

**MINUTES OF MEETING
LAKE ASHTON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AND
LAKE ASHTON II COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

The joint meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Lake Ashton Community Development District and Lake Ashton II Community Development District was held on Monday, **April 19, 2021** at 11:30 a.m. at the Lake Ashton Clubhouse Ballroom, 4141 Ashton Club Drive, Lake Wales, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum:

Bob Plummer
Michael Costello
Steve Realmuto
Harry Krumrie
Lloyd Howison

Lake Ashton CDD Chairman
Lake Ashton CDD Vice Chairman
Lake Ashton CDD Assistant Secretary
Lake Ashton CDD Assistant Secretary
Lake Ashton CDD Assistant Secretary

James Mecsecs
Bob Zelazny
Duff Hill
Angela Littlewood
Colette McKie

Lake Ashton II CDD Chairman
Lake Ashton II CDD Vice Chairman
Lake Ashton II CDD Assistant Secretary
Lake Ashton II CDD Assistant Secretary
Lake Ashton II CDD Assistant Secretary

Also present:

Jill Burns
Jan Carpenter
Molly Maggiano
Mike Eckert
Alan Rayl
Christine Wells

District Manager
Lake Ashton CDD District Counsel
Lake Ashton CDD District Counsel
Lake Ashton II CDD District Counsel
District Engineer
Community Director

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance

Ms. Burns called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m. and called the roll. All Supervisors were present. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of Meeting Agenda

Ms. Burns: First item on our agenda is approval of the meeting agenda. Unless anybody has any changes or additions to that we would be looking for a motion to approve the meeting agenda for Lake Ashton.

On MOTION by Mr. Costello, seconded by Mr. Plummer, with all in favor, the meeting agenda was approved by the Lake Ashton CDD Board.

On MOTION by Mr. Zelazny, seconded by Mr. Mecsecs, with all in favor, the meeting agenda was approved by the Lake Ashton II CDD Board.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments on Specific Items on the Agenda *(the District Manager will read any questions or comments from members of the public in advance of the meeting; those members of the public wanting to address the Board directly should first state his or her name and his or her address.*

Ms. Burns: I have two on here. The first is Stan Williams.

Mr. Williams: Good morning. I would like to address the issue of one CDD. We know based on statements made on public forums and comments made at various meetings that most of the Board members do not approve of one CDD. However, they are personal feelings, and it is your responsibility to do what is right for the community and a major portion of that is taking care of our money. If we had one CDD, where could we save money? First, no joint meetings. We save on lawyer costs, engineering costs, and District management costs. Legal costs: negotiating one legal contract instead of two. Just looking at the latest issue involving both CDDs, the lake level and the negotiation with the farmer. Not only did the lawyers have to spend time with the farmer's lawyer but had to confer with each other before that negotiation could begin. Every time they had to confer with each other, both CDDs got charged. Remember our interlocal agreement and the time it took to make changes, both CDDs got charged. Those are just a couple areas where we are paying twice with something that involves both needs to be agreed upon by both lawyers. Engineering time: two contracts had to be had to be negotiated. Now for engineer was not too bad since it was the same engineer but time at two Board meetings was used as well as lawyer time on both Boards. District management: again, you have two contracts. The utilization of employees, one District manager, one balance sheet, one

check run summary if we had one CDD. Renegotiating and combining contracting for landscaping, security, and pond maintenance. Those are just some of the major ones. I am sure there are other areas. Just as much as the monetary issues is that both sides would be managed the same. We may not have had liked how the COVID issue at the clubhouse of the HFC were managed, but there were a lot of problems because they were not the same. We should be one community and be treated the same no matter what amenity we are using. Mr. Eaton, I know this took time to solicit signatures. He submitted a few hundred names. I understand it's around 300 to the Board of folks who wanted one CDD. You may look at that and say what a small group that was, but think about this, at coffee meetings there are probably a couple of hundreds of folks, and this was pre COVID when he got that many signatures. A big percentage of the group at those meetings is where those signatures came from. That was not the total community. That was a small percentage of the community. So, I am asking the Board to approve doing three things today. One, put out a survey and ask the whole community what they think. We put out surveys for a lot of things, but it seems when we come down to issues that the Board is not sure what the answer would be, such as the golfcart issue, the golf course issue, and one community, it doesn't happen. I would like to see a survey to the community. See what both sides really think. Next, I would ask the lawyers to come up with what has to happen and what the anticipated cost would be. Then actually put on another joint Board meeting where we're going to have to pay everybody and make a vote not based on personal feelings but on what is right for the community and finally put this issue to bed one way or the other. We keep kicking this can down the road at so many Board meetings and not making any kind of progress. Let's at least make some progress this time. Thank you.

Ms. Burns: Thank you. Our next speaker is Jake Eaton.

Mr. Eaton: Good morning and thank you for putting this on the agenda. I won't repeat a lot of what Stan covered. He covered it very well on the finances of putting one Board together. It's an issue that will cost legal fees to get done, but it's going to pay us dividends in the long run because we will save money in a few years. What has not been covered by Stan is the social effect. As many people who are interested in combining the CDDs for financial purposes the other purposes were to stop the haggling back and forth

between the east and the west. The disagreements about what we have here and what we don't have there, how they are doing it over there, that's a big issue to the well-being of the community. I would hope that you would each consider this issue for the betterment of the community and not looking for your personal seat on a Board. Thank you very much, and I hope you move forward with this. It's the best interest for the community. If you have any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

Ms. Burns: Thank you. Come one up.

Mr. Scali: Tom Scali, 3084 Dunmore. Two comments. The first one, if Maxwell develops property across the street on Thompson Nursery Road, please make sure that there are no legal loopholes that these new residents have a right to use our amenities. Secondly, I would ask the west if they can provide financial information on the golf course so that everyone can understand the scope of the problems that are going on. Thank you.

Ms. Burns: Any other public comments from anybody in attendance here? Do we have any public comments on the Zoom line? Anyone wishing to make a public comment via Zoom can use Zoom's raise hand feature to be called on now. Seeing none, we will move on to the next item.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of Minutes of the August 21, 2020 and October 19, 2020 Joint Board of Supervisors Meeting

Ms. Burns: Next item is approval of the minutes of the August 21, 2020 and October 19, 2020 joint Board of Supervisor's meetings. Anybody have any questions, comments, or corrections to those minutes? Seeing none, do we have a motion to approve both sets of minutes from the Lake Ashton Board?

On MOTION by Mr. Costello, seconded by Mr. Plummer, with all in favor, Approval of the Minutes of the August 21, 2020 Meeting and the October 19, 2020 Meeting, were Approved.

On MOTION by Mr. Mecsics, seconded by Mr. Zelazny, with all in favor, Approval of the Minutes of the August 21, 2020 Meeting and the October 19, 2020 Meeting, were approved.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

There being none, the next item followed.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Discussion of Request to Combine
Districts *(requested at the Lake
Ashton CDD March Board Meeting)***

Ms. Burns: The next item up for discussion is the discussion of request to combine Districts. This was a request that came from the Lake Ashton Board from their Board meeting. So, if anybody would like to jump right in, I'll turn it over to either Board to discuss the matter.

Mr. Plumer: That was put on by the LA CDD request due to Jake coming to our last meeting and asking that we move forward on the petition that he put in and that had not been discussed at any of the meeting to this point. So, that's why I was asked to put it on. Obviously, Stan Williams makes several points that are good if you combine. I think we just need to look at the situation and make a decision whether to move forward and do a survey or not do a survey and kind of get an idea of what the community thinks. I don't think that we need to spend any dollars at this point until we find out what that survey tells us. Obviously if the survey comes in and tells us that there is no interest, then there's no interest. But we need to listen to the constituents. My opinion only.

Mr. Mecsecs: We've gone over this quite a few times. And yes Jake, we got the petition of the 300 and some odd folks. We took it, it was given out to our Board at one time and I think we all considered that. We can do a survey. I think it was on the Focus 2025, and I'll see if they can clarify that a little bit when they do theirs. For now, both Boards are confronting a lot of financial realities. I know a lot of folks that came and talked to me that signed the petition. The costs were not really articulated clearly, but our legal counsel was concerned about the costs. So, there is a financial investment. My perspective here is, if we want to consider it and it fits into our financial picture and our protocols, that's fine. But going any further I'm not okay with that.

Mr. Realmuto: I just wanted to address the question of surveys. I'm a big fan of gaging of the communities' interests through surveys. I think it's nice to hear from the squeaky wheels who find the time to come here and voice their opinions at a meeting. But surveys have a place, as you'll see in the Focus 2025 presentation, they represent a

much larger segment of the community. In this case, a majority of the lots actually responded. That's the place of surveys that you get the true sense of the community, rather than from the couple of speakers you might hear here. That said, I think Supervisor Meccsics made reference to if the Focus 2025 survey addressed this. It did not. It was a conscious decision made not to address areas like that. The idea was that the CDDs themselves could follow up with more specific surveys. My last comment regarding surveys is that although I do think we could do a survey to better understand the sentiment of the community, the results you get from that are only as good as the questions asked. And if you ask an "American" and "apple pie" kind of question like, should we combine into one community, you're likely to get a majority of yesses. There is no question about that. What you need to do is frame the question with more of the particulars as not only how it may or may not reduce costs and then what the initial costs would be to the community at large, how it will affect the individual homeowner's assessment. That requires that you do those studies upfront. If you're going to ask a question as they did in some of the Focus 2025 questions, they didn't just ask "are you in favor of this", there was an unqualified "yes" and there was a "yes if it doesn't raise my assessment." You need to do something more along those lines, or perhaps even more specific, exactly how it would affect them in terms of dollars. I think some work would need to go into that to get a valid result from a survey. Thank you.

Ms. McKie: We have a document that we were given, Chapter 190. And in section 189.074, the voluntary merger of independent special Districts, it goes through the process. It's ten pages long of hearing after hearing, vote after vote, merging liabilities, merging finances. I think that we really need to understand that full process.

**Recording and Zoom video were disrupted.*

Ms. Burns: Just to let everybody on the Zoom call know, we lost internet connection, so we did halt the meeting. You did not miss anything that was discussed, and it seems we are now reconnected and ready to go. Bob, I think you were ready to speak.

Mr. Zelazny: I just wanted to talk a little about the survey and the idea of a survey. They are a valuable tool, however, if you survey the uninformed and uneducated on an issue you don't get the desired result. Before we put out a survey that says, "Do you want

to combine CDDs, yes or no?" you need to understand what it means. I think a lot of the members on the Board have already illuded to that. Colette talked about the litigation and the legal fees, working with the cities, how you're going to do the money, how you're going to combine it. A lengthy process which that uses a lot of resources. The money that you're looking to save by consolidating could very well be eaten up just in the legal fees to consolidate. We need to do research before we go out and ask, "Do you want to do that." Another consideration Steve talked to, when he talked about what is it to the individual homeowner in Lake Ashton. I look at it from the West. Our assessments are somewhere around \$200/\$300 a year more than yours are on the east. If you consolidate into one, the assessments on the west will go down and the assessments on the east will go up. Because we have to assess equally across the Board. These are all questions and issues that need to be understood by the people that are going to respond to a survey. I would certainly support looking at everything that has to be done. I would support an educational program to inform the residents on what it takes and how much it costs and what the total implications of consolidation are. And then letting the survey go out and hear from the residents.

Mr. Mecsics: Everything that we do, and we already had our attorneys give us some fact sheets on this, I think Mike Eckert has given our Board some really good information. As Bob said, this is not something that we just turn overnight. And a lot of people that signed that original survey aren't too happy because they were given the opinion that it would be a real easy thing to do and it's not. It was just misinformed information. My concern, again, is looking at finances as our infrastructure ages and we are going to have to take care of that. I'm going to be upfront with this. Previous Boards did not get along. I know I was part of that. I can't tell you how many times he calls me, or I call him. The other gentlemen and I talk. Harry and I talk. I see Steve. We all tend to talk when we can. I see these Boards working a lot closer and working as one for the betterment but at this time fiscally to spend any more money and without, as Bob said, a uninformed public. We do what's best what's best for the community and not our own personal interests. And I don't care for that type of comment, I'm sorry. I think at this time we received your petition. This is something that we may want to confer about. We can

do some more research. But again, as far as CDD II is concerned, we will not propose to spend any more money in any way shape or form to move forward with this.

Ms. McKie: I forgot to include that this process would also include legislative approval. There is another added complication. I have this section of the document, maybe it can be copied and given to all of the supervisors who may not have it. I'm happy to do that.

Mr. Costello: I would like to see a copy of it.

Mr. Zelazny: Perhaps a way to move forward a little bit is to have the Board read the document that Colette has, have the lawyers do a little bit of research as to what they believe to be the requirements. I think Mike Eckert has already done it for us. And then at our next joint meeting have a joint workshop before and then a Board meeting afterwards so we can have actual dialogue with the residents on how they feel, and we can try to answer their questions at that time.

Mr. Realmuto: I like the path forward proposed by Supervisor Zelazny. I think it's a good idea. I wonder if we need to have our attorney duplicate the work or the information that you have been provided assuming none of it is subjected to attorney client privilege. Perhaps you would consider sharing the information you have with us since we're all essentially operating from the same base. That's one way we can work together as one community.

Mr. Mecsecs: I don't see a problem from the CDD II Board having Mike's information passed over to Jan. I'm not an attorney but I don't think there is a problem. Jan, do you see any issues with that?

Ms. Carpenter: No, that seems fine. I already wrote in my notes to get a copy of it because I know there are a couple of interesting issues with these two Boards merging. So, I am happy to look at it and maybe take a quick glance or talk to Mike if there are any questions. Mike, do you object?

Mr. Eckert: No, it's a public record and please provide it to the other Board and to Jan. Jan and I have talked about some of these issues in the past as well, so I think we'll probably end up on the same page on this issue.

Ms. Carpenter: Perfect, thank you.

Mr. Costello: May I ask if either one of you have ever had a situation in which this has happened? Where two different Districts joined together.

Mr. Eckert: Yes, we've done probably two or three mergers. What we found is usually the hardest issues are the timing and making sure that you're timing it during an election cycle so that you don't have an election in the middle of your merger process where people can come onboard and decide that they don't want to go through with the merger after the Districts have spent a lot of money on the merger. So that is one issue. And then the second thing in this particular case, and Jan and I would need to talk about this more, we may need to have a change in Chapter 190 to be able to accomplish a merger for these two Districts. Just given the unique situation and the involvement of the cities and the counties and how they have changed their boundaries over time. It's a pretty complicated issue on that part. I will say that in the mergers that we have done before usually within three to five years, the cost of going through the merger process have been recovered by the Districts with the going forward savings after that.

Mr. Realmuto: The cost savings after three to five years is assuming it's approved. We've heard a couple of references to it's a long complicated process. And that's true, but it's well prescribed. I think once you read section 190 it basically contemplates all of the contingencies. It sounds like one wrinkle might be the fact that we are in two different cities. So that further complicates it. But the point I am trying to make is, you would only recognize that benefit if it's approved and I believe part of the process is that essentially each District has to approve the merger independently. So, realize that. It might not come to fruition and by that point you have already expended most of the money to get it done. So, it is risk from that prospective.

Mr. Costello: Can I ask, approximately financially what kind of money are we looking at over the three to five years?

Mr. Eckert: I prepared some of this information before, and it may be in the documentation that's provided. I would just be guessing as we sit here today, but I would estimate probably \$80 to \$120,000 to go through the process and then you've also got the legislature. But again, I think we've seen those costs recouped in that three-to-five-year time frame and then beyond that you have a savings going forward. And Jan, I defer to you on your experience as well.

Ms. Carpenter: You're pretty much hit exactly on what we have. The biggest issue here is just because these were formed by counties, and then partially cities, the statute doesn't contemplate exactly the situation we're in, so there is a difference here that we'd have to either get a legislative change or something else. Generally, the biggest cost savings is having two managers. So, the administrative cost wouldn't be 50% of what the two are, but it is the biggest savings there. If the general admin is \$100,000 you can figure savings of 80% or so plus any other contracts where we merge them together and receive a discount because you're merging the two contracts into one. Yeah, we've seen savings as little as a year and half or two years and up to three to five, as Mike says. We'll take a look at Mike's memo and if he doesn't have numbers, we'll help work up some numbers to give folks an idea of where the savings would be and also for us to kind of come up with what we think the cost would be with this legislative issue if we have to go that far.

Mr. Mecsics: When you walked me through it that one time, especially during the legislative process, and it's a good point Steve, whether it gets approved by either Board or even the legislature. I know while we may have had 300 people sign a petition, I've had probably 30 or 40 people come to say that they will get to their legislatures and oppose this. And that just increases the time and the money.

Mr. Littlewood: I keep hearing things about the cost and the initial cost going forward, and then it gets counteracted by the savings that might be made. And the survey, nobody seems to do the survey. So, if you want to educate the residents would it be better if we got all this information and then did a workshop so the residents can have some kind of an input and we can educate them on what it is that we need to do to make this happen.

Mr. Mecsics: From our Boards, if we want to, or from at least the CDD II, if we wanted to do a workshop we could work upon what Mike has, but any other preparation from a legal standpoint will cost money. Duff, I know that makes you a little nervous whenever we have more increased legal fees.

Ms. Burns: Any other questions or comments on this topic? Or action?

Mr. Mecsics: Unless one of our Boards or both Boards agree, then there is no further discussion on this.

Mr. Realmuto: Before we leave this topic, I see some concerned faces in the audience. This isn't to say that we can't do something on these issues between joint meetings. I think we have agreed to do one thing and that's to get more information from the attorney and circulate section 190 so that essentially all of the supervisors here, half of which are new, this is our first joint meeting, fully understand the issue and what it might involve and the complexities. And I think it should be a topic for discussion at future meetings. We're not dropping the ball or ignoring what you had to say, But I think we're saying we want to learn more and bring it back. It could be a continuing item.

Ms. Burns: And I will circulate that email from Mike that had that information to Jan and the supervisors. I'll circulate it to all because I'm not sure of all the new supervisors have seen it, but we will make sure the Lake Ashton Board gets it as well and make sure Lake Ashton II in case there is anybody who has not seen that gets that as well.

Mr. Mecsecs: Are you also going to circulate the 190 to everybody so they have the same information to work with as well.

Ms. Burns: I will do that.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Security Options and Gate Security Enhancements

Ms. Burns: Alright, the next item is discussion of security options and gate security enhancements. Jim and Bob, this is security related, I will turn it over to the two of you.

Mr. Mecsecs: Bob and I spend a lot of time talking on a lot of things like security and how we most effectively and efficiently provide those services here to the community. We're still continuing on with that discussion. It's not just a clear cut one thing makes sense all the time. I think as you go through working on your security contract, we are exploring various different way to either reduce costs or to enhance the operations so they are best for the community.

Mr. Plumer: The community security is something that fortunately or unfortunately Jim and I talk about a lot. I think that once we go through the rebidding process for ours, we may find some competing companies and we'll see where all that works out and see what we can work together with and try to save some money and improve the service that we are getting from both as well. That's the goal that we're working on, but I don't have

anything concrete to report today because we're still trying to dig up some different facts and some different ideas and directions to go.

Mr. Realmuto: I want to focus on the second half of that agenda item; discussion of security options and gate security enhancements. I want to focus on the gate security enhancements. I know I raised this to our Board a couple of months ago. One of the topics we've discussed, I was hoping you guys might get together and present us with some options, it doesn't look like it's going to be at this Board meeting. Perhaps at our individual Board meetings and also on the agenda for the next Board meeting might be ways of improving gate security. And I am referring to the fact that the way gate security currently works, someone that got a gate clicker 15 or 20 years ago, it still works, and we have no way of tracking them or knowing where they are. There are much more modern options available now that are in use by many communities. License plate readers, barcode readers, that would enable us to revoke them when a resident leaves the community. We have no such ability now without changing the gate code. That would be a logistical nightmare. I guess one of the things I'm look forward to and would like as a supervisor on the east, but this really needs to be done jointly as a community. We can't do it at one gate and not the other. It would be to at least investigate what our options might be and what the cost might be around changing the gate opening mechanism. I'm looking forward to a quote on that, hopefully prior to our next joint meeting. Maybe your guys can get together on it and make a joint recommendation, but I believe there is a lot of interest in the community, and we would like to just understand what it might cost us or what it might involve.

Mr. Plumer: We actually have discussed that issue and we both have said some ideas that are similar. What we found is especially if we were going to rebid a contract to make sure that we had companies that either supported whatever we went with or were able to work with whatever we did. We didn't want to just hire a company and say oh by the way we're doing this. So, we kind of slowed down our thought process until we decided exactly where we are going company wise.

Mr. Mecsecs: And Steve, on one of those guys that recommends these programs to people as far as access control and gates. If you talk to a salesman, he'll tell you that their equipment, their systems will do everything but dress you in the morning and give

you breakfast, feed you at night, and put you to bed. There are all pros and cons to any phenomenology that you use out there for access control. And there are a lot of issues with costs. And the other issues we have to worry about sometimes is just the legal stats. And I can see Jan or Mike sort of shake their head a little bit. The legal status of what we have on our roads as well. We are looking at that. Someone said we can do a satellite. Okay, well there's money involved with that. We can do this. There's money involved with that. Then there's the supervision of those systems. That's the one thing people forget about it the supervision. That is one of those things that Bob and I are working on and going through all the pros and cons.

Mr. Realmuto: Can we look forward to you sharing the information with us at some point?

Mr. Mecsics: It's not a question of sharing. When people say that it sets me off. There are no secrets. What we'll do is we'll share and provide to the Board data driven fact-based information and not a salesman's pitch.

Ms. Littlewood: I am not a salesman for any of these security companies, but I have had experience with property in Providence which is a gated community. The residents there all have a barcode. When we change our cars, we have to get new barcodes. It costs us \$25 to have that barcode put in our car. I don't think that's an unreasonable cost for residents to stop people just coming in and changing clickers or moving out and keeping the clicker with somebody else. I think that's quite a reasonable cost and I think that's something that we should look into.

Mr. Mecsics: Angie, the next one in the phenomenology is we put it in the business. It's one of those phenomenologies. It's not just the \$25. There's a system that has to go into it. It's what we call the allied support that goes into it. That's one of the things we are looking at.

Mr. Hill: I'd like to bring up the fact that Jim negotiated the contract for security on our side and reduced our bill by \$60,000 a year by eliminating the unnecessary day time security. I bring that up because of you had one CDD your cost per year might either go up \$60,000 a year or it could go down on the east \$60,000 a year. I brought that up because I think it would pertain to the merging to the merging of the two CDDs also.

Ms. Littlewood: I have a solution for that Duff, and now everybody is going...I'm getting all this hate mail. Make the back gate residents only and you only need one security company.

Ms. Burns: Anything else on the security issue? Alright, seeing nothing else and we have no action on that item.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion of Focus 2025 Survey Results Interim Report (*requested by Supervisor S. Realmuto of Lake Ashton CDD*)

Ms. Burns: The next item is Discussion of the Focus 2025 survey results and the interim report. I will turn it over to Steve and Bob to discuss.

Mr. Realmuto: Although I requested this item and Bob and I were the liaisons from our respective CDDs, I did ask that the leader of the group be given the opportunity to speak and address the Board and be available to answer questions. With the Chair's indulgence, I would ask that we hear from Ms. Landgrebe to present their work to us.

Ms. Landgrebe: Well, good afternoon Supervisors. I am Debbie Landgrebe, a resident of Lake Ashton and the facilitator for the Lake Ashton Focus 2025 committee. Some of our members are here, I'd like them to stand so that we can see them. Thank you. And they are doing a great job. I'm here today to give you an interim report on the work the committee has been involved in. Thankfully, I will not go page by page. I can hear a sigh of relief from everyone. However, I don't guarantee that for next month when we plan to do a final report. The objective of the Lake Ashton Focus 2025 committee was first to develop a community wide survey to aid and assessing their needs and desires of Lake Ashton residents over the next five years. To reaffirm, this included all of Lake Ashton, all of Winter Haven, and all of Lake Wales. Not just one or the other. Second, provide the report sharing the results of the survey to aid CDD supervisors so they would receive independent resident feedback and perspective which in turn may serve as a working resource as plans and budgets for our Districts are developed. We were also given a very tight timeline to accomplish all this. And you saw the number of residents that answered the call. As an independent resident led committee adding a scope for us was making recommendations to the supervisors or including financials or identifying

perspective projects as short mid or long term. Our committee began weekly meetings on February 2nd of this year and immediately went to work on the objectives. The team created questions and developed a survey that was a very enlightening process. We electronically published the survey multiple times within the March timeframe. So, thank you community directors. We received responses until early April in order to allow for the multiple residents we believed who did not have internet access or capability and who would respond via paper. That was provided information through the LA Times. With responses in, the correlating a preparation has begun to complete and share our findings. Our committee worked hard. Very hard. In fact, they continue to work hard. We are attentive and focused. We represent all areas of Lake Ashton. We live in Lake Ashton. In fact, some of us have been here since Lake Ashton started and other members of the committee have been here for only a year. Our ages range from 55 to, well, let's just say and up. Certainly, the committee represents Lake Ashton. We will continue meeting until after the May's CDD meetings and our final report is presented. The focus 2025 committee is on target to accomplish all of this. Prior to this meeting you have each received a copy of a copy of the interim report with all of those graphs. To give you an idea of the number of responses versus previous surveys, the 2020 survey responses going back a few years totaled 323. That represented approximately 554 homes. Of those responses over 200 were filed electronically leaving another 100 or so one by paper. And that was in line with other surveys that have been presented in the community. I am happy to report that the 2025 survey had an astonishing 1,172 returned surveys. That represented approximately 859 households. In a percentage manner, that estimates 55% of the 1,560 current lots in Lake Ashton or 53% of the 1,627 total residential lots that will be within Lake Ashton on buildout. Certainly, this is the largest response of any Lake Ashton survey that I am aware of. And yes, it is not 100% but it is very representative of our residents and their perspective. There were only 11 paper surveys filed which makes me wonder if perhaps Lake Ashton is moving into our current century. 80% of respondents identified themselves as full time residents with at least 75% of respondents here during summer months and more than 90% present between October and April. 83% of our respondents are 65 years and older. Yes, age is creeping up on all of us. I mention this because we are an aging population and safety measures such as handrails, automatic

door openers to name a few become increasingly important and are often overlooked until the need impacts us personally and that often occurs unexpectedly. From a perspective of numbers, you can assume that 1% equals 16 respondents or I will round up using new math, 20 respondents equals 1%. So, let's understand the meaning of the responses. For instance, those responses labeled, "no opinion/don't use," the interpretation is, "I don't use it/I have no opinion about it" or "I don't have a strong opinion or a strong feeling about it." "No" means no. Now you may think that "Yes" means yes, and it does, however the caveat is that it also means "yes, but don't increase my assessment" or putting it differently, "yes and work it within the budget without an increase to me." Then let's touch on a few of the highlights. While currently there is a smoking policy in the joint amenity policy, there is a strong desire for a no smoking policy to be added to the joint amenity policy replacing the current smoking policy. A total yes from 75% of respondents expressed favor for such a policy. So, to be clear, a total no smoking policy would apply to all CDD owned properties for all residents, staff, visitors, vendors, etcetera. And that means total no smoking of any kind including vaping or drugs. Only 19% of the respondents said no. A second outdoor pool, another elephant in the courtyard here. 56% of residents said "yes" and that included 20% saying "don't increase my assessment" and those represented 26%. Location did not appear to be a factor and whatever space is available prevailed. Having an ATM machine is important to 60% of the respondents including the 20% that said, once again, "don't increase my assessment." 17% said no. An overwhelming present of over 85% of respondents are satisfied with the landscaping on both boulevards as well as at the clubhouse and HFC. You have to love this one, regarding speed bumps and tables, that was opposed by 61% of the respondents and the yeses totaled 26% but 10% of that was "don't increase my assessment." Respondents do not want speed bumps; however, speeding continues to be an issue. And it's not just residents in cars, golfcarts, bike, or electric bikes. It truly is a systemic issue. Just because there are multiple yesses, that doesn't mean the noes should be ignored nor vicea versa. And while there are many "don't use" or have "no opinions" on items one of the nice things about Lake Ashton are the multiple amenities and options that we have and that appeal to a variety of interests. We have appreciated all the respondent's openness. The committee hopes this give you a brief overview of the

interim report and we encourage the supervisors to spend time reviewing and pondering this report as you may have particular questions, thoughts, ideas as well as requests of how you the CDD supervisors would like to see various categories and results in the final review. I am asking you to please compile a list and email it to me prior to Monday, May 3rd. By doing this, we the committee can continue doing our best and get the final report to you. Not only in a timely fashion but in a document that will be a meaningful and resourceful tool for the CDDs. I also ask that you add the 2025 focus committee to your respective May meetings so that we can present our final report and answer any questions you might have. So, at this time, thank you from the committee for us being able to serve our wonderful community and I would ask if you have any questions at this time.

Ms. Littlewood: First of all, Debbie thanks to everyone that took part in this. The committee that you formed did an awesome job and it was nice to see so many responses from the residents which means that the residents are now starting to get involved. I have a question; I've never had to form a survey. How do you come to the questions that you put on there? What criteria did you use?

Ms. Landgrebe: That's a great question. We kind of started with a blank slate but we also referred to 2020's document. We had taken insight that all of us had from various groups and community discussions, and actually I believe that we may have even heard because many of us listen to your meetings and attend meetings, some of it could have been based on things you all are discussing.

Ms. Littlewood: In England, guns are not a big thing. We are not allowed to have firearms. So, I have no idea what a skeet range is.

Ms. Landgrebe: That was a very interesting topic. Anyone who has been in law enforcement understands the liability of gun ranges and skeet. You'll be impressed that I know what skeet shooting is, it's something that gives you a lot of bruises if you don't hold the rifle well. That's when they will shoot up a disk, and you kind of take your shot gun and go, "POW" and you try and shoot it. Aren't you guys impressed?

Ms. Littlewood: In England we call that clay pigeon shooting.

Ms. Landgrebe: There you go. But you can see by looking at the survey, we did encompass quite a bit and there were a number of things that we also chose to leave out. Anything else?

Mr. Zelazny: Debbie, just let me say again how much I appreciate the work that you and your committee have done. I was involved in the 2020 focus group and you guys have done a tremendous job. The report is very informative, even in its interim state. I look forward to providing you some comments. But to you and all of your Board members and Iris for putting this survey together and compiling all the information and getting it into this format. I tell you, it's a great piece of work and thank you very much.

Ms. Landgrebe: Thank you. I will tell you that this was clearly and continues to be a committee that works so well together. None of the old stories of the east versus the west, none of that really came into play. This really has been a great committee. Thank you, guys.

Ms. Burns: Anything else? I know that there was a request to add this to the individual meetings in May for Lake Ashton and Lake Ashton II. We are good with that? Okay, we will add that.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor Requests and General Public Comments

Ms. Burns: The next item we have is the supervisors' requests before we move to general public comments. Anything else from any of the supervisors to discuss?

Mr. Realmuto: Well, I guess to follow up on that, probably the item that received the most total yes votes in the survey, and something that I think we would need to do as a joint Board. The item that received the most support with 75% yes, is adding a no smoking policy to the joint amenities policy. I believe our amenity policy currently states that smoking is allowed only in designated areas, I don't think you can find anywhere that's designated. I guess I would leave it to the committee what they thought it meant to add this. But I think the idea was that it was all encompassing and that the policy clearly be non-smoking unless clearly designated otherwise and not necessarily just indoors. So, I wonder if that's something that we as a joint Board have interest in doing. And my ask of staff is to come back to us, maybe starting in our individual Boards, but to be approved at the next joint Board meeting with the text of a policy amendment that would add that

and by doing so kind of indicate our support or responsiveness to this kind of community feedback.

Ms. Burns: It's a pretty standard provision in most amenity policies that we see, so I can pull some language of what they have in other ones. Generally, it just says there's no smoking or vaping on any amenity or CDD property.

Mr. Zelazny: I think when we developed the amenity policy, it was intended to be a no smoking policy and it was written that said there's no smoking in any CDD facility. It didn't restrict those from outside or designated areas, but it was to keep you from smoking inside any one of the brick-and-mortar facilities. If the Board feels like that needs to be changes, then just like everything else, it needs to be discussed at two Board meetings and the changes made. I would welcome the final report with the comments that support the position to clarify what the difference is. If it's just to eliminate smoking outside, we have a cigar club that meets, but they meet in the designated parking lot to get together and enjoy cigars. So, if we're going to do that, we're going to have to have some discussion on that type of thing. I think when the original amenity policy was out in effect, it was universally accepted by all ten Board members at that time and was open to discussion in open meetings.

Mr. Realmuto: Once the committee can address this in their final report having the Board members working with them, I think the intent was again to apply it to a larger area to include outdoors. That's not to say there could not be exceptions or designated areas. But they should be well defined I think is what they are looking for. And I hope they'll clarify that for us next month.

Mr. Mecsecs: We have designated areas, as Bob was just saying when they wrote that up. My concern is, I'm a non-smoker and I've never smoked in my life, and I don't care for the smell of smoke, but I hate to say this, and I never thought I'd say this, smokers do have rights. Now we have to encompass everybody in this community and not just a certain group. When we look at this, because it's not under the amenity policy, there are other areas, such as the golf course and everything like that. And that's an impact. I think that's something that both Boards need to discuss at their respective meetings. And then we can talk about it at a joint meeting.

Ms. Burns: Any other supervisor's request before we turn to public comments?

Mr. Zelazny: Just one thing. It really isn't a request from me, but I know it's going to be public comments and then we're going to leave. Tom, let me just address your two comments. One is that it is already established that outside people can use our amenities, they just have to pay the amenity fee. So, you don't have to worry about that. What we might want to do as a joint Board is to look to reevaluate the fee that we charge for outside people using the amenities because it might be too low. But you don't have to worry about that. There is no collusion between the current builder and the builder across the street or anything like that. Secondly is the golf course finances, the finances are briefed every month at our Board meeting and their entire financial spreadsheet is provided. If anyone wants to know how the golf course is doing financially, you just have to go to our website, go to the minutes in the CDD report and you can find it there. That's available to anybody and it's briefed every month.

Mr. Costello: One of the things I'd like to bring up is over the last two or three weeks coming in the gate here. People behind me are pressing the button in order to let me through the gate. Anybody can be driving that car in front of you and it's a bad practice. Let everybody press their own button and get through the gate themselves. We don't want a repeat of what happened back in December.

Ms. Burns: Christine and Mary can add that to a future blast. Anything else from supervisors?

Mr. Zelazny: Jillian, let me just ask one quick question. On the non-resident users' fees, if we were looking to change those this year, when is the first time we have to have a proposal in front of our residents?

Ms. Burns: It's a 30-day notice. We would need at least 30 days prior to the public hearing date if you wanted to increase that amount. Any other supervisor's request or comments before we turn it over to public comments? Alright, seeing none we will open up to general public comments. If anybody has any, you're welcome to come on up to the podium.

Resident: My point on Maxwell was that he's putting...I understand that this may not be correct, but the vacant lot directly across the street from our Thompson Nursery Road, he is putting a home there. I want to make sure that those homes do not have any legal manipulation through Maxwell's attorneys and his contacts in either city that will

allow those residents to use our amenities. I would like to make sure that our legal teams are well aware and briefed on that and that there are no exceptions.

Mr. Mecsics Tom, as the one that spends a lot of time with the builder on the HOA, we've discussed that quite a bit. According to them, they have no interest in anything with our amenities because I asked them that question directly. And I can reaffirm that if you'd like.

Resident: I would strongly recommend that that go in black and white and be signed. Maxwell has been known to change his opinion.

Mr. Mecsics: It's not Mr. Maxwell anymore, it's Mr. Triber.

Resident: And he's even worse.

Resident: Two comments. By the CDD 1, I appreciate all of the discussion and all of the comments. I don't know that I heard a firm thing that said somebody is going to put this on the next joint meeting. I just heard that the last speaker, that you asked a question are you going to out this on the next meeting and everybody said yes. But on the CDD 1 it died.

Mr. Plumer: I think you're incorrect. I think Steve addressed. The exact verbiage I cannot repeat it. But he talked about it. Doing the research and bringing it up at the next joint meeting.

Mr. Realmuto: If you're looking for me to jump in, yes, that's exactly what I said. I think there's work that we need to do as individuals on the Board to understand some of these documents and we could bring it back to our own Boards for discussion so it doesn't necessarily need to wait three months for the next joint meeting. I'm proposing that we all do our homework on the issue and discuss it as individual Boards and at the next joint meeting., We have a week or so before the joint meeting to put it on the agenda so that's not a decision we have to make now.

Resident: I apologies I didn't hear that as firmly as I heard the other one. The real one I wanted to come up here at the end was, at our last Board meeting on the west I had suggested that for the budget process that we would talk to the builder about whether he was going to release or sell those buildings, the buildings across the street, the wharf, the maintenance shack, and so forth. And if he was that we should be in a position through our budgeting. Instead of having like we've had in the past where the golf course on the

east side where they increase the budget by \$100 on that side. It can go to the roads; I'm not planning toward before and we just talked about it again today and for us like the golf course we got hit with the \$400. If we had like we said on the post if we had thought about that earlier over the last ten years and just increased by a little bit, we'd have better position to afford some of those things. I know Jim said he would follow up with the builder. If you're going to leave in the next two or three years and he's planning on selling that property at the end of that time, maybe we would be in a better position if we thought through our budgeting process to add something in the budget and earmark it for that would be a good thing. So, I just ask you, follow up and in fact just thinking about that remember when we first started looking at the golf course, he offered the golf course plus all of those buildings in the first very first statement that he put out and then he pulled everything out except for the golf course.

Mr. Costello: I think he also made it very clear that he had no intent on getting rid of the storage area. He had no intent whatsoever of getting rid of the storage area. I don't know that the building across the street was addressed.

Resident: He said a lot of things over the years. I think maybe it's time that we asked him again if there is anything that's going to come out. And maybe it is just the building across the street. But do we have a joint Board interest in buying that? If we do I think we should start planning on it early, is all.

Mr. Zelazny: Just to clarify, the seller didn't pull everything back. The original proposal that was offered when the Boards approached Mr. Maxwell, everything was on the table and it came at a bill of \$8.2 million. That's when we started pushing things away because we couldn't conceive of coming up with \$8.2 million. You're correct that there could be a possibility that's he's still willing to separate them. The maintenance shed was \$2.7 million based on his profit over a ten-year period. That's how he came up with that value. Worthy of asking because this is prime property across the street, and it has some potential to address a number of things that Debbie's group has identified as wants for the community. It has a lot of merit.

Resident: During the budget process, if it is a possibility, you might want to think about adding something there for the next two or three years to help elevate some of that.

Mr. Mecsecs: You're correct on that. As my progress speaking with the owner versus the builder and all that back and forth, what I'll do is I'll draft up a report back for both Boards and then we can look at that at a budgeting process stand.

Mr. Realmuto: Before we move to the next speaker, I think the best way to address that potential eventually is to make sure that we have strong capital reserves. They don't necessarily have to be designated for a particular purchase but that's the reason we don't have to spend every dollar we have every year and that we should work on building our reserves. More to handle emergencies but also to help in this type of a situation when something should become available at an attractive price. Just for the record, the indications I have heard is that the developer has no desire to sell the sales center. It doesn't matter that when all the lots in Lake Ashton are sold, what we heard that the intent was to continue using the sales center as a sales center for other properties that he may be developing. As distasteful as that may be to some of you, as a property owner in the District who pays an assessment just like you do on your individual lots, each of those lots is assessed a lot equivalent, he has the right to do that. Don't assume that building will become available anytime soon.

Mr. Mecsecs: And we have to make a distinction Steve, that the correction there would be, there is an owner which is the Maxwell Lee program. Mr. Lee and Mr. Maxwell own those properties, in fact there is an agreement between the builder which is Mr. Schriever. Whatever you hear, please do me a favor, take it with a grain of salt until I come back and give folks the proper information.

Iris Realmuto: Deb was very generous in her time frame saying that you can respond by May 3rd. I'd like to request that supervisors send their input to Deb a lot earlier than that since we need to turn around the full report in time for the May meetings. And the final report will also have the break downs of the charts based on the different CDDs.

Mr. Realmuto: I think what a lot of us are looking forward to is seeing the individual comments since they tend to shed a lot of light on it that the numbers don't necessarily.

Iris Realmuto: Yes, and all the comments will be there organized in a manner that makes sense.

Rodger Hanson: Information about the stop sign up at the front gate. I've been here since 2003 and I have brought this up several times and I know you're aware of it.

But people hit the button when they are out on Thompson Nursey Road and go flying through there well over 20 miles an hour. I know there are a lot of ways to get around that and fix it. But so far nothing has happened as far as that stop sign goes. Thank you, I wanted to bring it up again.

Resident: Lot 412. I failed to mention before when talking about 1 CDD Board, that that would lend also to one HOA and one arch so that the community would develop together as one and there wouldn't be different house paint colors and other things and so forth. One comment that you made Jim about people getting misinformation. I don't know what you were told, but when people ask me about the legal cost, I was told by an attorney that it would be about \$80,000 and that may have increased some by now. Jan just confirmed that when she said the cost would be between \$80,000 and \$120,000.

Mr. Mecsics: That was given by not Jan but Andrew. There is a lot more than just the \$80,000. And that's what the Boards will work on.

Ms. Burns: Any other public comments from anybody in attendance here. We will turn it over to public comments on Zoom. Anybody wishing to make a public comment on Zoom can use Zoom's raise hand feature. Alright, seeing none, anything else from the Board?

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS


Adjournment

There not being any further business to discuss,

On MOTION by Mr. Plummer, seconded by Mr. Howison, with all in favor, the meeting was adjourned by the Lake Ashton I CDD Board.

On MOTION by Mr. Mecsics, seconded by Mr. Zelazny, with all in favor, the meeting was adjourned by the Lake Ashton II CDD Board.


Secretary / Assistant Secretary


Chairman / Vice Chairman