

# MINUTES OF MEETING CELEBRATION COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Celebration Community Development District was held Wednesday, November 14, 2007, at 7:00 p.m. at 851 Celebration Avenue, Celebration, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Pete Crow	Chairman
Cliff Akey	Vice Chairman
Paul Collins	Secretary
Richard Quinn	Supervisor
Tom Sunnarborg	Supervisor

Also present were:

Gary Moyer	Manager: Moyer Management Group
Jan Carpenter	Attorney: Shuffield, Lowman & Wilson
Mark Vincutonis	Engineer: Hanson Walter
John LaRocka	Safety Committee
Brian Smith	Severn Trent Services
Several residents and members of the public	

## FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

### Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Crow 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. Glenn Glover asked is there a schedule for trimming the trees? I do not know if it is the right time of year or not, but I have noticed that a lot of the trees are looking pretty ragged. They hang low over the sidewalks.

Mr. Akey stated I had that same conversation with Mr. Smith a few weeks ago and we will put together a schedule.

Mr. Smith stated we do have a schedule pursuant to the landscaping contract, but there are a lot of smaller trees that do not need to be pruned. We do a site-wide pruning on a regular rotation and we do have them go to the worse areas. We are a little behind on the pruning and Davey is well aware of that. They are going to work as hard as they can to get caught up to the schedule. They are out on a regular basis doing tree pruning.

Mr. Akey asked would you provide a weekly schedule of where they anticipate being? I would like that posted on the website. Let us pay particular attention to the trees that are blocking the stop signs.

A Resident stated I live in Artisan Park. I know this item is later on the agenda but I think there is some confusion about your position on the interconnect.

Mr. Crow stated we will discuss this under item 8A and clarify our position at that time.

Mr. Garry Stephens stated personally I want to thank Mr. Crow for attending the Planning Commission meeting and for presenting the position of the Celebration CDD that has been presented to our community. There have been some accusations that Mr. Crow did not present the position of this Board in a correct or proper manner and I want to make sure this Board discusses that and clarifies your position.

#### **FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Approval of Minutes of the October 10, 2007, Regular Meeting**

Mr. Crow reviewed the minutes from the October 10, 2007, regular meeting and requested any additions, corrections or deletions.

On MOTION by Mr. Quinn, seconded by Mr. Akey, approval was given to the minutes from the October 10, 2007, regular meeting.
---

#### **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.

Mr. Collins stated these statements reflect the unaudited financials as of the fiscal year end. It shows that there is a surplus of \$195,203 that we will be adding to our reserves. I want to thank you for doing a great job this year of managing our revenues and expenses. Given that we had about \$200,000 in storm damage, it is great that we have another \$200,000 to add to our reserves. It was a very good year.

Mr. Moyer stated when we prepared our budget last year, there was some concern about right-of-way fees and we budgeted them very conservatively for next year. We budgeted \$650,000 and it was gratifying that we actually collected \$685,000.

Mr. Quinn stated I want to echo Mr. Collins's comments. Given that costs for everything goes up and we have to set these budgets a year in advance, I think it is a credit to the management for the District.

**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.

Mr. Quinn asked when an entity petitions the District for use of the District's resources and as a result, it causes the District to have to engage the services of legal counsel, why are we paying that bill for those services? I am looking at the invoice for Shuffield Lowman and the issues related to the paddleboats.

Mr. Moyer stated anyone who appears before this Board should pay those charges but the invoice comes to the District because we do not want our consultants working at the request of the public; that creates a conflict of interest. Once this invoice is approved and paid, we will collect the money from the paddleboat folks.

Mr. Quinn stated I want to make sure we are in agreement as to the process

Ms. Carpenter stated if it is something minor, like this one, we will include it in general matters. If it is a major issue, we will setup a separate billing file so that it is all segregated from other legal matters.

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

**C. Consideration of Resolution 2008-01 amending the general fund budget for fiscal year 2007**

Mr. Moyer stated governments in the State of Florida are granted 60 days after the end of the fiscal year to go back and true-up the expenditures that were made against the line items that were originally budgeted over a year ago. If you do not go through this process, when the District is audited, the auditors will point out that we exceeded several line items and identify the dollar amounts. I spent many years of my professional career arguing with the auditors and the Auditor General of the State. When you do all of that, if someone looks at the year-end statements, it looks like we spent everything exactly according to the budget, and it really does not help the residents and the public understand the things that we went through during the year. We go through the year and give an explanation of why the budgeted amounts change. However, we do follow the

rules of the Auditor General and that is why we are asking the Board to approve these budget amendments to make the audit a smoother process. Hoyman Dobson did send us an engagement letter related to performing the audit for fiscal year 2007, and they indicated they will charge the same fees as they did for the fiscal year 2006 audit. We are targeting the completion of the audit to be much earlier than last year.

Mr. Woodville stated this is the third year of our three-year engagement with this firm, with an option for renewal.

Mr. Quinn stated once the audit is complete, then we can have an agenda item to discuss how to proceed with future audits.

Mr. Moyer reviewed Resolution 2008-01 amending the general fund budget for fiscal year 2007. The major categories are relatively the same although there are individual line items that went up and down. For administrative expenses, we budgeted \$413,000 and we only spent \$381,000, which is a positive variance. In total field expenses, we budgeted \$1,987,000 and spent \$2 million. All things taken into consideration, we ended right on budget in all the categories but there are those fluctuations within the major categories.

Mr. Quinn stated those items that fall under the category of routine maintenance—street lighting, signage—those are where we seem to go over budget. I think it is simply a matter of the age of the infrastructure. When we prepare the budget for next year, we should look at those line items that were under budgeted this year.

On MOTION by Mr. Quinn, seconded by Mr. Akey, with all in favor, approval was given to Resolution 2008-01 amending the general fund budget for fiscal year 2007.
--

#### **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 stated we also included a schedule of the tree replacement and they are slightly ahead of schedule. We expect to have all trees installed by the first of the year.

Mr. Quinn asked how bad was the pond fish kills?

Mr. Smith stated there were four ponds with fish kills. Because of the time of year and the overcast weather along with the cooler temperatures, the ponds turn over and all the stagnant water from the bottom comes to the top. We go through this every year. That causes the low oxygen levels to kill the fish. We got out there and had Davey clean them

up. They were four small ponds and it was not a major fish kill like we had in Town Center. It is normally the bigger fish that die, and when they get to be that size, they quit eating and become useless. We lost some fish in two golf course ponds, one pond just before you get to Roseville Corner and one pond at the end of Spring Park Loop.

Mr. Quinn asked are the two ponds between the golf course and Golfpark Drive the CDD's ponds?

Mr. Smith stated yes. Those were conveyed to the CDD about four years ago, before the sale of the golf course.

Mr. Quinn stated a resident wanted to know about ponds and whether or not we stock the ponds.

Mr. Smith stated we have not had to in some time. They pretty much stock themselves and they are pretty healthy fish.

Mr. Collins stated a lot of the storm replacement trees still have the guy wires holding them up. Can we remove those?

Mr. Smith stated yes. We left some of the wooden ones up through the hurricane season but we are going to remove them.

Mr. Collins stated there are some on Longmeadow that are not wood. They have been there for a couple storm seasons and are breaking off.

Mr. Smith stated Davey has been told to remove any that are hanging or that are not useful anymore. We did leave a couple wooden ones on but we will start removing them.

Mr. Sunnarborg asked what is the status of the repair of the weir behind Jasmine?

Mr. Smith stated the attorney is working on the agreement. I have the drawings and specifications from Hanson Walter as well as all the material. Once we receive the agreement, we will solicit for bids. I anticipate the work starting in January or February. My goal is to have the bids received in time for the January Board meeting but it might be February. Work will start shortly after that.

Mr. Smith stated regarding removal of the ducks, we removed 28 ducks. There are still about six that we will be removing hopefully by the end of the week. I have seen some wood ducks and we are trying to get them to move down to Town Center Lake. We have started work on the fountain and it will be closed until Friday. We will have it operational for the weekend but we may have to close it down during the week for a

couple days. Our goal is to have it running over the holiday weekend. We will resume any further work after the holiday.

Mr. Quinn asked where do we stand on the restroom facilities?

Mr. Smith stated we have an agreement with Kilwin's. When the work is done on the fountain, we will go back to the health department and ask them to come out and look at everything in the field and the paperwork. We will have to put up signage directing people to use the facilities at Kilwin's. Once all that is done, we should be fine going forward in getting it registered, and then we will need to treat it like a swimming pool. I asked one of our utility contractors to get a certified pool operators license so that he can check the pumps and all the utilities for the system and perform a daily test. I am also going to get a pool company to come in three times a week to perform checks until we get the experience to maintain it going forward.

Mr. Smith stated plants have been installed on the retaining wall in Artisan Park, which is a row of hollies.

Mr. Akey asked what is the status of the painter and mason?

Mr. Smith stated we hired the mason but had to let him go. I also had a painter lined up but that fell through. I have two good prospects, one I am meeting with on Monday and one after the holidays.

Mr. Akey asked is this painter going to paint the fire hydrants for Enterprise CDD?

Mr. Smith stated yes.

Mr. Akey asked what about the poles for street signage?

Mr. Smith stated we have all the poles but we do not have all the brackets. We need a certain kind of bracket to mount the County signs to the poles.

Mr. Sunnarborg asked what about the fire behind the lake?

Mr. Smith stated after the fireworks were over, I met with the fire department out there. We did monitor it over the weekend. It was not on our property but in the wetland, about 150 yards behind the sidewalk, just outside the RCID property line. We got the fire out on Monday. It was caused by a dead cypress tree that fell over and was smoldering.

## **SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Staff Reports**

#### **A. Attorney**

There being no report, the next item of business followed.

#### **B. Engineer**

Mr. Vincutonis stated Mr. Larry Walter and Mr. Shawn Hindle had a meeting yesterday with the County regarding making Mulberry Street one-way in front of the school. Mr. Hindle has since revised the plans for the County and we are trying to get it approved as quickly as we can. Regarding Acadia, we had some meetings with RCID and they seemed to be positive about changing the underdrains. They want to see some more plans and details and we will have another follow-up meeting with them. Regarding the rest of the roadways being accepted by the County, we are expecting this item to be on the County Commission's agenda on Monday.

Mr. Crow stated the problem we have had in the Acacias is with the roads. Do I understand that the ponds are draining under the roadways?

Mr. Vincutonis stated the underdrains help take water away from the roadway base to the pond. One of the ponds is actually three feet higher than another nearby pond, and we do not know why it was designed that way. We are looking to take the underdrains to another pond that is two to three feet lower.

Mr. Crow asked is this the final stretch of road that we have a problem with in that area that has now been accepted by the County?

Mr. Vincutonis stated yes.

### **C. District Representative**

Mr. Parker stated regarding cell phone providers in the community, Verizon is in the hotel. T-Mobile has been approved for the Bank of America building for some time and it is now in their court to build according to the approved plan. Recently Cingular/AT&T has submitted something for the hotel downtown.

Mr. Quinn stated downtown is not the area that needs coverage. It is Artisan Park, South Village and the areas that are more remote.

Mr. Parker stated the north end of the community is covered by U.S. 192 cell towers. The carrier in downtown will help the south end of the community. The plans that Cingular/AT&T showed us will be a big improvement for the south side.

Mr. Quinn stated where the monorail stops at Disney, there is a very well disguised cell tower probably not more than 100 yards from the Grand Floridian. At some point we need to consider those kinds of alternatives. It comes down to if the tower structures in the downtown area are not sufficient to deal with South Village and Artisan Park, then I think we need to seriously begin to discuss taking those steps. It is ridiculous to have to walk out to your front porch to be able to get cell phone reception in South Village. If

camouflaged trees are good enough for the most expensive hotel on Disney property, then it should not be an aesthetic problem in our community.

Mr. Parker stated as we build out on Celebration Boulevard, we offer to all carriers the ability to meet with the owners of the various buildings where they can get the height they want for their towers. The cell phone companies are the ones who tend to back away from that kind of arrangement for their own personal reasons.

**D. Safety Committee**

Mr. LaRocka stated we appreciate Mr. Smith installing all the No Parking signs along Golfpark Drive for Halloween. It was a big help and there was not a lot of parking on the grass. The goal was to keep gridlock at a minimum or non-existent. Every place within the community was fine except for Celebration Village. The goal for next year is to deal with that area specifically and there are two main plans. One is to limit the three main arteries in to Celebration residents and bus non-resident traffic in and out. Option two is to direct traffic to Waterside Drive. When that becomes saturated, then we direct traffic to Campus Street, and when that becomes saturated, direct traffic to Celebration Avenue. That plan that I envisioned was for traffic to go down Golfpark Drive and Campus Street but that did not happen. We wanted to flow the traffic in a certain pattern but all we did was park it in our lots or our streets. There were 1,100 trick-or-treaters at some houses by 8:00 p.m.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**New Business**

**A. Comments from the Chairman regarding the CROA workshop held October 1, 2007**

**B. Consideration of proposed letter to the community regarding the CROA workshop held October 1, 2007**

Mr. Crow stated I met with the Chairman for CROA regarding certain comments that were made at their workshop. I was able to eventually see the tape of the meeting and I was able to pick out several items worthy of note. I asked that my memo be distributed to each of you prior to the meeting. This is a memo of my conversation with Ms. Eissinmann. Is there anything this Board wants to do with this matter? Do we want to go further with it?

Mr. Quinn stated in watching the CROA Board meeting that happened after you had an opportunity to meet with Ms. Eissinmann, I thought she was not only conciliatory toward the District but I thought she was attempting to do exactly what we wanted her to do, which was to make amends for what happened. Based on that, my personal opinion is

that we probably have taken this as far as we need to. Regardless of what anyone personally feels about what happened, we need to have a good relationship with CROA. We need to put it behind us and simply move forward.

Mr. Crow stated I have not seen that meeting but I have heard comments similar to your take on the meeting.

Mr. Akey stated I saw the meeting and I do not see any further action needed on this issue.

Mr. Collins stated I have a different perspective. For two hours, they throw out comments about our Board, about Severn Trent, about things that have happened. They question our reserves without any communication with us. They question our dealing with Severn Trent and their contract as well as with Gary Moyer. They throw out these comments and the community hears it. The community has these questions. Then CROA says at another meeting the opposite, "never mind, they are really good." That does not mean that people are still going to be thinking about what is going on with the reserves and what happened. While I agree that there is no need to antagonize or further split things with the CROA Board since we need to work with them on a number of things, but I think we need to set the record straight. We need to answer in a very matter-of-fact way some of these questions that were thrown out there and have been left unanswered. For instance, what is going on with the reserves? They did not press that issue at the CROA meeting. I think we have a responsibility to the community to reassure them if things are fine and if they are not, then we can tell them what we are working on. My concern is there are a lot of unanswered questions and we need to clear the air. I think my letter does that in a way that should not antagonize the CROA Board but sets the record straight on a few things. I think we can do both. I certainly do not want to get into a fight with them.

Mr. Crow asked would you like to send that letter to the CROA Board?

Mr. Collins stated it does not matter if it goes to the CROA Board. I care about the community. They have heard things about the CDD and how it has operated for 11 years but they have not heard our perspective as a Board as to whether or not Severn Trent has done a good job or not or whether or not Gary Moyer has done a good job. Then they said they did not really mean that and they are doing a good job. If I am a member of the public, I still have a lot of questions.

Mr. Crow asked how should we disseminate this letter? Put it on the Front Porch? Give it to the media?

Mr. Collins stated I would like it put on the Front Porch to clear up any questions that might have arisen from the interview CROA had with Severn Trent. I do not think it is an antagonistic letter. It is meant to clarify or clear up any concerns that the community may have. A lot of people do not know about the CDD and one reason is that it has not been resident controlled until recently. I think when it is developer controlled, people think the meetings are very short and they do not look to the CDD to be a resource. If nothing else, this letter is a way to inform people of what the CDD does, why it is important, the good things it is doing, and the things we are working on. It will let us get the word out there that there is a CDD and let them know they have community representatives on the Board to bring your questions and concerns to, who are going to be responsive. I do not see this as just clearing the air but also as a way to inform people about the CDD. If people have problems, we want to resolve them. We want them to have confidence in the CDD that we are here to work for them.

Mr. Akey stated if we had problems that we did not resolve, we would sure hear about them. I have been out in the community many times since this meeting and many people have come to me to compliment the CDD Board and the actions we take. I do not think the community is that unaware of the CDD's responsibilities. I think in the past four years, we have had three elections for CDD Board members. We campaigned and put ads in the newspapers. There were very well-qualified candidates, and that speaks very well of this Board.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated I have seen the replays and I have talked with a couple of the CROA members whom I know well enough personally to talk candidly with, and I gave them my opinion. The summary is that I thought they were out of line. I was disappointed with the way they behaved and I told them so, and I got over it. I have no interest in extending this into an argument that persists. I am ready to set it aside and move on. I think Mr. Crow fulfilled the mission that you were sent on. You did what the Board asked you to do. You documented it. It is on our record. We can only control the way that we behave. If others take a different track, that is their issue. I think we should put this behind us.

Mr. Crow stated I will ask a question of Mr. Moyer and Mr. Smith because you were treated grossly unfairly at that October 1 meeting. We have raised this issue with CROA. I think it is appropriate to ask you on behalf of our staff on how you would like for us to proceed at this point.

Mr. Moyer stated Mr. Smith and I and Severn Trent very much appreciate the support that we received from this Board. It is encouraging and I think you all are aware that our staff works very hard to make Celebration as good as it can be. We take our responsibility seriously. I somewhat agree with Mr. Sunnarborg. It angers you when you first see it but you need to get over it. I think the relationship between this Board and CROA is important going forward. On Severn Trent's behalf, they submitted a proposal that they thought was in the best interest of the community, given the fact that CCMC indicated that they were not going to submit a proposal. When that changed, we were too far down the line to withdraw the proposal. We have no animosity whatsoever against anyone on the CROA Board. I think we are all fine.

Mr. Akey stated I also met with some of the CROA Board members and expressed my displeasure over this interview.

Mr. Crow stated I did as well and I received what passes for an apology from someone the other day who was probably one of the principal offenders. Although I will say he seemed to take it back a day or two later when we were not surrounded by other people. I find what Mr. Collins said very compelling. They did repeat this over and over, night and day for many weeks. I come down to the need to not stir up the issue any further because I think we need to work with them. I also feel that the perception of the people in the community who watched this led them to "consider the source." While many of the details were factually incorrect, I am not sure that much rubbed off on us once we said what we had to say. I think the message has been heard on the other side and I do not think Ms. Eissinmann missed the message when I met with her. I sensed that others felt some embarrassment over what happened that evening. Is it the desire that we move on?

The Board responded unanimously yes.

Mr. Moyer stated there are confrontational ways of doing things and there are positive ways of doing things. I am concerned when anyone attacks the CDD or you Board members. Maybe the way to approach this, if you want to consider this over the next

month, is to do a very positive communication piece by this District that we send to the residents, not taking specifics of someone said something and we disagree, but in terms of reserves, this District is in better shape with respect to the reserves and financial position than any District I am aware of in the State of Florida. Maybe we ought to tell that story. We ought to remind people that it was Mr. Smith and his staff at 11:00 p.m. who came out after Hurricane Charley to move trees lying in the middle of the street. There are a lot of good stories to tell about what we do as a District and what you gentlemen do in terms of setting policy. Maybe we need to do a better public relations job than we have in the past.

Mr. Akey stated that is a good point.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated I think that is an excellent idea. We have never had to proactively pat ourselves on the back because we have never been attacked. I am not proposing that we do not defend ourselves if we are attacked unjustly. I just do not want to pick a fight unnecessarily. I also do not want to get into a Front Porch argument. There is no good outcome and no good upside from engaging in an argument. On the other hand, we do have our own tool and our own forum. I do not like going into someone else's arena to make a point about something. If you are going to make a point, at least do it in your own way with your own message. We have our own website. It does not have to be an answer to CROA. It can be a forum where we identify the questions and provide our answers.

Mr. Quinn stated I agree with that. A lot of the content in the letter from Mr. Collins is the basis for a lot of positive discussion about what the District has done, not just over the past three years but over the past 11 years.

Mr. Crow asked is it acceptable to note where this letter came from if we post it on the website? It was a very good letter and we appreciate it.

Mr. Quinn stated in the body of that letter, there are at least eight to 12 good solid talking points that can go out on the District's website. There is a way to positively communicate that information that takes it to a level that is the appropriate level to take it to, which is professional: this is what we do, this is where you go with certain questions.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated it is 101 little things. It is Mr. Smith going out and putting out that fire that was not even on our property. Someone had to do it and we went ahead and did it. On the other hand, I think the CDD has always taken a humble servant's approach.

I would not advocate changing that. I would not go to the other extreme. I suggest listing points on our website indicating what we do, not point, counterpoint from that interview.

Mr. Crow stated in reality this affords us an opportunity. They raised certain issues about our reserves and other things. We do not have to say who raised the issue. All we have to do is address them. I believe that our relationship in terms of the professionalism that you all have demonstrated on this Board is pretty well set in the mind of the Celebration residents. We are moving into the holiday season. I think Mr. Collins's letter provides a basis for communicating that information. Do we want to work on this after the first of the year?

Mr. Quinn stated I would like staff to work on this and have them come up with an effective way to communicate the goals and objectives of the District, and we can look at that in the new year.

Mr. Moyer stated there is no urgency with this. We will prepare something and distribute it to all of you before it is posted on the website. You can review it and add to it and come up with a decision of what to post.

Mr. Crow stated we have discussed having another joint workshop with CROA. I think if we were to do a mobile workshop and invite CROA and others along in the spring, we will have an opportunity to reach out to them but we will not be in the nexus of where we just had these issues with them and all of a sudden, we invite them to meet with us. I find that uncomfortable. With regard to the proposed joint CDD/CROA workshop, what does this Board think?

Mr. Quinn stated I think doing a drive around is fine as an event, but there are substantive areas where the two Boards need to sit down in a forum and discuss them. One of the questions that came up after the last CROA Board campaign was the use of synergies. One issue is always who does what. We started that at the last workshop. We had 18 items on the agenda and we basically got through two of them. Those other 16 have not gone away; they are still there and they are items where there needs to be substantive discussion between the two Boards on how to make those things function right. I just do not think that driving around in a bus looking at ponds affords us the opportunity to have those discussions. I think they are both part of the process. I agree with doing a drive through annually because this community changes. But I think we also

need to sit in a more formal environment with an agenda and a plan of action so that we can begin to effect the synergies in governance that this community expects and deserves.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated I agree. I also think the drive-through, as good as it was last time, will be even better now that we have this property map. It will be especially helpful for the new CROA Board members to have a visual out the window and a visual in their hand of who owns what and who is responsible for what. I think that would be very efficient. I agree that we left a lot of unfinished business after the last meeting. None is urgent but we certainly should get it on the calendar and do it as soon as we can. That does not mean over the holidays but as soon as practical.

Mr. Akey stated I agree.

Mr. Collins stated I think a drive-through is constructive and we learned a lot. I thought the meeting was very tense and I did not get anything out of the meeting. I think we would need to structure the meeting differently. It should be specific as to something we are working on, or more project oriented. We do deal with issues as they come up, for instance, the maintenance facility. We realize there are issues that affect both CROA and the CDD but we deal with them. As we see issues that affect more than one organization, we do get together and work together effectively and I think that is the test.

Mr. Crow asked should we initiate the meeting, assuming we will have the drive-through?

Mr. Akey stated yes.

Mr. Quinn stated I think we also ought to provide a list of key items that we think should be on the agenda for discussion.

Mr. Crow asked should we include that in our invitation?

Mr. Quinn stated to the extent that we can identify the key areas that we want to discuss, we can list them. We have the agenda from the last meeting and we had some spirited debate on both sides of the room. I agree with Mr. Collins to a large extent. It took a long time to get to the place where we could do anything, and we spent an hour describing to each other who we were. I do not think we need to do that again. I think we can quickly get to the items of substance and it is up to us to identify those areas of substance that we believe need to be discussed and dealt with.

Mr. Crow stated I will ask Mr. Moyer to provide our last agenda for the joint meeting for us to discuss at our December meeting. We can also advise staff of any issues that are

occurring. I would like Mr. Moyer to forward that agenda to us as soon as possible so that we can be looking at it and we can respond in the meantime. We should be in a good position at the next meeting to firm up the items that we think should be discussed. Then we can issue an invitation for February or March or perhaps the end of January. Is there a preference to having the meeting before the mobile drive-through? Do we want to do both?

Mr. Quinn stated yes, but they do not need to be done simultaneously. We tried to do that last time and it did not work well. We can do the drive-through at our Board's convenience. We are doing it and we can invite whomever is available to come.

Mr. Crow stated we will discuss this issue at our December meeting and decide when to put it on the calendar, but it is our intent to do both a meeting and a drive-through.

Mr. Collins stated I enjoyed learning about the lift station so be sure to include that on the drive-through.

#### **EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Old Business**

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

Mr. Crow stated as we look at this issue, it will now be decided, one way or another, in a matter of weeks on December 10. I think we need to be very clear on what we want. If we want the right-of-way to be preserved, I think we need to so state that. If we want the right-of-way preserved and we want The Celebration Company (TCC) to come back and discuss property that has not been developed, I think we need to say that. If we want to completely withdraw our objections, we need to say that. If we want to leave in place the conditional withdrawal of our objection, which is where we were after our September meeting, then I think we need to reaffirm that. I will say very clearly, as we are all honorable gentlemen, that I adhered as closely and as truly to what I felt was the majority will of this Board. I think our documents supported that. To summarize for the benefit of the public, TCC filed an application in March or April and they are seeking to take a section of road, approximately 34 acres, of right-of-way in Celebration and to remove it from the various documents where it is shown as a right-of-way and to use it for other purposes. They have renamed this area the civic corridor. At the Planning Commission meeting, TCC had no formal agreements or oral agreements on establishing a church or any of the other uses for this area. If the application is granted, then TCC is in a position to invite whatever civic uses they want.

Mr. Collins stated I have heard from many people at the Planning Commission meeting, and they were stunned. They were really mad at this Board because everything that was said reflected upon this Board. What Mr. Crow said, from what we discussed and decided on and the intent of what we said, were 180 degrees apart. What Mr. Crow said in no way reflects in my mind what we discussed and decided. I thought our decision was to have Mr. Moyer write a letter and represent the board and send a letter indicating our views. He did that. While I am not in 100% agreement, Mr. Moyer was the person we asked to do that, and in my mind, that is what stood as this Board's position to the County. I may have missed something, but Mr. Crow's first statement was, "I am Pete Crow and I am the Chairman of the Celebration CDD and I appear on behalf of my Board." I do not remember us sending you to do that. Maybe I am missing something but I thought we asked Mr. Moyer to send a letter. I do not recall this Board authorizing you to represent us because this does not represent me. This is totally opposite to what I thought we voted on and to what I thought this Board decided. Your statements did not represent me.

Mr. Akey asked are you referring to what we approved by motion at the September meeting, the three conditions?

Mr. Collins stated yes. I think what Mr. Moyer wrote reflects the position of the Board. That should have stood. We all know Mr. Crow is very passionate about this issue, to keep this right-of-way open, but your presentation reflects your point of view. That is fine but we all have different views. But you do not have a Board discuss something, come to an agreement and then go to the County and say I am representing the Board and give them your own viewpoint. I do not understand it. I think as a Board, we have worked very well together.

Mr. Quinn stated I agree 100% with Mr. Collins. I think if this was Mr. Crow, as a member of the community and as a citizen of the County, who stood up at the County and offered your own personal view on what you felt was the proper use of that land, you would have been within your rights to do so. But to open up by saying this is the Board and I am representing the Board and your opening statement is that the Celebration CDD opposes this application, that is out of phase of a properly discussed, properly motioned, properly voted Resolution by this Board, which is embodied in the letter that Mr. Moyer wrote to the County. The County is the only agency that has the ability to deal with the

requests that we made. There was a member of the Planning Commission who was here earlier in the meeting and if we asked him, he would say that the Planning Commission can only deal with what has been presented to it on the table. They cannot go out and make decisions above and beyond what is in the documents. They had no choice but to do what the documents requested them to do. This is a decision that could only be made at the County level. The County Commissioners are the only body in the County that can, in fact, impose these kinds of restrictions. That is why this letter was written to the County and that is why this Board made the decision it made. To go in and make a statement that you represent this Board and the Board is now basically saying that the letter we wrote to the County is pulled and this is now what our opinion really is, I think that is completely out of character with what I would expect from the Chairman of this Board. There were many errors of fact in this letter, including that there are thousands of acres of TCC land within the community that are available for development. If you look at the map that you reference, if you take out the 36 acres for the connector, there are about 50 acres in total that are not under contract that can be built on. There are 1,000 or 2,000 acres of land that TCC owns but it is on the other side of I-4. Are you saying in your statements that it is fine to build a church, ball fields, trails and everything else and put them on the other side of I-4? I am not sure that is the statement you intended to make but that is the way I read it. Not only is this not my personal opinion, it is not the decision that this Board made, and it is fallacious in its content.

Mr. Collins stated there were 100 people who showed up from this church. The future of that church depends on this land. They wanted to hear from us what we felt about it. We needed to be honest and we needed to deliberate, and we came up with our plan. It was tough and it was not everything they wanted to hear, but I cannot imagine what they are thinking now. It is complete betrayal from that meeting. They expected to hear from this Board what we say is then what we do. What they heard was us deliberate and agree to something, and then they are sitting at the Planning Commission meeting and they hear "I represent the CDD Board and we are against this." They want to have a church. Can you imagine what they felt like when that happened?

Mr. Akey stated we did agree on those three conditions at the September meeting and we sent the letter to the County Commission. As Mr. Quinn said, that is the only agency that can approve or disapprove. The Planning Commission reacts to the recommendation

of staff and the people who are presenting to them. They ask some questions and they say they are in agreement with staff or in disagreement. Our three conditions are the three that we should stick with.

Mr. Crow asked do you feel that I misrepresented this Board?

Mr. Akey stated I do agree that there are some questionable things in the letter and you should have clearly stated that we have these three conditions. I also thought we were going to send a member of staff to that meeting. I think we got a letter that day indicating that someone from staff was going to represent us.

Mr. Quinn stated there was an email that was sent that said that the District was going to be represented by a member of counsel or staff.

Mr. Akey stated I do agree that we should stay with the original motion with the three conditions that were in Mr. Moyer's letter.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated I was at the September meeting but I was not at the October meeting. At the September meeting, I thought we all had come together on this issue. What I tried to do, and what I think we all did unanimously, was the idea of a complex compromise. This is not an easy issue. I started this whole thing with the idea that it is important to preserve a right-of-way. I saw the advantage of putting the land into a civic use and something productive in the meantime, but I was trying to deal with the uncertainty of the future. We do not know if that road will ever be built. We have traffic studies and I know what the total entitlement is for the land that is left. Traffic engineers have told us that all of that has been factored into their analysis of whether or not the road will be needed. All the engineers have said that the road will never be needed. Then we get into the definition of "need" and "levels of service." What is a need for one person is not a need for another person. There are many variables in play and I thought we struck a very difficult compromise. We were all equally unhappy which is sometimes the definition of a good compromise. The letter that we asked Mr. Moyer to write, I reviewed carefully and helped edit a little. I thought it was a very good representation of the agreement that we all came up with. The letter was sent and that was when I left on my extended business trip. Something happened between our submittal of that letter and the meeting that Mr. Crow attended. I do not know what that was, but my opinion is that they disregarded some of the conditions. Someone at the staff or Commission level misinterpreted our letter to be a removal of our objection, period. But for me, it was a

removal of our prior objection if these following conditions are met. The letter is a package deal: we remove our objections if someone will impose these conditions upon the applicant. What happened between Mr. Moyer's letter and the Planning Commission meeting?

Mr. Collins stated I thought that the conclusion was that we wanted to preserve the community and we agreed upon these conditions. After reviewing all the information, the civic use of the connector area, we felt that was a good use of the area. However, we felt that these other conditions, if they were not dealt with, could have significant adverse effects on our community. The focus from Mr. Crow's comments is that we were against the connector. That is not what we said in our letter and that is not what we agreed on. We are for the connector. Converting the area to civic uses is good and we need those; however, we are very concerned about these other things and we would like TCC and the County to act on those conditions because we feel they are so important to preserving our community. That should have been the focus, trying to work out an agreement with TCC and the County on those things. I do not think that happened. Mr. Crow's comments indicated that we are against the connector and I do not remember that at all in the compromise that we discussed. I think we do need to discuss these conditions. Are they conditions that can be met? To what degree do we want these conditions met? TCC may say they do not want the flyover and will not build it and the County may agree, but the County may say they still need to know what is going on in our community. They may want to wait three to six years to make that decision.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated I think there are two ways that those conditions can be met. One way is for the applicant to voluntarily make a commitment. We will never know with absolute certainty if the road is going to be needed or not. The applicant can change the application today. They can make the commitment that they will never, under any circumstances, build the flyover or make the connection to Reunion, or do anything in their work or the land that they sell to others that will cause the four-laning of Golfpark Drive, Celebration Avenue, or Campus Street. The applicant can make that long-term commitment in their application. The second way is for the County to impose those things as conditions in the development approval.

Mr. Collins asked does the County need to decide if they want the flyover or not? They are not going to be willing to do that until they know what is going on with traffic.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated if the commitment was made today by the applicant to never build the flyover or to remove it from their plans, that limits the program that can be built on the other side. The flyover was always a safety valve to exit traffic from the mall on the west side.

Mr. Quinn stated it certainly changes the architectural design of that program.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated the elimination of the flyover effectively reduces the development program on the west side. For us on this side, it means that they are not going to be exiting traffic that way and dumping it onto Waterside Drive or onto Celebration Boulevard that can clog our local roads. There is a lot of anxiety on both sides of this issue. What are the unintended consequences that we are trying to avoid? It is not the Development of Regional Impact definition of what will happen to U.S. 192 or I-4. We are concerned about what happens to our local streets. We do not want those three streets four laned and we do not want offsite influences, like the west side or downstream of our property like Reunion, to send more traffic onto our local streets. If we can get some assurance from the applicant or from the County that those things will never happen, it reduces the anxiety and uncertainty about whether or not that roadway will ever be needed.

Mr. Collins stated I would like Mr. Sunnarborg to meet with Matt Kelly and talk with him about our concerns because you know more about this issue than anyone. I would like you to talk with him and find out what they can do and are willing to do, and then bring that back to us before the December 10 meeting.

Mr. Quinn stated we have a meeting on December 5 and this item is on the County Commission agenda on December 10, so we will have a meeting before the Commission meeting to discuss this. We, as a District, need to be at the County Commission meeting with the rationale and logic and reasoning behind the letter that the Commission has in their hands. That is the question they will be asked to deal with, the letter Mr. Moyer sent. It is the only way this District will be a credible witness in that environment, if we, in fact, are consistent with what we asked the County to do. I agree with Mr. Collins that Mr. Sunnarborg is the best person to talk with Mr. Kelly because you have been involved in this project. If we can get TCC to be the ones to say to the County that they would like these conditions imposed as well, it makes life a lot easier.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated I am happy to meet with Mr. Kelly.

Mr. Crow asked what is our present position? What position do we have as of September 26 when this letter went out? Our position is that we are saying that we will remove our objections to TCC's application if 1, 2, and 3 conditions are done. As of November 1, they had not been done. I will argue and believe that I cannot see anything other than our position is that we stand in opposition to this application and we stand in opposition because of this letter.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated it was September when we sent the letter, our position was still in opposition. I am very happy with the letter. I have thought about it a lot since then, wondering if we could have written it better or do we know anything today that we did not know when we wrote it. I do not know that we do. Mr. Crow's interpretation, versus Mr. Quinn and Mr. Collins, I know there is a lot of frustration and anger, but I think the differences are the interpretation of what the base position is as modified by the letter. To a certain extent I agree with Mr. Crow that we started with wanting to preserve the fundamental philosophical point that preserving road rights-of-way is a good thing in the face of an uncertain future. But if the elimination of the right-of-way will not cause unintended consequences in a bad way and is not an imposition to the rest of the community and we can get some civic uses that we want, that is great. I thought that letter indicated that position. We should either maintain or reinforce the letter. That was my position in September and it still is.

Mr. Crow stated we will get to what our position is before the end of the meeting. What we are talking about is whether or not I misrepresented the position of this Board. I hold that our position has not changed from being in opposition to TCC's application because nothing has changed. We set forth conditions under which we would change. Those conditions have not to date been met. They may be met tomorrow or some other time but they have not been met. Therefore, the opposition that we have to this application stood and stands to this very night. When I went before the Planning Commission and I said I represent the Celebration CDD and our position is that we are in opposition to this application, I would argue comes from my heart and in a very firm belief that not only is it true, but it is reflective of exactly the Board's position that remains the Board's position to this very moment.

Mr. Quinn stated I respectfully disagree. As you stood in front of the Planning Commission and reiterated the contents of this letter, not only would you have saved six

or seven minutes of your presentation but you would have accurately portrayed the position of the Board. You did not get to this until the bottom of the second page of your presentation. By the time you got to this, you had already corrupted any ability for the Planning Commission to recognize that statement. You may feel as though that statement gives you the license to make the statements that you made, but I will respectfully disagree. You misrepresented the Board in the way that you couched and presented the information. While the Board may still very well be of the opinion that those three conditions are part of our agreement, the fact of the matter is that is the statement you should have made. It should have been plain and simple. You should have reiterated the letter, reinforced the letter, explained why the Board got to the letter and let it go at that. The rest of it is Mr. Crow's personal view and is not reflected in the September minutes.

Mr. Collins stated I think we need a new motion. I think at this point, the CDD does not have a position concerning the connector road, pending us giving the applicant the courtesy of talking with them to consider the conditions. I would like to rescind our earlier position so that at this point, we do not have a position but we will be discussing with the applicant some of our concerns and expect a new motion at our next meeting.

Mr. Collins moved to rescind the Board's previous position regarding the application by The Celebration Company for the uses of the interconnect. The Board has no official position at this time and will be meeting with the applicant to discuss the Board's issues and concerns, with the expectation of generating a new position at the Board's next meeting.

Mr. Sunnarborg seconded the motion.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated I think we are in a position to help in this situation. I do not want to start drawing lines in the sand, but if there is an opportunity to help the applicant, the County, the community, the church, and we can do something, I think we should. I am willing to meet with Mr. Kelly and I will ask Mr. Moyer to also attend. Let us not start entrenching positions; let us try to be helpful. The bottom line is the County did not need to listen to us in the first place. We have no official standing and they still do not need to listen to us. Let us try to do something that they will hear.

Mr. Quinn stated I agree with that and I respect where Mr. Collins is trying to go. I think more often we hear the wafting back and forth and we do nothing but damage our

ability to be a resource at the County. My personal opinion is that the position that we took and the statements that we made after our long discussion in September to get to the point where we drafted this letter is absolutely clear about what this Board wants the outcome to be and what this Board believes is in the best interests of the constituency in the community. To go back and say we do not really have a position but we will come up with one in December eliminates any ability for us to have any influence at the County. I would much rather see us stay with where we are today. We made a complex compromise. I would like to see if the applicant will make that compromise themselves.

Mr. Akey stated I prefer that we stay with the conditions of the letter. It was a well-worded motion, but I think those conditions have to be met to avoid some very negative consequences. The conditions are listed and I like the idea of working with the applicant. I would like them to put those conditions into their application but I would like to stick with the letter.

Mr. Collins withdrew the previous motion.  
Mr. Sunnarborg withdrew his second.

Mr. Akey moved to keep the position as stated in the letter to the County Commission and designate Mr. Sunnarborg to meet with the applicant, discuss the issues with the application in an effort to encourage the applicant to put those conditions into their application.  
Mr. Quinn seconded the motion.

Mr. Collins stated I think Mr. Sunnarborg's suggestion of Mr. Moyer also attending is a good idea.

Mr. Crow stated we are going to stay with the letter. Are we also not still in opposition to this petition?

On VOICE VOTE, with all in favor except for Mr. Crow, the above motion passes 4-1.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated as the Board's emissary, I will try first to get the applicant to accept the conditions and modify their own application. If they will not or for some reason they cannot, my second proposal will be to convince them not to object to the County imposing them as conditions in the approval of the NOPC.

Mr. Quinn stated either or both will accomplish the position that this Board has.

Mr. Crow asked what if the County does not impose them?

Mr. Sunnarborg stated we have a Board meeting on December 5 to decide what to do.

Mr. Quinn stated between now and December 5, we will have an answer one way or another from the applicant. We can then decide on December 5 if we need to take any further steps.

**B. Update on parking discussion group**

Mr. Quinn stated I have asked for and have been given the opportunity to be on the CROA agenda for December. I have spoken with members of the safety committee, the covenants committee, and the Board. I have asked them to compile a list of those items that are in the covenants that are parking-related items that they would like to see move forward. The ultimate goal is to consolidate all of those into a Resolution by the Board to petition the County to adopt a local parking ordinance, similar to the ones they did in Buenaventura Lakes and Indian Wells. I presume the process is that we put together what we want to have done, compile that into a Resolution, and that Resolution is put out for public comment. I think it makes sense to ask for public comment.

Ms. Carpenter stated I can call the County Attorney and talk through their process since they have had so many internal changes in the last couple months. Things do not work the way they have in the past.

Mr. Quinn stated you may want to look at that Article in the County Code because that process is defined in the Code itself. The process of how it gets to the County Commission is that it comes from a Resolution from the District through either the County Manager or the Sheriff. From there it goes to the Commission who will vote on making it a special Ordinance in the Code.

Ms. Carpenter stated it is a process but I would like to verify the steps of who wants it first and do they want an advance copy. I will check on that for the next meeting.

**C. Update on maintenance facilities group**

Mr. Collins stated Mr. Sunnarborg was not able to facilitate this group, so I will now take on this task. I wrote an email to Matt Kelly and Pat Wasson, stating that the "CCDD, ECDD and CROA share usage of a temporary maintenance facility on what has come to be known as the connector road. With potential development of the connector road the time has clearly come to look at building a permanent facility to avoid what could be the significant cost of having to use an off-site facility. The CCDD Board has asked me to represent the CCDD on a joint CCDD/CROA/ECDD task force to identify a site for a

maintenance facility, develop a plan for and build the facility, if necessary, and determine how to finance the cost of the structure and the ongoing costs to maintain the facility. Our Board suggested a task force with one representative of each Board and a staff person from CCMC and Severn Trent who is responsible for field operations.” I received an email from Mr. Kelly indicating he will participate and also from Ms. Wasson indicating she brought it to the CROA Board and they appointed her along with their field supervisor, Jerome Simpson. We have the group set and we will begin investigating this. I will keep you updated. We will look at the options and make recommendations.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated I am willing to help if you need anything.

Mr. Collins stated I think your idea was great and I will bring that up to the group.

**D. Park and trail security**

Mr. Akey stated this involves having additional security from 11:00 p.m. until 3:00 or 4:00 a.m. I proposed for fiscal year 2008 that we add a budget line item for \$25,000 to have security during that time slot. That is the biggest issue. During the early evening hours, the community patrol goes around and walks some of the parks and trails. But during those hours from 11:00 p.m. to 3:00 a.m. is when we get complaints of noise and vandalism. This would not be for seven nights a week but it will be a random patrol. We will choose the nights and times and the people we want to perform that function. We had fires back behind Eastlawn and these security people will be plain-clothes security. If they catch someone, they will more than likely not just send them on their way. There will be appropriate action to ensure the safety of these trails, including behind Town Center, Lake Evalyn, Eastlawn and some in Artisan Park.

Mr. Quinn asked who will be providing the security services, Osceola County Sheriffs?

Mr. Akey stated yes, they are our first choice.

Mr. Crow asked will they have full policing powers?

Mr. Akey stated yes.

Mr. Quinn stated that was my concern. If you have someone other than the sheriff, all they can do is send the kid home and that does not work.

Mr. Akey stated they will have full policing powers and we will write a scope of the functions we expect for their duties and tasks.

Mr. Crow asked is this a problem on certain nights of the week?

Mr. Akey stated yes. On Longmeadow, there were fireworks going off late at night. In North Village, there are a couple locations where we are called about loud noises. Many times they will ask if the community patrol can do something, and they will confront the noisemakers, but this is noise at midnight and 1:00 a.m.

Mr. Crow asked do you envision this being ongoing or for a period of time to break it up and then maybe consider bringing it back at a later time, three months later perhaps?

Mr. Akey stated it will be ongoing. Certain months, like March and April, they will work fewer hours but they will work more hours during the summer months. It is not a set schedule. It may be a Thursday and Friday or a Friday and Saturday. If school is off on Monday, they may be out Sunday night.

Mr. Quinn stated I think it is a great idea but I have a concern from a budgetary standpoint. I would like to see the detail on how much coverage we can get for \$25,000. Is this full cost or are we subsidizing what is already being funded by the home owners association?

Mr. Akey stated it will be specifically to cover the trails in four-hour details. Our cost basis is \$35 per hour, so that is about 800 hours.

Mr. Collins stated this gets us involved in an activity that the CDD has not been involved with before, which is policing. That is something that CROA takes care of. We manage and maintain the alleys, but will we now be asked to pay for policing of the alleys? To me it is simpler to have it in one area, especially since we are talking about one incremental amount, as opposed to getting in the business of policing the community. I think a lot of these boardwalks are more remote, isolated areas, and I think many of them are not a disturbance to residents but more an issue of safety and vandalism. I would ask that if we are incurring \$50,000 of vandalism, then go ahead and spend \$25,000 to reduce that cost. I ride my bike fairly regularly and I see some vandalism but not a lot. I do not know that this issue has gotten to the point of hiring security. I would rather wait until we are incurring that amount of damage in vandalism and then step in and spend some money. To me it is an issue of cost benefit when you are looking at a vandalism issue. Is there a reason why CROA would not incur this cost? Why does the CDD need to get involved in policing those areas?

Mr. Akey stated it is a combination of CROA and CDD. The costs for security do not come from CROA but from the Celebration Joint Committee (CJC). CROA funds CJC at

75% and CNOA funds it at 25%. The actual contract is with the CJC. These are our trails specifically. I understand what you are saying about the amount of vandalism, but I also look at the amount of maintenance to keep it out and make sure it does not get worse. This is more targeted to these trails in these areas.

Mr. LaRocka asked what if we went to CROA and asked for the deputies to patrol the CDD trails? In my opinion, it is the CDD's responsibility for those properties. There is not a lot of vandalism but I indicated at a previous meeting that I can be out on those trails and not ever see any law enforcement personnel unless there is an emergency. The theory was to have some sporadic patrols so they will see deputies at different times.

Mr. Collins stated I was just on the trail from Artisan Park to the high school, and it is a beautiful trail. I do not know why more people do not use it. I ran into four groups of people on that trail so I felt pretty secure. If there is some traffic on a trail, I do not think a kid is going to do anything. I want to know what the level of vandalism is. I did not see very much but I saw a little around Lake Evalyn. I do not know what it costs and to what extent it is.

Mr. Smith stated it is minimal. We repair it as soon as we find it and the repair is generally minimal. They will occasionally kick out the spindles on the boardwalk or a light fixture, but they are easily and quickly fixed. The bigger matter is the trash, which is constant maintenance. They do not necessarily stay on the trail but they go off the trail and into the woods. There are some areas where they have built forts and have camps. What is happening in those areas at night, no one really knows and we do not know what they are consuming. A patrol will cut down on some of the vandalism but a presence would be nice to see on the trails.

Mr. Quinn stated my major concern is if they are going off into the woods and building camps, which we found, sooner or later someone is going to start a campfire and it is going to start the woods on fire.

A Resident stated I see fires out there all the time.

Mr. Crow asked what kind of costs are we incurring? What manner of safety issues, if any, have we encountered on our trails? It may be a preventive aspect that we consider. My issue is, to what level does this arise and at what point does the situation warrant stepping in? This could be a rather expensive item and Mr. Collins makes a very good

observation. We are embarking on an increase in our level of service. Rightfully, we are and have been pretty frugal with our residents' money.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated I have a lot of respect for what the safety committee is doing in their devotion to this issue. I struggle with how much CROA and all of us pay for the additional security versus the service we are supposed to get from the Sheriff. We should get some services from them anyway and I know that is a constant battle. The combination of base Sheriff services plus the enhancement through CROA, if that is not enough and we have some significant level of vandalism and damage on CDD property, then we will have to deal with it. I tend to agree with Mr. Collins. To spend \$25,000 to prevent \$5,000, I look at the cost benefit. Next year we can analyze it and make a decision.

Mr. Akey stated we can ask Mr. Smith to provide the numbers for damage. Preventive maintenance is always a hard thing to measure but it is key.

Mr. Quinn stated when the costs exceed the budget available, I think the question of what it costs us is part of it, but it is also an opportunity cost that you look at in a risk-benefit analysis. If you continue to allow the opportunity for someone to do something that will cause a great calamity, then we need to be able to deal with that issue as well. We need to consider this from a broader perspective than simply the dollars it is costing us for repairs and the security patrols. It is the potential for damage. It is a good thing that fire started in the swamp, surrounded by a lot of water and not much wind.

After a brief discussion, the consensus of the Board is to discuss this item at the December meeting.

## **NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Items for Future Agendas**

Mr. Quinn stated we need to redo the meeting calendar. I think the agreement was that after the December 5 meeting, we will go back to the third week of the month. I want to make sure we get that calendar and that it is republished.

Mr. Crow stated we will add this to the December agenda for the Board to consider and approve.

Mr. Quinn stated when Mr. Katz was still on the Board, Mr. Smith developed a map of the downtown area showing the area that we consider to be the downtown parking corridor. We need to get that back to the Board because that is part of the parking discussion. One of the things that Mr. Collins brought up was being able to put effective

directional signs for people to park so they know where to park. We were driving through the Disney properties and in Downtown Disney, they now have directional signs on the street lights that point you to where you need to park for various events, and you can change those signs. If someone from staff would find out what the costs of those are and the process for doing those, that may be something we want to consider at a future date. I just do not know who to ask.

Mr. LaRocka stated there was some discussion before of traffic at Siena on Waterside Drive and Celebration Boulevard. We have received complaints about that area.

Mr. Quinn stated it should be on the agenda, probably under Mr. Walter's report. Can we shrink that island so that people can actually make a legal left turn before someone gets hit?

Mr. Akey stated we can go to the County and ask them to look at it.

Mr. Quinn stated doing that always seems to work better when Mr. Walter goes to them on our behalf.

#### **TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Supervisor Requests and Comments**

Mr. Akey stated I would like Mr. Smith to keep us informed on the tree trimming schedule as well as the status of the new employees.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated this fire got me thinking about if the CDD had its own emergency number, not 911, but some other number. If a tree is blown over or there is another fire or something that happens outside of weekday office hours, there should be a number or call list for us and for the community.

Mr. Smith stated they generally call Town Hall. If it is a CDD issue, they will call us.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated if people will start using our website, we can publish that number.

Mr. Moyer stated I think we have something on the website but that is a good point.

Mr. Sunnarborg stated I am curious as to how and when we will start to do a traffic warrant study around the idea of an eventual traffic light at Waterside Drive and Celebration Boulevard.

Mr. Akey stated that warrant is scheduled to be done in January at Waterside Drive and Celebration and at Campus Street and Celebration Boulevard. The safety committee asked for those warrants to be started.

**ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

On MOTION by Mr. Akey, seconded by Mr. Quinn, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

---

Paul Collins, Secretary

---

Pete Crow, Chairman