulevard at the construction site, some sections of the sidewalk were taken out. Is that permanent?

Mr. Parker stated no, the main purpose is to repair the sidewalk that was damaged by vehicles for construction. It will take a few days to repair.

Mr. Akey stated there are not as many builders in North Village anymore. On Eastlawn at the crosswalk, there is construction debris and you cannot get to the crosswalk. Dumpsters are full and debris is blowing around. Can you ask the builders to empty the dumpsters and get stuff off the sidewalks? Carlyle has the lift in use, sidewalks are not coned off and people walk underneath when they are working. Many residents do not look up when walking or biking on the sidewalks. They are dropping boards down from the lift. I would like to get some of that off the sidewalks. I would appreciate your assistance.

Mr. Parker stated I would be happy to do that. Regarding the builder in North Village, we discussed these issues with them Friday. Often pool builders will take things to any open site they find. I think that is the case in North Village. I asked them on lot 344 to get that mowed. I will address all of your concerns.

Mr. Akey stated we all realize that Carlyle is a construction site but we appreciate cleanliness, not trash and beer bottles.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Old Business

A. Status of The Celebration Company's NOPC for the interconnect property

Mr. Moyer stated this item is scheduled for TRC review July 11, as previously discussed.

B. Consideration to change Mulberry Street to one way near K-8 school, results from website comments

Mr. Moyer stated we did not receive very many comments regarding this issue. Most all were in support, some with conditions to change it back and forth, which makes no sense.

Mr. Akey stated the County will not approve that condition.

Mr. Moyer stated it is up to the Board how to proceed.

Ms. Wright stated on the website, we gave them until June 30 to provide comments.

Mr. Akey stated I will send an email to eight or ten people in that area to make sure they support changing it.

Mr. Quinn stated at least three of these five responses are in that area. A deadline of June 30 gives us time to talk to more Campus Street residents and get their input.

C. Consideration to transfer parks within Artisan Park from the CDD to the Owner's Association

Mr. Akey stated Mr. Quinn and I have each looked at these parks.

Mr. Quinn stated they look like they should be CROA parks, not CDD parks.

Mr. Akey stated I agree, or the appropriate association.

Mr. Quinn stated as the engineer pointed out, the CDD owns easements for utilities or along edges of roadways, not parks designed to be utilized by people.

Mr. Collins asked will they accept them?

Mr. Akey stated we need to ask them and give them our proposal.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated it looked like an anomaly to me. Thank you for looking at them. I wanted to be sure it was not just me. I am not recommending we take it on as a CDD park but it looks like an oversight with these parks being within the area of Artisan Park condominiums. I think the next step, if all the Supervisors are in agreement that these are not parks that the CDD owns or maintains, that the CDD ask the condominium association to take ownership of these parks consistent with other parks in the community. I suspect the answer will be that they do not want the additional costs but we have the responsibility to do that.

Mr. Akey stated I would like Mr. Moyer draft a letter to the Association.

D. Discussion of emergency sirens

Mr. Akey stated Seminole County has done studies on this item. Ms. Sacks had meeting with Ted Stone two months ago, prior to his departure from the County. The County has now put this item under another department. I asked the CEO where this falls

under and who we can coordinate with. I would like to see what the County will do and what they will do with the entire County, not just Celebration.

Mr. Quinn stated I agree wholeheartedly that this is a County issue. The liability issue we talked about earlier is my concern. If the County maintains them, and a warning goes off but the sirens do not work, it is their responsibility. If we own them and they do not work, it becomes our liability issue.

Mr. Akey stated I agree that we need to push it toward the County.

Mr. Quinn stated it is the right idea but not on our insurance policy.

Mr. Moyer stated emergency management is a County function. Nothing in our powers enables us to supersede the County.

Mr. Akey stated I will keep you posted on our discussions.

Mr. Quinn stated our County's emergency management team is really quite competent, and they are one of the best in the State.

E. Discussion to engage CNOA to address downtown parking issues

Mr. Quinn stated this is part of our ongoing discussion about the perception and/or reality of the amount of parking in the downtown area. One of the issues we discussed is there is a convenience factor on the main streets—Celebration Avenue, Front Street and portions of Mulberry Avenue—which we call the Market Street area. People are using that area because it is more convenient to park there and go to their Water Street condominium rather than park behind their unit. We have the ability to create a map and a process to encourage the flow of parking on public streets but if we do not do that in coordination with Lexin and CNOA, all we end up doing is forcing inconvenient parking into those areas, which exacerbates their problems. Whatever decisions are made on effective ways to utilize downtown parking need to not exacerbate any of the parties in the downtown area. The CNOA is the entity that owns Market Street, Front Street from Sycamore Street to Campus Street, and Bloom Street. The prime parking area is under CNOA control and we need to coordinate our efforts. There are signs that pop up in areas where someone wants to put up a sign that says you cannot do something (e.g., No Parking, No Skateboarding). These signs are nice looking but not enforceable because they are not according to County Code. We need to know who owns what piece of real estate. The sidewalk from Mulberry Avenue to Sycamore Street, is it Lexin, Celebration CDD or CNOA? If it is Lexin's sidewalk and they want to prohibit skateboards, that is fine. If it is ours, we need to make that decision. We need everyone to discuss this issue

Mr. Akey stated Gillian Walker called me after our last meeting. She is agreeable in discussing the issue. CNOA meets prior to the Celebration Joint Committee (CJC) meeting. I go to the CJC meeting so I will go to the CNOA meeting and ask for a representative from them and tell them what we want to accomplish, and then we can move forward. Sheriff's deputies said kids could not skateboard through town to Lakeside Park but we need to know who owns those sidewalks and who can make that determination. I will go to the CNOA group, who meets later this month.

Mr. Quinn stated Mr. Collins raised some points last month about putting signage in that tells people to park where we want them to park. We need to direct newcomers where to park and not direct them somewhere else. We need to coordinate all that.

Mr. Akey stated I will go to CNOA and also talk with Ms. Walker.

Mr. Quinn stated I am willing to represent this Board to sit in on that group.

Mr. Akey stated that sounds good to me.

F. Continued discussion of signage issues (slatted green signs, permission of other signs to be in CDD rights-of-way)

Mr. Sunnarborg stated this is an issue I raised a few times. In early June, I documented all the signs I have been talking about and sent the memo to Mr. Moyer. I would appreciate it you forward it to the other Board members. There are 21 signs in the CDD right-of-way, not in the downtown area. Those 21 signs can be grouped into three groups: (1) new home sale signs (there are three), (2) model home tripods, not permanent but constantly up (there are three), and (3) slatted vehicular directional signs (there are 14). I have the same issue with all of them. Why are they there? Who owns them? Who maintains them? How long are they going to be there? Who changes them when they no longer make sense? Who removes them? I will read part of the email I sent to Mr. Moyer. "I would very much like to know what documents allowed these signs to be placed in the CCDD right-of-way and what, if anything, the CCDD could do to have them removed if the Board of Supervisors was inclined to pursue that course of action." I want the questions answered first. If we find we want to change these messages, what can we do?

Mr. Basque stated one item in the email I sent today is documentation regarding tracts 1 and 2 in South Village Unit 6. It is designated as a roadway shoulder tract; the deed for all those roadway shoulder tracts subjects them to restrictions and easements on the applicable tracts. The plat notes and easements for South Village Unit 6 has the grantor as The Celebration Company ("TCC") and it is a broad reservation. When TCC deeded

these tracts, they reserved an easement subject to certain rights. For Easement 2 on page 13 of the email, the language reads "Corporation [TCC] reserves for itself, its successors and assigns, a private perpetual non-exclusive easement on, over and under Tracts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 30 for: road drainage; utilities; parking; the right, but not the obligation, to perform road maintenance; the right, but not the obligation, to pave and construct driveways and curb cuts subject to and in accordance with the rights of the Corporation as set forth in Plat Note B; access to the contiguous publicly dedicated portion of the rights-of-way dedicated by this plat via the driveways and curb cuts now or in the future constructed thereon in accordance with and subject to the rights of the Corporation as set forth in Plat Note B; the right, but not the obligation, to perform landscape maintenance and the right, but not the obligation, to install and maintain signage, lighting, decorative improvements including but not limited to fencing and entry features." I have seen several of these and there is a broad reservation to TCC for this right to install and maintain signage.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated it says "private perpetual non-exclusive easement" for these purposes. I understand this is legal but I object to this. Fifty years from now, when TCC is no longer here, they can conceivably come in and put any sign in our easement for any reason. They can assign that right and any company can come in and put a sign in our right-of-way. We should pursue asking them to remove that language.

Mr. Basque stated all these shoulder tracts are subject to plats and easements. The ones I looked at contained these restrictions, a reservation to TCC when these tracts were deeded. It is non-exclusive so they do not have an exclusive right to this easement. That language is contained in all these documents.

Mr. Quinn stated for Easement 8, they also grant "a private perpetual non-exclusive easement on, over under and through" et cetera to the Celebration Residential Owner's Association.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated I find the whole idea objectionable. It is a reasonable course of action that these rights they have should end when they are no longer the developer.

Mr. Quinn stated I agree 100%. I would like their rights to end sooner rather than later.

Mr. Collins stated I agree. I think we raise these issues with TCC to see their reaction. I cannot imagine they have any interest in holding on to this after they are gone. I think

we first ask TCC. I agree with the issues and concerns. We relay those and see what they say. I think Mr. Moyer can ask TCC on our behalf.

Mr. Moyer stated it will not be by the next meeting because Mr. Kelly is out of town for an extended period of time.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated there is no real urgency but something that got my attention. This is something that troubles me. They could sell their rights to someone else who will do something that the whole community finds reprehensible.

Mr. Moyer stated I will contact Mr. Kelly.

Mr. Hindle stated signage is a generic CDD issue throughout the State. Signage in those tracts still falls under Osceola County signage permits. They need to get permits for signs. If there are no permits, they are illegal signs. In three CDDs where we are the engineer, we worked with the attorney to develop a sign permit and sign ordinance where they place restriction on signs. Others can still place signs but you control where, when how and what they look like. They have to secure your release before they go to the County for their permit.

Mr. Moyer stated please provide that to me and this Board can consider implementing that.

Mr. Hindle stated it will give you some control of these signs.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated the conclusion of my memo to Mr. Moyer is once we get these answers, I think we need to change out some of the messages on the directional signs and we need more. There are some I suggested in my memo to Mr. Moyer. It is time to freshen the old ones, add new ones and take out ones we do not need anymore. Please forward my email to the other Supervisors.

Mr. Akey stated we have also talked about For Sale signs.

Mr. Smith stated we take them out when we see them.

Mr. Akey stated I called one guy and told him they could not be there and he said he would remove them.

G. Vehicular connection from the end of Celebration Avenue in Artisan Park to Celebration Boulevard, Tract 51

Mr. Moyer stated Mr. Sunnarborg wanted us to look into this issue. I asked Mr. Parker to identify what Pritzker's plans were, if the plans would allow for a roadway.

Mr. Parker stated Pritzker owns that property and we cannot answer for them. They have a plan that they presented six months ago or so, not a final plan. The property is for

sale. When it is sold, the buyers may use Pritzker's plan or come up with a different one. Your questions need to be directed to Pritzker. Whatever you are asking them to do will impact their project.

Mr. Quinn stated on that particular tract, my understanding is that TCC has overlay easements as far as what can and cannot go onto that tract. It is designated as open space on the plats.

Mr. Basque stated tract 51 is included in the email I sent. The deed for that tract is from St. Joe Residential Acquisitions, Inc to the Celebration CDD. For several tracts including tract 51, it includes the disclaimer I read into the record earlier, which includes the right to install signage.

Mr. Quinn asked if we want to put a road on that tract to connect Artisan Park with Celebration Boulevard to allow emergency access out for residents and access in for emergency vehicles, do we need approval from TCC, and St. Joe and Pritzker?

Mr. Basque stated unless St. Joe's rights are further assigned, that is reserved to St. Joe. It is a deed over to the CDD but with broad rights back to St. Joe.

Mr. Moyer asked can you condemn easement rights? Can we get those released?

Mr. Basque stated they can be vacated and also subject to condemnation, along with all other interests and property.

Mr. Quinn stated we should do that research to find out what the process would be.

Mr. Collins stated Aquila Reserve has same issue. If we address one issue, we may need to address others.

Mr. Quinn stated a second way can be provided out of there.

Mr. Smith stated there is property adjacent to it that can work, but we have to go through the process of building a road. There is a possibility of building a roadway out of Aquila Reserve.

Mr. Sunnarborg asked is tract 51 designated as open space?

Mr. Basque stated yes.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated there are so many restrictions on that parcel. Why do we own it at all since it is absolutely useless to the CDD? We should quit-claim deed it to TCC.

Mr. Collins asked do we maintain it?

Mr. Smith stated there is a pond and wetland buffer area. We do not spend much money except for occasional bush hogging and spraying cattails on the pond. They are very minimal costs.

Mr. Sunnarborg asked is it developable at all? Can we vacate all those restrictions and get a road through there?

Mr. Basque stated it is not an easy process. It is in a Reedy Creek Improvement District wetland and designated as open space. It would be very difficult to remove these restrictions.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated the existence of this tract gives people the hope that this road is possible. If it is not, then let us say it out loud and say it is not possible.

Mr. Quinn stated I agree.

Mr. Parker stated whether or not there are easements, Pritzker still owns the property at the other end.

Mr. Quinn stated Mr. Sunnarborg makes a good point. Everyone asks why there is no road. The only ones who can stand up and say why comes from this Board. If it is doable, then we need to know that. Then we move on.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated we need to document this. The first time we have a major storm event, this issue will come up and we need to say immediately it is not the CDD who will pursue this.

Mr. Quinn stated I want this into the public record.

Mr. Moyer stated the minutes for this meeting and the research material from Mr. Basque is as good as anything. We can call it a Study of Tract 51 Feasibility. I will do one-page summary of the Board's concern, the research done, and this verbatim discussion and the decision that there are too many restrictions prohibiting the building of a road.

H. Continued discussion of upland areas, Celebration CDD lands and other undeveloped parcels and the acquisition of these parcels (Salt Lick Island and Orange Grove Island)

Mr. Quinn stated these are on the map shown as relatively large wetland buffer areas. We researched the restrictions on these areas. They have South Florida Water Management District ("SFWMD") restrictions on these parcels. I want to pursue this to a logical conclusion based on the May 20, 2007, issue of the Orlando Sentinel. SFWMD agreed with Polk County to construct boat ramps and other things on wetland buffer areas

and to allow people access to those areas for moderate recreational use. If SFWMD has these restrictions, are they somewhat amenable to carefully considered conservative uses of those lands?

Mr. Moyer stated yes.

Mr. Quinn stated there is not much of Florida left and these are areas where we can put in nature trails and experience what Florida is and looks like. It is an immense benefit to the town to have and preserve those areas. We need to figure out the layers on these areas.

Mr. Moyer stated Mr. Walter gave a report to this Board some time ago and those kinds of uses are permitted through SFWMD. Mr. Basque can look at other reservations to see if there is any prohibition against doing that. If not, the Board can pursue that and go through the planning and construction process. I think we own it but it is subject to a lot of restrictions.

Mr. Hindle stated the SFWMD permit is not a big deal; it is an amendment to a permit. SFWMD handles that transaction. Permit modification is not a huge hurdle. There is also a Department of Environmental Protection (“DEP”) reservation or easement of conservation, which is more difficult to achieve. We need a formal release. It can be done but it is more difficult. Most buffers are mitigation for development. Florida Statutes allow SFWMD to administer DEP permits. It will take a pre-application meeting to determine what agency you permit through.

Mr. Quinn pointed out the tracts on the map. They are very interesting environmental areas that people need to be able to experience.

Mr. Basque requested a copy of that work to match up with the title work.

Mr. Hindle stated I suggest you ask Osceola County for grant money to be able to provide that type of recreational area.

I. Consideration of area(s) to be used for a permanent CDD maintenance facility

Mr. Moyer stated this item ties to the discussion of what we own and what we can use.

Mr. Basque stated in my email, there is tract 55, one of the upland tracts in South Village Unit 6. I met with Hanson Walter, and we went over upland tracts. This is 0.3 acres but does not have the same level of reservations and restrictions as the others. This is one example, depending on access, that could be free of restrictions. It is next to I-4.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated I suggest we table this until we get our information gathered.

Mr. Collins stated Mr. Smith indicated once that there was land Issa owns by the storage area.

Mr. Smith stated they are not interested at this time in doing anything with that property. Adjacent to it is Progress Energy's power easement and a gas line. Progress Energy has allowed us to put things on their easements as long as it is moveable.

Mr. Quinn stated at the end of Celebration Boulevard where it was cut to make a left turn to Island Village, we do not own those properties but various out-of-the-way wedges that I would not think are developable based on what is going in on Celebration Boulevard. Can we identify with TCC areas that are accessible to have a maintenance facility but not commercially viable as property?

Mr. Smith stated I am not sure if they are developable.

Mr. Moyer stated we will continue to look.

J. Discussion of CDD-owned lands, specifically whether or not the CDD owns any land that blocks a roadway for which CDD permission would be required for that road to be built

Mr. Akey asked is this in reference to the tracts at the end of Celebration Boulevard?

Mr. Basque stated yes. Tracts 1 and 2 in South Village Unit 6 have pie-shaped wedges and tract 2 is at the dead end of Celebration Boulevard. The CDD owns those tracts and has the deed for those tracts, with other shoulder tracts, subject to extensive reservations back, so it is not useful to build something to block anything because of the reservation of rights.

Mr. Quinn stated it is layers of superseding rights that go with the deeds. This started before Mr. Crow and I joined the Board. This was an area subject to an interlocal agreement between Enterprise CDD and Celebration CDD for construction management, then rescinded by this Board when we joined the Board

Mr. Moyer stated that included this property and the extension of property down to Four Seasons. You are correct; that has been rescinded.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

New Business

A. Review of traffic study

Dr. Leftwich stated we are doing a metro plan for the tri-County area (Orange, Osceola and Seminole) and a 2010 update. I have been in business in Osceola County for 20 years, done over 1,000 different traffic studies, studied large developments and cities,

and did the Osceola County 2004 model. We were asked to look at the roadways in the community if the connector was eliminated. We need more background information, including socio-economic information and what the community will look like in the future. The models are designed for reasonable impact. We also need to look at the parallel roadways. The results may turn out as the models show and I will let you know that. You need to know the different caveats. If they say it works, we need to check it out.

Mr. Quinn stated you said you need traffic data for those parcel roads to see the impacts. In all the studies I have seen, none of those numbers exist. They may exist somewhere but everything presented in the NOPC and Development of Regional Impact ("DRI") to the County is the classical regional impact traffic model. It talks about major roadways. Other than one small segment, Celebration Avenue from US 192 to 417, it does not have a single number about what happens inside the town

Dr. Leftwich stated a regional study will not show that. We can get TCC's traffic counts. If you have not taken traffic counts, the only numbers available will be from a consultant. My opinion is to find out what the numbers are. They may have done this with their model including their conclusion but you need more information.

Mr. Quinn stated there was a study done that shows moving the two-lane connector but in public when they talk about it, they refer to a four-lane connector. The impact of a two-lane connector raises at least one segment of internal roadways as critical but not a failure.

Dr. Leftwich stated critical is fine on some roadways but you do not want to build that in if you have an alternative solution.

Mr. Quinn stated traffic impacted by that segment of roadway has a tendency not to turn. Whatever happens on that segment happens on the entire length of the road. If we do not have data that shows that removing the two-lane connector, which is what is in the study showing that it will have no negative impact on the two main roads inside town, that is the concern I have.

Mr. Collins stated we agree that Celebration Avenue from US 192 to downtown is included in the studies. Celebration Place to Celebration Boulevard is shown. It indicates Celebration Boulevard to downtown but that should be Campus Street. I think they mislabeled the street. They covered all our major roads within the community. It is

correct to say they are not tracking Golfpark Drive but they are covering the major internal roads.

Dr. Leftwich stated we put a central connector in our models. You take neighborhoods and where they come in and out. Not all the streets will be on the model. You do cut lines to see where traffic comes from and to see how the models calibrate that area to see if something is missed with that parallel facility. There is nothing wrong with the information here but you may want to consider traffic counts on a biannual basis.

Mr. Collins stated it seems strange that the developer is the one who pays for the traffic study. That is why there are question in the community. The developer does not want to build the road so they will fudge the data to support their position. The County accepts their information. How can the residents or County have confidence that what is being done is accurate?

Dr. Leftwich stated I have worked on many DRIs. If we are working for a private interest, we do not want roads at over capacity because you cannot sell houses or commercial space. There need to be transit areas and different modes, such as pedestrian paths. Osceola County also can go back and check the counts.

Mr. Akey stated they can do their own study.

Dr. Leftwich stated they have a staff of consultants and they can do their own study.

Mr. Moyer stated the Department of Transportation (“DOT”) also reviews this as part of the NOPC.

Dr. Leftwich stated they will look at the relationship for their own roads.

Mr. Collins asked who looks after the interests for our residents?

Mr. Akey stated the County has someone who signs off on this for the County Commission. The engineering department can commission further study.

Dr. Leftwich stated they can request a consultant look at it in more detail. The calibration may not have had enough generation. I recommend you take traffic counts bi-annually or every three years if they do not change. You can take key intersections at the same time. You can calibrate your own model so you know where the traffic flows.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated maybe we can do a two-step process to get this information quicker. In a series of public meetings TCC has held with the community, they stated there is data about these internal roads that we are concerned about, including Golfpark Drive, Campus Street, and Celebration Avenue. Since it was not required by the NOPC,

those were not included but the data is somewhere. If that is true, can we have step 1 on your proposal to do an analysis of those impacts quickly and then a full blown analysis as step 2?

Dr. Leftwich stated yes, if the counts are available. I agree that I think they are available but you have to ask for them.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated all these different agencies have issues they are concerned about. What we are concerned about is not necessarily what happens in other places, such as US 192 or I-4 but we care about Golfpark Drive and what conclusions can be drawn quickly. That will impact our decision on standing or retracting our Resolution.

Dr. Leftwich stated they may have put the connector on the 545 model but you should check it out. We finished work for Westgate and there needs to be more capacity on US 192 for Disney which could have an impact on your roadways.

Mr. Sunnarborg asked what is the timeframe for your work?

Dr. Leftwich stated about 30 days. I need to find out exactly if the information is available. If counts are not included, then the information I have to analyze is not much.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated that should be fine depending when this issue comes before the Planning Commission or County Commission.

Mr. Collins stated it will go to TRC review in July. When will it first get to the Planning Commission?

Mr. Akey stated we can get the analysis after TRC meets, as long as it is before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Collins asked can you request another month's delay?

Dr. Leftwich stated yes, if we need to. If the data is available, I recommend taking your own data at key intersection and doing that on a bi-annual basis. The information may already be available.

Mr. Quinn stated the first step is to get TCC to release the data if it exists on internal roadways so Dr. Leftwich can review it.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated yes. Ask them to release it or if it is available, and then Dr. Leftwich can do a peer review.

Mr. Quinn stated Larry Walter said this at least twice that reviewing the external data will probably not come to any different conclusions. That data does not concern me but the internal data. Step 1 makes sense.

Mr. Collins asked can we have something at next meeting?

Dr. Leftwich stated yes, and I can bill by the hour in that case.

Mr. Moyer stated I can request that information from TCC.

On MOTION by Mr. Quinn, second by Mr. Sunnarborg, with all in favor, approval was given to proceed with step 1 as outlined on the proposal from Leftwich Consulting Engineers, billing at an hourly rate, and for Mr. Moyer to request updated internal roadway counts from The Celebration Company to provide to Dr. Leftwich.

B. Consideration of waiving non-ad valorem assessments for disabled military veterans

Mr. Moyer stated I think Ms. Mazzone is a wonderful woman and I would like the Board to be able to do this, but this is not an ad valorem tax where the governing board can do those types of things. These are benefit assessments to all property owners and it adds value to the property. It is not a public service but a value-added assessment. When you start to waive these, then someone else has to pick up that assessment. Someone will then come to you and say we cannot do that because they have to pay for it and do not receive any added benefit. I do not believe you have the ability to waive this kind of assessment.

Mr. Quinn stated there are two elements to the non-ad valorem assessment. One is the debt service on bonds. If you eliminate the debt for one person, everyone else picks that up. The other piece is the maintenance assessment. That varies depending on the village.

Ms. Wright stated the maintenance assessment is the same by product type for each village. The debt portion varies but generally is less in Celebration Village and increases as the villages were constructed.

Mr. Moyer stated the Presbyterian Church asked for waiver of their maintenance assessment. To the degree that maintenance is related to original construction, you cannot waive that fee. If it has nothing to do with infrastructure, we could waive it. The Board as a result ended up waiving mosquito control because it is not related to infrastructure but that amount is not very much.

Mr. Akey stated we will look at this next month after staff has had time to research the issue.

Mr. Quinn stated you said we could offer a reduction for maintenance items that are not related to infrastructure.

Mr. Moyer stated it would just be for mosquito control and it would not be very much. For the church, their entire maintenance assessment was around \$14,000 and with the reduction, it ended up being around \$12,000.

Mr. Woodville stated if the Board adopts a policy to exempt certain people from assessments, then the assessment methodology has to be reworked.

Mr. Moyer stated it is a pledged security. My advice to Board is based on experience with other CDDs that we cannot waive the assessments. I do not think we need to spend money on legal research.

C. Feasibility of refunding 1997 bonds

Ms. Zare stated we are proposing that the CDD place the cash reserve fund with the surety bond and for bond counsel to move forward at no cost to the District.

Mr. Draper stated the 1997A bonds had a cash funded debt service reserve fund of \$300,000 as a requirement of the bonds, which all municipal bonds are required to have. The bonds were insured by MBIA. Since the project was not developed at the time, there was a Walt Disney World reserve fund deficiency agreement to reimburse that reserve fund if drawn on to pay debt service. That deficiency guarantee is now gone and you can now use that \$300,000 for capital projects. There is a cost to MBIA to release those funds, which is 3.5% of the balance.

Ms. Zare stated there is a benefit to doing a surety bond rather than refinancing or refunding. If monies are released out of the refunding from the reserve fund, it can only be used for certain purposes. If we replace the reserve fund with the surety bond, there is a possibility of using those monies for other projects.

Mr. Draper stated the Manager asked us to look at refinancing the bonds to release the reserve fund but it did not make economic sense. This is an alternative to get to the same place that will not cost you anything but will free up this money. We do not get paid for this service. The only cost will be 3.5% of \$300,000 to the insurer.

Ms. Zare stated it will take 30 days to get a rating and insurance. We already have a verbal commitment from MBIA.

Mr. Quinn stated when we refunded the 1994 bonds in 2005, our bond rating was AAA.

Mr. Moyer stated we did the same thing in terms of insuring those bonds with MBIA and that had a AAA rated transaction. We saved about \$2.5 million. I was hopeful that we would be looking at a similar scenario with the 1997 bonds issued for North Village but because the interest rate on those bonds were lower than the 1994 bonds, when they looked at the numbers, it did not make any sense because we would end up in a worse position. As part of that analysis, the one place where we can free up money is the cash reserve that will be there until we pay off the bonds.

Mr. Collins asked will that be in 10 years?

Mr. Draper stated they mature in 2018.

Mr. Collins asked do they generate interest?

Mr. Draper stated yes.

Mr. Quinn stated on page 12 of the analysis is cost of issuance per thousand dollars and it comes out to \$150,000. What is that? Is that part of this process?

Mr. Draper stated no, it is part of the economic analysis that did not make and that is not the approach we are suggesting.

Ms. Zare stated refunding the bonds will accrue more costs.

Mr. Draper stated we are suggesting you not refund the bonds because it does not make sense but we provided the results anyway for you to see the numbers. We are suggesting you free up the reserves as an alternative.

Mr. Quinn stated the deficit reserve fund is \$321,485. When all is said and done, net of fees, what will the CDD get?

Mr. Draper stated \$321,485 less 3.5% of that amount, which is \$17,523 less any bond counsel fees. We will get bond counsel involved to be sure what we use the money for is appropriate. Bond counsel would not have a problem if you build new improvements but they will take issue using it for landscape maintenance.

Mr. Moyer stated we already addressed that as part of the 2005 bond issue. Total fees will be about \$25,000.

Ms. Zare stated a BBB rating is 4.5% of that amount.

Mr. Quinn stated it is a single payment insurance policy for that reserve fund.

Mr. Draper stated that is correct.

Mr. Collins stated it is the thing to do if you need the money. The money is there and when the bonds are paid off in 10 years, we get the money and pay no fees but earn

interest. If we have significant reserves, this money will added to that and earn interest. I do not think it makes sense to do if we do not need the money.

Mr. Moyer stated the fees will not exceed \$25,000. We talked about alleys in North Village. For Celebration Village and West Village, we have money from the 2005 refunding. It is not clear if we can use those 2005 funds for North Village alleys, and we do need to repave those alleys.

Mr. Quinn asked how much are the reserves in the North Village bond issue?

Ms. Zare stated for the 1997 bonds, there is \$541,000 in the revenue account and \$146,000 in 1997B construction funds.

Mr. Quinn stated that coincides with my memory that there is not much left.

Mr. Collins asked we cannot use 2005 refunding proceeds for the North Village alleys?

Mr. Moyer stated we can get a legal opinion but I am hesitant to do that. Some of those proceeds of the 1994 bonds were for master infrastructure for all of Celebration. There may be an argument that we can use some money for North Village and South Village. If someone objected to it, then we have to address how much went to North Village and South Village areas. The vast majority of the 1994 bonds were primarily for Celebration Village and West Village. The issue really needs to be looked at by Mike Williams as bond counsel. Since we are not trying to target interest rates and get into the market to refinance bonds, it is not a time-sensitive transaction but an opportunity. Prager Sealy is doing this as a favor to us and they are not getting paid for this work they are doing.

Mr. Collins asked what is the cost to do this and do we have an issue with using 2005 refunding money for North Village?

Mr. Moyer stated we will look into that.

Mr. Draper stated it is 3.5% of \$321,000 to the surety and \$8,000 to the rating agency to rate the bonds, which comes out to approximately \$25,000 as Mr. Moyer mentioned earlier.

D. Discussion of budget workshop date

After a brief discussion, the Board came to a consensus to hold the budget workshop on Wednesday, July 18, 2007, at 4:00 p.m. at Town Hall. Mr. Sunnarborg will be attending by phone.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Items for Future Agendas

Mr. Quinn stated I would like for us to consider adding a section of sidewalk between Celebration Boulevard in North Village and Water Tower Place on the east side of Celebration Avenue. We also need to get something back from the traffic engineer that says they either fixed the timing of the lights to the satisfaction of the safety committee or we need to revisit the issue.

Mr. Akey I will provide copy of the report that the engineer provided. He had a couple suggestions.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated I received a call from a resident requesting that we add a sidewalk between the condominiums in Artisan Park and the path that already exists to the high school. I request Mr. Moyer and Mr. Smith look into this issue. Next month perhaps we can review a conceptual plan and determine if it is a good idea and how we can pay for it.

Mr. Quinn stated I also wondered why it is not there.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor Requests and Comments

Mr. Akey asked are we painting the crosswalks in the alleys?

Mr. Smith stated yes. One is done and we are closing out a punch list with APAC. We are happy with the product. We will finish getting the rest painted.

Mr. Akey stated the crosswalks on Oak Shadows were not done and there are others. The Montessori school is not done. Those are ones the County is doing and I pointed those out to them.

Mr. Quinn stated on Greenbrier Avenue at Jasmine Street by the K-8 school, where the house on the corner is getting larger, a construction dumpster took out the light pole. They should be ready to put that back in.

Mr. Akey stated the engineer drove through Artisan Park and identified places where streets were one way and you do not know where it becomes two way. That item is on the engineer's list.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated I appreciate you letting me participate by phone. I am on a work-related assignment and it will continue for at least another month.

Mr. LaRocka asked where can I get a report on damage and vandalism that occurs on property?

Mr. Akey stated work with Mr. Smith.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

On MOTION by Mr. Quinn, seconded by Mr. Sunnarborg,
with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Paul Collins, Secretary

Cliff Akey, Vice Chairman