



Lake Ashton

Community Development District

Carol Pontious, Chair

Borden Deane, Vice Chair

Brenda VanSickle, Assistant Secretary

Bob Ference, Assistant Secretary

Mike Costello, Assistant Secretary

November 19, 2018

Lake Ashton

Community Development District

5385 N. Nob Hill Road, Sunrise, Florida 33351
Phone: 954-721-8681 - Fax: 954-721-9202

November 9, 2018

**Board of Supervisors
Lake Ashton
Community Development District**

Dear Board Members:

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the **Lake Ashton Community Development District** will be held on **November 19, 2018 at 10:30 a.m. at the Lake Ashton Clubhouse Ballroom, 4141 Ashton Club Drive, Lake Wales, Florida 33859.**

1. Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance
2. Approval of Meeting Agenda
3. Public Comments on Specific Items on the Agenda (*speakers will fill out a card and submit it to the District Manager prior to beginning of the meeting*)
4. Approval of the Lake Ashton and Lake Ashton II CDD Joint Meeting held on October 5, 2018 and Approval of the Minutes of the Lake Ashton CDD Meeting held on October 15, 2018
5. Engineer's Report
6. Unfinished Business
 - A. Discussion Regarding Vivonet Termination
7. New Business and Supervisors Requests
 - A. Consideration of Bocce Ball Court Refurbishment Quotes – *will be provided under separate cover as available*
 - B. Consideration of Clubhouse Wi-Fi Equipment Quotes– *will be provided under separate cover as available*
 - C. Discussion of Combining CDDs (*requested by Supervisor Deane*)
 - D. Discussion of Landscaping Agreement (*requested by Supervisor Costello*)
 - E. Consideration of **Resolution #2019-01** Amending the Fiscal Year 2018 General Fund Budget
8. Monthly Reports
 - A. Attorney
 - B. Community Director - Monthly Report
 - C. Field Operations Manager
 - 1) Monthly Report
 - 2) Consideration of Medjool Palm Injection Program
 - D. CDD Manager
9. Financial Reports
 - A. Approval of Check Run Summary
 - B. Combined Balance Sheet
10. Public Comments
11. Adjournment

**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 October 5, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. at the Lake Ashton II Health & Fitness Center, 6052 Pebble Beach Boulevard, Winter Haven, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum:

Carol Pontious
Borden Deane
Mike Costello
Brenda VanSickle
Bob Ference

Chairman
Vice Chairman
Assistant Secretary
Assistant Secretary
Assistant Secretary

Doug Robertson
James Mecsecs
Daniel Murphey
Stanley Williams
Carla Wright

Chairman
Vice Chairman
Assistant Secretary
Assistant Secretary
Assistant Secretary (by phone)

Also present:

Jillian Burns
Andrew d'Adesky
Jan Carpenter
Christine Wells
Mary Bosman
Numerous residents

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

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Roll Call and Pledge of
Allegiance**

Ms. Burns called the roll and everyone recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**Public Comments on Specific Items on the Agenda** *(speakers will fill out a card and submit it to the District Manager prior to beginning of the meeting)*

Mr. Robertson: Next we have public comments. I will note that we received a speaker card from Bob Zelazny as the first person to speak. Bob?

Mr. Zelazny: I am Bob Zelazny and I live at 5192 Pebble Beach Boulevard in Winter Haven. First I would like to thank the negotiating team for where it got to this point so far. Many of you have heard my comments before, but I am going to reiterate them again because I think they are important. I am a strong advocate for the purchasing of the land. I view the land, golf paths, the bridges, and the ponds as amenities enjoyed by all residents of Lake Ashton. Having said that, there is an inherent cost to maintain them that should be shared by every resident whether they golf or not. This is no different from any amenity offered at Lake Ashton. Now I will address the costs in a minute. The golf club itself should be viewed as an activity, no different than pickleball, the pet parks, and bocce ball. The CDD has expended resources to provide these activities with lands and facilities. These activities continue to self-fund themselves with little or no additional resources from the CDD. With that in mind, the golf club as an activity should be self-funding through membership and be no burden to the non-golfing residents. To the non-golfers, it will just offer an additional economic incentive to support the continued operation of the golf club. Based on an earlier analysis presented to the CDDs, the annual assessment to minimally maintain the land associated with the amenities could run an excess of \$600 per household per year. If we continue to operate the golf club, those same annual assessments could be reduced down to approximately \$200 per year per household. I would now like to address today's presentation. I have two concerns from the basic terms that are discussed. First is the agreement to split the pro-rated membership fees. I feel that if they accept it, the golf course could have a first year operating deficit in excess of \$400,000. I understand that the pro-rating of the dues is to offset the seller paying off the bond. I would propose that in lieu of accepting the pro-rated dues option that these dollars be added to the cost of the land thereby allowing

those funds to be spread out over the payment period and leaving the golf club with the operating revenues necessary. To ensure the golf club has sufficient funds to operate through this year, all revenue resulting from the collection should be transferred to the buyer obviously less those revenues extended between October 1st and the closing date. The second issue is the upfront payment for the free golf memberships. Based on the operating figure, the golf course received \$4,000 per new home that accepts first year membership. This is estimated to be sixty homes based on 30% acceptance of golf memberships as a part of the contract. I would not object to taking less than the full membership being for new members, but I feel that the anticipated percentage of new residents that take the free golf should be verified based on previous years' sales records. To me it certainly would not be a deal breaker for me, as it does sever all financial ties between the current owner, the builder, and us. Three quick thoughts in closing, first there must be an acknowledgement that if we move forward there will be an assessment on every home. The question only is how much? The Board has done a great service today by not increasing fees while maintaining our community standards, but to think that we can purchase and maintain 200 acres of greenspace, approximately ten miles of bridges and paths, and approximately twenty lakes and mitigation ponds without an increase would be irresponsible. Secondly I need to make sure you do not focus only on the offered price when making the decision. You need to determine the total cost, which would include lot revenues from shared dues, non-reimbursements for free memberships, and taxes. We should ensure that the total amount does not exceed the appraised value of the property. And lastly, let me just remind the members of the Board that many of us believe the responsibility to be, and that is to maintain, protect, and improve our community assets that would ensure that we protect our property values and maintain our lifestyle. Thank you.

Mr. Robertson: Janice Gordon.

Ms. Gordon: My name is Janice Gordon. I live at 5525 Hogan Lane. Thank you for allowing me to speak. On the preliminary term sheet provided to the residents, I'd like the Boards to address in their discussion today: 1) the information provided seems

like there is an assumption that the purchase provides for keeping the golf courses functioning as they are currently. Is this the case? If so, does the purchase include the paths and take into consideration the suggested improvements made by the consultants? What are the exact time limits for the 50/50 split of membership fees, especially resales? Will HOA fees paid by the seller be put into an escrow account? How will the HOA fees be credited to CDD I and CDD II since they are separate entities? 2) While you have provided us with information about the golf courses, there is no information on the two businesses included in the purchase. What are the current operating expenses for the Pro Shop and the Eagle's Nest? Are the furnishings included in the sale? How many employees both full and part time are currently employed? Once the sale is finalized, there will be an immediate outlay of funds for these expenses. Where will that money come from? I know my time is limited so I will stop here, though I have other things, but I appreciate consideration of what I mentioned in your discussion. Thank you.

Mr. Robertson: Steve Realmuto.

Mr. Realmuto: Steve Realmuto, 3624 Blackmoor Lane. First off, I want to thank the community for putting onto paper the context of the proposal that was distributed with the agenda today. I understand that it is essentially what the developer is putting forward as a proposal and it is not an offer yet. It seems to capture a lot of the current thinking about the purchase price and the acquisition of the golf course. It is very useful for us to see that on paper, but I want to point out that the acquisition cost is really only one piece of the total picture. It is probably relevant so far as it affects the yearly operating expenses as some others have pointed out. I think before you come to any decisions, we have a couple facts before us about the developer losing money operating the golf course. So your focus really needs to be on developing a plan if you think you can actually operate the golf course at least at breaking point. That is what most of us are concerned with, the operating expenses and how much to keep the increase in assessments minimal. Golf course as an amenity, I object to the characterization that it is like any other because no other amenity costs over a million dollars a year to operate and will affect our assessments by hundreds of dollars. So please focus on the total operating costs also

going forward and only move forward if you feel you can do it with minimum impact to our assessments. Thank you.

Mr. Robertson: Jarrett Thomas.

Mr. Thomas: My name is Jarrett Thomas. I live at 5361 Hogan Lane. Purchasing the golf course, I would like to ask that you consider that any say in purchasing the golf course be put on ballots produced by the Supervisor of Elections of Polk County and given to everyone who is a resident of Lake Ashton and Lake Ashton II so they can participate regarding changes in their lifestyle to pay for something they are not currently paying for entirely. Thank you.

Mr. Robertson: John Velebir.

Mr. Velebir: I am John Velebir, 5205 Green Drive. A couple things people already talked about but I would just like to emphasize again that there is a big difference between the golf course as an amenity and everything else. Yes we all pay for the amenities we don't use or rarely use, but the difference between those and the golf course is if I want to play racquetball or pickleball, I can. I just go and do it at no additional cost. The golf course is an additional cost, so it is not the same kind of amenity. And like Steve said, it is going to cost us a considerable amount of money. At the meeting on the 24th in here, it was said that a detailed plan, not only on the purchase but also the operations on how we would be able to afford all of these things. I think before we move forward we should have a detailed plan for residents to actually see what this thing is going to cost us and I would endorse what Mr. Thomas just said that this should be put to a vote on by the residents. Thank you.

Mr. Robertson: Alan Cinquino.

Mr. Cinquino: My name is Alan Cinquino. I live at 5413 Hogan Lane and have been a resident here for nine years. I am absolutely opposed to the purchase of the golf course. I don't see any reason to. I didn't move here to own or operate the golf course. I think we moved here to retire, or at least most of us did anyway, and retirement doesn't involve being involved in the operations. As I understand it, there is a very valid offer from an outside party to purchase the courses and I think we are very lucky to have that.

I lived in Jersey and we had a similar circumstance up there. The difference was that when the developer decided to sell the course, the neighborhood was nowhere big enough to support the purchase of a four star golf course so the issue never came up as a homeowners issue. The golf course was sold and it has now changed hands four times. That sounds bad, but guess what, it has been with the same person now for the last six or seven years. The price kept coming down as people decided they couldn't make money on it and now everyone is fine. None of the residents have anything to do with it at all, except that if they want to become members they have a discounted price. So I think we are very lucky that we have a good valid outside offer. I don't see any reason that we should get involved with this. It certainly isn't an amenity as compared to other amenities like the basketball courts. So that factor and most important possibly if we are going to do this, I think a purchase of this magnitude certainly requires the residents approval and if not approval, at least a referendum so you can get input from every resident in the community. That is pretty much all I have. Again, I think we are lucky to have somebody that wants to buy it. People buy things to make money. I have no problem with people making money on our property. That is what the restaurant does. We want good functioning operations. We don't care if people make money. We want things to run well. We are not in the business to be operating money and worrying about profit. Profit, big deal. Loss is the thing we are all worried about. I think we really should look at the offer that is on the table and consider it that we are very lucky and in addition, whatever we decide to do, I think we should get the chance to vote. Thanks.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Update and Discussion Regarding the Potential Purchase of the Golf Courses

Mr. Robertson: Mr. d'Adesky? Your presentation is next.

Mr. d'Adesky: I will read everything as I go through the PowerPoint presentation that was included with the agenda so everyone can hear it even if you can't see the projector perfectly. For those who don't know me, I am Andrew d'Adesky, I am District Counsel along with Jan Carpenter. I am going to be presenting the facts that were

collected as part of the Lake Ashton and Lake Ashton II Joint Golf Course Committee. So what I am presenting is a summary of the term sheet, which is a quick two page preliminary term sheet that we put together based on our discussions with the seller of the golf course. I am going to go through the scope of the committee, which I think addresses some of the questions as to why we are presenting what we are presenting today, why it appears to have some limitations, why certain things are excluded from what we are presenting, talk about the members of the committee, who was there, the basic terms of the agreement, and also future considerations or other considerations such as things that should be thought about or could be thought about as part of the consideration of the purchase. The scope of the committee and the reason behind the committee was prior to the CDDs coming together and authorizing folks to meet with the golf course owners, nobody had been authorized by either District to actually meet with the seller and come up with terms, real actual terms that we can kind of move forward on. We heard things from individuals, there have been different offers, thanks to our consultants, NGF, and some of these things have been reconciled, but we needed more than that to move forward. Both Boards, as part of the joint meeting and pursuant to the respective authority, authorize certain individuals to work with District staff, which was myself, Jillian Burns, Darrin Mossing, and Jan Carpenter, to meet with the seller to determine the basic terms for the golf course purchase. The committee was not authorized to make any decisions or enter into any agreements so nothing we did, and we made this clear throughout the process and subsequent to the meeting, constitutes an offer or any sort of negotiated agreement that we are bound by at this point. So once again, I have talked about staff, but we also had Supervisor Jim Mecsics on behalf of Lake Ashton II CDD and Supervisor Mike Costello on behalf of Lake Ashton CDD. Also not included in this list because they are not part of the committee were the folks who were in the room. So during our meeting with the seller, Larry Maxwell was in the room and Jim Lee was also in the room physically to negotiate the basic terms. Subsequent to that meeting, they engaged Mike Workman of Clark Campbell as their attorney. That is important because he also was in the room during the negotiations. And we did receive

subsequent phone calls from Jim Lee following this deal kind of eliminating different details and flushing out the deal. So those are all of the individuals involved. First of all, the seller willingness to further negotiate terms so the Districts at this point have the ability to counteroffer. There isn't really an offer so we can come back with different terms or change the terms. And certainly this is a draft summary so it is not binding at this point, but there are also certain things we need to negotiate. For example, they agreed that they were flexible on how the fees were paid. They said we could pay them over time over a series of years. They didn't get into specifics and the committee didn't get into specifics so that is something that if we are going to have an actual legally enforceable contract that we would need to go back and talk to them about. That is just one example of something that needs to be further negotiated. Once again just to reinforce, this was preliminary. So we will just go right in to the basic terms as detailed on this sheet and go through that. I will present that and if everyone has any questions, if we can wait until the end we can deal with all of them that way. The first term is basically the purchase term for a fee simple ownership of the golf club parcels, which includes the Pro Shop, the Eagle's Nest and all of the golf course parcels on both Lake Ashton and Lake Ashton II. There are two separate entities that own those parcels, but all of those together that constitute the golf courses would be included. Of course once again we need to get a detailed list from the seller of exactly which ones are included. We have not received that yet, so that would be part of any contract we would finalize. They agreed for the payments to payable in multiple payments up to three years. This was important because the Districts might want to fund them in smaller payments followed by larger payments over time. They were agreeable to take a smaller deposit upfront given that the Districts don't have extremely large reserve funds. The second portion was a long term lease on the storage area utilized for the current equipment. The current equipment is stored on a parcel which would not be included in the sale of the property. The intent would be for the lease to last as long as the CDDs maintain ownership. The sellers, Mr. Maxwell and Mr. Lee, were concerned that we would potentially assign that lease to a private entity or to another entity and they didn't want

that to happen so one of their terms was that it remained within CDD ownership. The next one came up later as part of negotiations, which is related to the payment of the bonds. Because there was \$425,000 in bond debt on the parcels between Lake Ashton and Lake Ashton II, which would need to be settled before we acquire fee simple ownership because the District cannot acquire the property while it is still encumbered with that bond debt. So that was a major term that needed to be negotiated as part of the deal. Considering that they have to pay that debt, which in their view was something they didn't anticipate and they put forward a 50/50 split of the pro-rated membership fees as counted from the day of closing. So whatever the date of closing is through that to the financial year we will split those evenly between the seller and the CDD as the buyer. The next term was the date of closing, which needs to be negotiated. Now this has been updated since I put up the PowerPoint in speaking with the committee that is with Supervisor Mecsics and Supervisor Costello. There was a follow-up conversation from Mike Workman, the attorney for the developer who was not in the room during the negotiations. Pursuant to subsequent conversations, they clarified that they don't desire to close before December 31, 2018, but they demand to close before then. That is a term that they are requiring as part of their current offer. Another term, which is not included in this, but I will bring up now is that they also want a signed contract before October 15, 2018. That was a term that they brought up subsequently. Two or three days ago their attorney contacted me with that term and I communicated that to the Board of Supervisors and they wanted us to relay this as part of the presentation today. The next term is for the payer to pay all of the outstanding liens, taxes, and assessments, all operations and maintenance debt, HOA fees, city and county taxes, and anything else outstanding would be paid so we would be getting it free and clear of any assessments. Once again, the CDD cannot have those once we obtain the land. We want it to be completely free of all of this. The next one is the environmental study. There was some clarification on that. The seller said they would provide it; however they said they would provide the latest study they did and they would not provide a new study. The latest study was done in 2009 so we would probably need to obtain a new environmental study

as to that one is a little outdated at this point. The next one was about retention information. We had previously had the first demand was to get all membership retention information throughout time. The point was made to us that the only retain information for the last two to two and a half years, but they would provide that to us in order to verify some of the numbers they have been giving us. For example, the number that was used in the calculation of 30%. According to the seller, the membership retention information indicates a 28% resident to golf membership ratio according to the information they said they would provide to us and have not provided to the District as of yet. The next provision is regarding the new homes. During our meeting in person, Mr. Maxwell explained that he handle the new home situation and the payments on that. Subsequent to that meeting, they came back with the offer to provide an upfront payment for free golf for the new homes, that there is an obligation currently that the seller currently has to provide free golf for one year to new homes. So the proposal is for the CDD to undertake that burden and exchange for a \$240,000 upfront one-time payment to settle that obligation. The calculation as explained to me by the seller was based on the fact that there are 200 new homes and an approximately 30% golfing rate based on the 28% rounded up to 30%, which would equal sixty golfers at \$4,000 per membership. However, the proposal is that we would be liable to provide up to 200 members with free golf. So if more came in than the rate, we would still be liable to provide that. However, if it is less than sixty, we wouldn't be liable for a refund to them of that \$240,000. It was assured that there would be no more free golf offered for a resale after the date of closing, however any free golf offered up until the date of closing we would have to offer. So if they were granted a membership on 12/30 and we closed on 12/31, we would be obligated to honor that for a full year. The last provision is paying off the current equipment contracts and transferring equipment. According to the seller, the only equipment, which is currently under contract, are golf carts, which have approximately two years left on a lease-to-purchase agreement. They said they would be willing to pay off those so they would be fully purchased and transfer those to the CDD, along with any other current existing equipment utilized from the golf course. The last few terms is to

provide copies of all current membership information, to provide existing appraisals, and copies of any permits, licenses, and any other official regulations or rules they are bound by to transfer to us and pay the cost to transfer those, which is part of the general commercial deal, as well as providing copies of all contracts, leases, and other agreements to be assigned. Now the CDD would be able to choose whether we want to assume those contracts. Certain contracts we can certainly say we don't want to assume or we want different vendors to assume those at a lower cost. So given to the public considerations, this is very important because I think a lot of the questions from the audience that were raised during public comment involve things that are other considerations or future considerations. The reason why we are presenting this information today is very important. This is what the committee was asked to do. This was under our scope of authority which we are bound to in our scope of authority, which is to obtain the basic terms of the real estate deal. There are other considerations, which I am not going to go into as part of this presentation. That is not to say that they might not be important. That is not part of this particular presentation. And some of those things are listed here, which are an operational cost analysis, an assessment analysis, proposed management of the golf course or how they will be run, structured, and managed, which will also include the interlocal agreements between the CDDs to operate that if both chose to purchase that. It does include renegotiation or consolidation of the golf course contracts. It has been brought up that there are certain contracts like landscaping that might be able to be consolidated. We don't have those numbers today, though. Also alternative uses for the golf course property have been suggested, which could be reducing the size of the golf course or number of holes for alternative use. That is not part of what we were asked to do or had authority to do, therefore it was not part of this presentation. We did receive some resident comments that we did want to address that were involving the acquisition of the property and how it will be dealt with in terms of an amenity. And once again, if the golf course were purchased, the CDD would have full leverage on how to deal with this, so they can manage it any way they want to, including a way that might differ from other amenities, including charging fees and costs, and dealing with this in terms of the

nonresident user fee, which is currently assessed on any nonresident user, which are individuals outside of the District that might want to use the facilities within the District. So that can fall under operational cost of management. The Boards have a lot of flexibility on how to answer that. At this time I am going to ask the committee members Mike and Jim, if they would like to elaborate on any of this.

Mr. Costello: Pretty much I think Andrew has told you through his PowerPoint what is going on and it seems that some of the things that were agreed to verbally changed dramatically since we met with them. One of the things that someone spoke with me was the fact that there was an agreement that we were going to have a ten year payout on this, which would have made this a very simple choice that we do it. To try to squeeze all of this in, we did talk about closing as early as the first of the year, but it seems that now they seem in agreement that it was probably going to take a little longer than that, but now all the sudden they want a contract by the 15th of October and to close by the 31st of December, not giving us a lot of time to figure out exactly how we are going to manage it, and what our costs are going to be to run it. Andrew, have we heard from them any more as far as changes?

Mr. d'Adesky: Those were the material changes, having a contract signed by the 15th and to be clear the explicit factual reason for that they said was because they had a pending listing contract to list the property. Let's be clear, list the property does not mean sell the property. That means to put it on the market for them on their behalf. They wanted to try to get a contract before that on the 15th. The reason for the 31st date and the reason why they came down hard on that was apparently because of taxes. They claimed that they would have to pay next year's taxes if it went to the 1st, which is why they drew a hard line on the 31st.

Mr. Costello: I can understand that. They are trying to cut their costs. Another thing that sits with me is the fact that they want half of any dues that have been collected. This should be on a per diem per day basis. The rest of the money should be capital for the golf course. You can't walk into this without operating capital and they are going to

take away half of what was paid out for a quarter of the compensation so it becomes a little bit unrealistic.

Mr. Meccsics: First of all, I just want to thank Mike Costello as a fellow Jersey boy because as the attorneys and our management company have been burning up a lot of the airways on emails and back and forth and many different facets about this, we really did work very hard on this in good faith representing all of you. As Mike said, there are some things that changed from our original face-to-face meeting. The 15th date was made very clear to us that if we did not have something whether it be a commitment or a contract by the 15th they would go ahead and list it with that company. There are some portions of this that need to be flushed out, especially the 50/50 pro-ration. We have to make sure our interests are still protected and our operating capital and how we work within this community and protect it. Having said all of that, this was initially what we had as a draft, and there is still a lot to be worked out, but I don't want to give anyone false promises. I know we thought we had some of it worked out and we will keep going at it. We had a spirited discussion but the bottom line is this impacts the future of Lake Ashton and we need to be truthful when we say we are committed. We have to look at it as do we want control or leave control of Lake Ashton in someone else's hands. It is as simple as that. How we manage it, we will figure it out. I had a gentleman come by last night and we sat and talked. He reiterated some stories he had in the past with golf courses. He is very interested in the golf course. We have a lot of talent in this community. I think we need to keep open minds on this and keep in mind if we want to have control over our community. Again, thank you to everyone for allowing us to represent you. We thank you.

Ms. Carpenter: For those who don't know me, I am Jan Carpenter. Andrew works with me. I just want to make a couple comments. The one issue that hasn't been discussed between the two Boards is the relationship between Lake Ashton and Lake Ashton II. The property is within the boundaries of both Districts. The way Florida law works is the District that owns the property needs to buy it. You can only buy property outside of your District with an agreement of the other or some other statutory

agreement. So the Districts will need to work that issue out as to buyer and seller and how things will be allocated. That is another overriding issue that makes this timing a little bit difficult. Also, just for the record this is a joint meeting of Lake Ashton and Lake Ashton II and this is the only item on the agenda so these Boards will be considering this now. Lake Ashton II does have another meeting this afternoon, but this item is not on that agenda so the issue will be discussed here and it is unlikely that it will come up later because it is not on the agenda. It can be discussed later then, too, but I think we anticipate that these issues will be raised here with both Boards. One other quick item in Andrew's discussion, I will reiterate that the Boards have talked nothing about assessments, payments, setting fees, etc. To set any kind of fees, there has to be a public hearing notice in the newspaper. There is a process for governments to charge fees so should the golf course be acquired, they need payment, and the way that will be structured will be in the public and will be noticed by both Boards if that is the case, and there will be input on that in the future. The one other item is once the seller engages in counsel under Florida ethics laws for lawyers, we cannot talk to anyone but the counsel. We can no longer talk to Mr. Maxwell, Mr. Lee, or anyone else. And their lawyer cannot talk to any of our Board members. So at this point all communication should be coming to us, and I know we keep hearing comments and commentary so there seems to be a lot of talk and things going on so just so everyone understands that, we can't be talking to Mr. Lee and they should not be contacting our individual Supervisors for information because that kind subterfuges the attorney-client relationship. I think that is all I have at this point. I had a couple other notes, but I think most of them have been covered. The other thing Andrew mentioned, we do a lot of bond work and work with the state lending. The timeframe is really not reasonable for the due diligence you need to do. An environmental report needs to be done within six months to allow the purchaser time to get a survey. Ninety days is applicable in the commercial world. Surveyors are very backed up right now. There are quite a few things the Districts have to do to protect themselves, just like any other purchaser would have to do. We are not advising slowing down, but there are things the Boards have to consider to protect everyone in the CDDs.

Mr. d'Adesky: For the record, Supervisor Wright from Lake Ashton II CDD has joined the meeting by telephone. I think at this point it would be appropriate for Supervisors to engage in discussion along the lines of the initial proposal and if there is any desire to do a counteroffer and scope of that, or where to go from here because at this point the joint committee has accomplished its initial paths. In order to do more, you would need to re-task the members, what the scope is, etc. That is something that needs to be determined by these Boards today. So with the facts presented to you, if there are any questions staff is willing to answer whatever we can answer right now.

Mr. Ference: Andrew if I understand correctly from what Jan just said before any valid agreement organizational plan goes forward, we must answer some questions about the existence of CDD I and CDD II and their relationship and how that collusion can come together to enter into an agreement. Until we understand how CDD I and CDD II are going to operate together independently and jointly to come together, finding out more information about purchase and negotiation, pales in the light of the fact that we don't know how the organizational part of this Lake Ashton can manage that. It sounds like we have some work to do between CDD I and CDD II before we can move forward. Is that not correct?

Ms. Carpenter: The Districts could decide today to go forward and jointly enter into a contract. You can decide on terms as they are under the current interlocal or by number of lots or set up some sort of pro-rata sharing that you can adjust along the way. You can make that decision during your due diligence period as one of the items while you are doing your environmental and other terms. But yes, that has to be decided because right now both CDDs need to enter into the contracts since you each own property, or one would have to enter into the agreement with the other to have another interlocal to allow them to buy property in the other's District. So there are certainly some discussion items and also we represent both CDDs and should there become discussion or adversarial positions, we would recommend that other counsel assist so you have totally unrelated people negotiating on both sides.

Mr. Ference: But CDD I has not decided to buy the property and neither has CDD II so unless we resolve this relationship we can't really go forward and make an offer that will be supported by either. Am I understanding that correctly?

Mr. d'Adesky: Yes. It is an issue, but you have the ability to clarify it today.

Mr. Ference: How do we clarify it today to decide today?

Ms. Carpenter: There was a current interlocal agreement for the sharing of the costs with the amenities so you could go under that same plan, which is either constructed lots or built units. Generally interlocal that are sharing for a couple CDDs and for similar situations where two CDDs will share amenities and they generally do it on the number of platted lots.

Mr. d'Adesky: And to the extent that any of that calculation in terms of lot numbers, if you directed the Board to do something, just like you direct the Board to do on a regular basis, direct staff to do an analysis, or just direct Jill to do that. Based on that, even if she hasn't put it all on a spreadsheet it is something for staff to be directed to do.

Ms. Carpenter: It has been done because it is part of the calculations. The amenities are shared on a per lot basis between the two CDDs.

Mr. d'Adesky: There are different systems out there and the Boards could adopt us to direct a specific system.

Mr. Deane: I think we are putting the cart before the horse. I have said this the whole time that we have to make a decision to operate as one CDD not two. That would eliminate the interlocal agreement and would make us one CDD. The state tells what the CDD Board is supposed to be and how they are elected and there will be no discrepancies between I and II then and decisions can be made on how to operate and purchase items. I think purchasing a half a million dollar item when we can't even agree on security companies is ridiculous.

Mr. Mecsics: Let me qualify that, sir. While we all want to act and work as one community, and keep in mind we have talked about this before, but it isn't cheap to do that and it doesn't happen overnight. We have to go to Tallahassee and do that. Right

now we need to push that aside and let's start working together as a community to confront what we have in front of us today and stop this with all due respect silliness.

Ms. VanSickle: My concern is that we don't have enough information. I think the things on the other considerations are some very important items that we need to come to resolution before we go forward. I think the October 15th deadline is ridiculous. I think we need to know about the other costs. I was looking at another community that purchased the golf course and there was \$200,000 in addition to the price on the other items. I want to know what those other items are and what kind of money we are talking about. I think we owe it to our residents to let them know exactly what this is going to cost them. We don't know what the cost is right now and we need to have a plan. We need to know how it is going to be operated, how it is going to be paid for, and I don't think we can move forward without knowing that. I wouldn't buy a house without knowing how much it is going to cost me. This money is going to come out of all of our pockets and I can't do that unless I know how much it will be.

Mr. Costello: I think one of the biggest things here is the fact is that he is not going to close by December 31st. There is no way he is going to close that quickly. We need more time and he should be told that. We need time to investigate it.

Mr. Murphey: Timing is a concern. Jan, I heard you say it will be virtually impossible to close by December 31st in any case.

Ms. Carpenter: You could close by December 31st, but that wouldn't allow you sufficient time to get a survey to be able to check if you have title issues or environmental. There is no way you can get all of that done in that time period.

Mr. Murphey: I am sure we all have a lot of questions here, I have a few. For instance, the environmental thing. Can we put in the contract that the environmental study is not done for three months after closing and anything that comes up, any mitigation we have to do the costs would be borne by the seller or something like that?

Ms. Carpenter: You could put really anything in a contract. The part that would concern me is under certain federal and state laws, there is something called the innocent landowner defense that says to do all your due diligence before you take title to property.

So you would have a contractual claim against them, but you could be liable for any problem that was there.

Mr. Murphey: The costs and dues. It says we split 50/50 pro-rated. Could you give us an example if we didn't close by January 1st, then that would be one quarter of the membership here so if the owner has collected \$1.6 million in dues like we all just paid, would they get just one quarter of that, or half of that?

Mr. d'Adesky: Whatever the date is. It is 50% a split a year. So that is a quarter and a quarter. It is pro-rata. Instead of transferring the balance to the membership, whatever the membership funds are through the fiscal year, they would transfer half of that amount. Once again that is supposed to be compensated and I will bring up that is one of the terms they specifically said they are flexible on. However the flexibility is based on us paying the bond debt. If we were to pay the bond debt, they would be willing to give us membership fees. It is going to be one way or the other according to their position currently. I am not saying we couldn't counteroffer, we can.

Mr. Murphey: My understanding, and someone can correct me if I am wrong, but for every lot that is sold, and they claim there are around 200 lots left, the builder pays the golf course owner an excess of \$9,000 for each lot that is sold. So even at \$9,000 times 200 that is \$1.8 million. Is the builder still going to be paying that to the seller and only \$240,000 of that is coming to us?

Mr. d'Adesky: That is correct. This is allowing the seller to continue to reap that benefit while we would have obligation to deliver the free golf with a one-time payoff of \$240,000.

Mr. Murphey: That seems way short of what we should be getting. That is just what I think. I am sure everybody has a lot of questions so I will stop there, but I think that is a number we need to further negotiate. As far as that October 15th thing, I am sure there are a lot of real estate people in the room that can tell me that they can go ahead and list it and have a provision in there that they do have a possible buyer, right of first refusal or something like that, that being us. I don't know if it is really something we

have to rush into and I am sure we are not going to because there is no way we can sign a contract by the 15th of October.

Mr. d'Adesky: Like I said before, a listing is not a sale. It doesn't prevent a subsequent contract to be entered into; however, from the seller's perspective, they have to pay a fee for that to be listed.

Mr. Robertson: If you have somebody who wants to market something like this, and it is a \$2 million contract, they are not about to spend \$50,000 to \$60,000 in marketing this thing to the potential golf course buyers of the world and expect to just lose that money. If they list it, they are going to pay a significant amount of money. We can say we are going to exclude it, but if his costs go up, I don't know why he would say if you are going to wait, we just lost \$60,000. That is one issue. The second item is if it goes into January, my understanding is that the owner of record on the 1st of the year determines what the property is in terms of its usefulness and therefore if they own it on January 1st it is a private entity and taxes are assessed based on the owner of record on that date.

Ms. Carpenter: That is correct and that is under the assumption that the property appraiser will consider the golf course a government amenity and not tax it. There is a chance that they may tax it. That is part of why they want to sell it before that so they wouldn't have any liability before taxes.

Mr. Robertson: If we avoid the taxes, then that saves another \$160,000.

Ms. Carpenter: It does, but if you recall we did have a dispute with the county early on, so we don't know for sure whether that will be or not.

Mr. Robertson: We don't, but we absolutely forego the \$160,000 for the first year because it is gone. It will be due if we close before the date, we have an opportunity to get rid of it. If we close after that date, it is a guaranteed \$160,000 more expensive purchase. And if the developer lists it, then that is another \$50,000 to \$60,000 so the price for the developer just went up by \$200,000 and I don't think he wants to pay all of that himself. So we can say we are not going to do anything, but it is going to be put on the market and the cost is going to go up and we just raised the price.

Ms. VanSickle: I think it would be negligent if we didn't do our due diligence before we make a decision.

Mr. Robertson: No one suggested we not do our due diligence.

Ms. VanSickle: By October 15th, I don't think we have had enough time to do it.

Mr. Robertson: The issue is if you write a contract, that doesn't mean that it absolutely closes all issues we have to work out in going through that process. We have time to do our due diligence during that timeframe. If we close by "X" date, we have time to do this analysis. All of these things are not done ahead of time. You can offer to buy a house and then you have to get a mortgage or an appraisal that matches your offer and then the contract falls through. This is not a contract. It is a contract to attempt to purchase the golf course. It is not a contract to absolutely buy it. That is why you have time after the initial offer to make those things. So everything doesn't have to be done by the 15th is all I am trying to say.

Ms. VanSickle: What I am trying to say is the fact that he is going to list it by a certain date is not our problem. That is his choice whether he lists it or not. Before we think about buying this, we have to know what the costs are. I didn't sign on the dotted line to buy my house with no idea what it was going to cost me. I had a pretty good idea. That is what I am saying. We have to know how we are going to do this. Where is the money going to come from? Where are all of the hidden costs that we don't know about? I am not one to sign a contract and then say okay let's now find out what it is going to cost. We don't know how to manage it. There are too many unknowns right now. I can't do it without knowing more.

Mr. Robertson: I understand that.

Ms. Pontious: I have a problem with this whole process. This gentleman has known for months now that he wants to sell the golf course and we are interested in buying it. He has sufficient information so why have we not been given this information? All of these things pending at closing is too late. We need to know what is happening before we get involved, not afterwards. I just think it is a very poor business practice on his part and expected better from the caliber of business man that he presents himself.

Mr. Williams: I have a couple questions and comments. If we want to proceed and take the next step, we have to do due diligence. I have heard all kinds of costs about what due diligence is going to be. I have heard anything from \$40,000 to \$150,000. I have no idea. I don't know if anybody does know. Can anybody answer that?

Ms. Carpenter: The next step, which I was just writing down, would be to go out and get some proposals. I would say between environmental and survey and some other basic due diligence, it will probably be in the \$100,000 range. It could be less. Without going out and getting proposals, it is hard to know. Surveyors are overwhelmed right now. It is really tough to get them. The other thing, the seller pays for the title search so it depends on how title and all match up. Perhaps the next step for the Boards would be to have us go out and get proposals for the various due diligence costs.

Mr. Williams: So let's say \$100,000 because that is somewhere in between. So now we are at \$577,000. Does that include any kind of combining of doing whatever we need to do to create this other entity that is going to manage it?

Ms. Carpenter: We don't need to create another entity. The interlocal will work.

Mr. Williams: Between now and then there are going to be many joint meetings. Would that number include those joint meetings? Like if we have to get another attorney, if we decide to split or something?

Ms. Carpenter: Probably not.

Mr. Williams: So that increases that item. So right now we have some unknown number that we have to deal with. Let's just assume we buy the course on the first. However we decide we are going to manage it, but in any case, from the time we start to manage it and until we come to some point of being profitable because we know it is losing money every month, from now until the time that we are actually able if we are able to get it profitable, we would also have to pick up the money every month from our reserves to pay it back. Am I saying that correctly? Does anybody disagree with that? From the day we buy it until we figure out how to get it profitable, whatever that entails we have to pick up the deficit through our reserves. I have given a lot of thought to this, and I am sure everybody else has also. I moved here nine years ago. One of my crazy

neighbors left two years after I got here and decided I should go out and play golf. I did and enjoyed it, but I used to go out to all of the other golf courses and play, too, that were a lot cheaper. A year and a half ago the golf course here offered a summer thing. I joined and took advantage of it because I wanted to see what it was like. I really liked it. I enjoyed playing on the golf course. This whole year I have played on the golf course and I signed up for another year. It costs me a lot of money, more than I should be paying, but I have looked at this from both sides. I wouldn't call myself a golfer, but I play golf here. The one thing I do remember is when I bought here, I was told I did not have to pay for the golf course. From the day this community was developed until the last house is sold, everybody was being told they do not have to pay for the golf course. We have an ongoing thing talking about the roving patrol. We have had disagreements on how it should be. One of your statements is when I moved here, it was here and it should always be here. Well this is kind of the same thing. Some folks have said that we should buy the golf course so we own the land and can do whatever we like with it. We could have nature walks, another outdoor pool. The problem with those things is they, too, cost money. What are they going to cost us? So take out nine of the eighteen holes, make it a nine hole, put in a nice swimming pool, do a nature trail. What is that going to cost us? We have no idea. So that is also a risk. At our point of life, I think most of us moved here with pensions, IRAs and other things, but most of us moved here to eliminate risk in our finances and investments. Now we are looking at adding risk. It is going to be a risk. There is a chance that at some point the course will be unprofitable. Until we get that point, we are going to be paying those fees. The other problem is our folks on the other CDD did a tremendous job dealing with the restaurant, but remember the problems we have had with that? Four or five different restaurants went through there. To add to that something that is much bigger, not managed by one CDD, but by two different CDDs. Think about what we are going to go through. Looking into the future I believe there are better investments for our money. At some point the RV park, the maintenance shack, the building across the street, they are all going to come up for sale. He has talked about that already. I believe our monies are better reserved for looking at purchasing those. If

we do purchase the golf course, I don't see where we would then have the ability or funds to possibly purchase those other ones. Probably the only reason to buy the golf course is because most people that I have talked to, and I have talked a lot of people out here, and a lot of them have told me that they are not interested. I believe the big reason is the risk. It is a retirement community, folks. We are retired. We are not looking to run a golf course. Subsequently if an outside company buys the course, and I have talked to an outside company who is interested. They have not made an offer, but they have said if we are not going to do it, then they are interested in talking to the builder to do that. I asked them about what happens to the golf cart paths. They said with insurance and liability, they would have to restrict walking and bicycling on the paths during the time that golfers are out there. If you are a golfer you want that anyway. If you are not a golfer, you shouldn't be out there risking your life doing that. They are not going to have rangers out there making sure people can't use it at night or in the morning. I think that any person who is coming in here is looking to make a profit. Literally his revenue is going to come from this building. Our biggest revenue source is the people in this community. Are they really going to tick us off? I don't think so. I agree with a lot of folks. I think you all ought to have a voice. The only thing that would maybe change my mind on this process is if I heard an overwhelming yes from this community. I think the only way to get that is with some kind of full input from you folks out there. I am not in favor of even going forward at this point and time. The process of overseeing it and not controlling it is another issue. This builder has 200 more homes he has to sell and he has to maintain this property for at least that amount of time. Anyhow, that is how I feel. I am not in favor of doing anything at this point. I think we need to offer to help him in any way we can to find a viable, good management company to buy it rather than us.

Ms. VanSickle: I agree with you 100% on everything you said.

Ms. Burns: Carla, are there any comments that you would like to add?

Ms. Wright: I sent my thoughts to Darrin and assumed he was going to read it.

Ms. Burns: I have it. It says: "My position on the golf course property acquisition, all things considered, 1) assuming we have negotiated the best possible terms, and 2)

those terms are within our financial ability and will not make long-term hardships to our residents, I believe it is in the interest of protecting the investment of all our residents, we should proceed with the purchase of the golf course property. Future use of said land will be ours to determine and not to nonresident owners to use or not use if they choose."

Mr. Ference: That brings up an issue that many folks have asked me, do we want other people to own our property so it becomes open to the public and where are they going to park their cars if they come and play golf on a publicly owned golf course or privately owned golf course here. How is that going to work? If somebody buys a golf course and runs the golf course down for profit, not to maintain them, then our property values are going to decrease. When you drive into Lake Ashton you look at how beautiful it is, how green and nice and well-kept it is, etc., etc., well if someone else is going to own the golf courses for profit, will they put as much money and effort into maintaining it? They don't have an interest in the housing. They don't have an interest in resales. They have interest in opening up to the public to come in and play golf. If the public comes in to play golf, as I said, where are they going to park when they come in to play? Where are they going to get the golf carts that they need? Where are they going to store them? What payouts will that provide? Where are you going to put fifty to 100 cars in here every day to play golf if it is open to the public? The possibility of someone else owning our property has little or no limitations as to how the property will be maintained. What happens if they decide they only have nine holes, then what will happen to the rest? The unknown in the third party ownership I think faces the questions that our primary decision to make is do we want to be responsible for our own property and whatever else it may take to do that, or do we want a third party to own our property where we would have little or no control over our future. So the question is, that big one. We can work out the details of ownership if we choose to own our own property. If we don't want to own our own property, then we will have to deal with who knows what where and when. So the big decision with the cart before the horse is, if we want to own our property, we can, but if we don't, who knows what will happen.

Mr. Williams: Bob, are you saying we will not run it for profit if we own it?

Mr. Ference: We certainly will.

Mr. Williams: So if we use the money for a profit and not run it down, but anyone else can do that?

Mr. Ference: If we own the property, it is not going to be open to the public.

Mr. Williams: Wait a minute. Isn't all of our property available to the public at a cost? Just like our clubhouses and all of our amenities?

Mr. d'Adesky: That is a good question that was asked. The roads are open to the public if they wish to venture upon our roads because they are funded by bond funds. The amenities; however, we are allowed to enact these charges. One of the most common things that is enacted is the nonresident user fee. We enact that to account for the amount of assessments that residents have paid for the benefit of those amenities. Anybody can pay that and come in and use our amenities. However, that being said, Jill, has anybody from either District ever paid that fee?

Ms. Burns: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. Williams: Would that be the same for the golf course?

Mr. d'Adesky: Yes. If you so choose you could apply that fee to the golf course in order to have that fee in place such that it would favor membership being resident only. However, if someone really likes Lake Ashton, they can pay that user fee and be entitled to use the amenities.

Mr. Ference: If someone buys it privately and owns it they can open it to the public because the roads are public. If it is a privately owned business it is not an amenity and people can come in here. If they come in here, where are they going to park? Where are they going to get golf carts? I am just thinking of congestion. It will be impossible.

Mr. Mecsics: About the comments about control and risk, I don't intend to make risk. I manage risk. When I had a liver transplant, they gave me the risk factor. You could die or you could manage that risk. It is all about control. I know there are probably a lot of army veterans out there. The army told you that you control your destiny when you own it. I don't know who authorized anyone to go out with doing any kind of negotiations because that was not authorized and I am very saddened and disappointed

in that, but also take, because of my experience and background, any kind of talk like that with one huge grain of salt or sand, whichever. In the end I trust, but I also verify. My perspective is that we talked about just having the land. We have a golf course that we have to deal with. The future is in the hands of the ten people up here and how to run that, whether it is by an independent person or what have you. That is our next step. We had to get to first base, ladies and gentlemen because if we don't, we might as well close up what we have here for this issue and go home and enjoy the weekend. I am not a golfer, but I look at it from a different perspective. Each of you have all made very valid points, but let's be careful about what we assume because we all know what assuming makes us.

Mr. Williams: I am not authorized to talk to anybody, but I went out and talked to folks because I wanted to learn how people managed other golf courses. I did it as a member of the community, not as a Board member. I didn't negotiate anything. This group that I have talked to did talk to Jim Lee and expressed interest. They did it without me. When I questioned them about it, they said yes, they did talk to Jim Lee, and yes, they are interested. I didn't need an authorization to do that, though.

Mr. Robertson: You did need an authorization to go on private property and invite them in. Jim Lee gave me a formal protest of that behavior. You brought them on their property without telling them and that is inappropriate.

Mr. Costello: Doug, I disagree with you and I will tell you why. I was with Stan when we spoke with the pro at the Pro Shop, told him what we were doing, and he said going into it that if Mr. Lee didn't know about it, it was only because he wasn't told by one of his employees. We never negotiated anything. Nothing was negotiated and my Chairperson knew we were going out and meeting with these people to get an estimate or some sort of idea of what it was going to cost us to run this golf course. So I have to defend Stan in this situation.

Mr. Robertson: I didn't suggest for you to negotiate at all. Jim Lee said he would have much preferred if someone had told him they were coming in to do an assessment.

Mr. Costello: I saw Jim Lee that day. Quite honestly, like I said prior to going out on the golf course, Stan, did we or did we not talk to Paul? Paul said, go ahead and knew we were going out. There was not one negotiation and quite honestly if Mr. Lee did not know about it is only because Paul didn't tell him about it.

Mr. Robertson: Okay. That is good. In looking at the choices, there are a lot of things that aren't known yet. We did have an analysis by NGF that said with the recommendation of spending money, they would breakeven on this golf course at about 420 members. The current membership is about 360 and we talked about the sixty more that are coming in with the houses that are being built. That brings us up to 420 so NGF said we would be breaking even with 420 members and the golf course would be self-sustaining with 420 members. If we maintain our current participation rate that we have now, when we are all built out, we should have about 450 playing golfers, which means the golf course would generate a profit based on its current level of fee structure. We already paid for that analysis from NGF. So from there I look at the choices that we have. What happens if we increase our assessments by \$20 a month, which is \$240 a year for five years? That is \$1,200. That generates \$2 million worth of cash. In the next under five years, all of these members we need will all be here. They are running behind on the expenses because they don't have all of the memberships yet. I don't know how to spend that \$2 million to fill the gap in the costs we have right now. I can't spend \$2 million on the golf course in five years. It is just not possible. There is nothing that has to be done to fix it. So there is a reference point of that to look at it as an insurance policy. If we spend as individual residents \$1,200 we would generate \$2 million in cash to deal with a lot of the unknowns. A lot of the things we know about the golf course is that it doesn't cost anything like that. I have also heard people say they want to sell and not live here anymore. You can say you don't play golf and sell your house and pay \$12,000 for sales fees or \$1,200 and stay to help figure things out. We could also give it to a similar company that has much less interest in us than Mr. Maxwell. People came here because they like how it looks, they like the community. Mr. Maxwell still has the opportunity to make money from the new home sales so he has a vested interest in having this work out

properly. Anybody who comes and buys the golf course doesn't have the same vested interest in us. If you go talk to the community of Lake Wales Country Club, no trespassing on my property. You can live in the Lake Wales County Club, have a golf cart, but you are not allowed on their golf paths anytime. It is private property. So you can expect something like that could happen. There are no guarantees and it is quite a reasonable possibility with the level of animosity and things that go on that a new owner may decide to restrict his problems. Then we have the last option, which I think is a very low risk, but it is a risk, which is the golf courses get closed, in which case we have a problem with the property values. You can decide for yourselves how the property values will go down when a golfer's community closes its golf course. There are lots of examples from 10% to 30%. Well 10% loss in property value is \$20,000 if you own a house for \$200,000. Paying \$1,200 over five years generates \$2 million and solves all of these problems and will keep Lake Ashton exactly as it is right now. I don't need to spend the \$2 million. I think the \$2 million will go into the reserve funds and the golf course will be profitable and we will be very happy moving on. Everybody likes living in a golf course community that has an operating golf course. We like how that works. So a \$1,200 investment over five years, \$20 a month, gives us the opportunity to have sufficient funds to solve all of these problems. Or, we can just say no and roll the dice on letting somebody else come in and run this community for us. So my point-of-view is I think there is lots of risk, there are a lot of things that Brenda wants to figure out, and I agree, those are all things that have to be worked out, but if we say no, at this point and time, then the other clock starts ticking, the real estate taxes are still there next year, the cost to market it will be there, and all of the costs keep going up. We can put an offer in to say this is what we want, we can discuss it today. You still have the opportunities when you write a contract to purchase, but it doesn't mean you have to purchase it if things don't work out right. If there are problems with the survey, and I can tell you there are. You can go look at the fifth hole on the West and that piece of property, the cart path goes through Lot 880. That cart path is entirely on lots. Does that give a reason to cancel the contract if we don't like it when the survey comes in?

Mr. d'Adesky: If that is how we write it, but we would need to have a survey.

Mr. Robertson: If we complete the survey and we find that there is a variation, we can say we don't like that variation.

Ms. Carpenter: They generally have an opportunity so they can get easements from other people or some other way to fix it.

Mr. Robertson: So it is at their expense to cure the problem.

Ms. Carpenter: It depends on how the contract is written.

Mr. Robertson: If they don't want to cure it, we have an out. My point is it is just because we agreed to try something today doesn't mean we are absolutely committed if things don't turn out how we want. I don't have the survey yet, but there are things that are going to turn up. The environmental study could turn up something. We can say we don't want the risk and we can terminate the contract. So we have lots of outs if we need it going forward, as opposed to saying we are not going to do anything and now we are starting the clock on all of those other expenses. If we gave a contract that we had opportunities to manage, then the clock doesn't start and those costs don't kick in yet.

Ms. Carpenter: That is true. A typical real estate contract has a due diligence period of say 120 to 180 days to perform due diligence and we would request a very broad one that if we don't like we can get out. I am sure they will come back and want to tighten it up so the District can only get out of it for very specific things though it will only make them angry and not go through with the contract.

Mr. d'Adesky: Looking to Jim and Mike to confirm, but if I recall they made it clear during the meeting both in person and during subsequent calls, that one of the things they did not want was a long due diligence period. Is that correct?

Mr. Mecsecs: It should be realistic.

Mr. Robertson: And we can decide if in the process we stop and look at it, the actual purchase price is around \$200,000. When we eliminate the bond debt, the money that comes in from the golf course, the fees for people to play, there is money in there to pay the bond debt, but the bond debt is already paid, so that is just going to be annual profit going forward and we will get that bond debt money back over time. That money

will come back to us over time because it is already baked into their cost of operations. So yes we have to pay off the bond debt, but that \$425,000 in bond debt comes back to us over time. So essentially real out-of-pocket we have to spend \$250,000 to buy the golf courses, Eagle's Nest and all of the machinery.

Ms. Burns: Doug, sorry to interrupt you, but Carla wanted me to let you know she has to board a plane in five minutes so if anybody wants to have any kind of vote in which you would like for her to participate it kind of has to be now.

Mr. Robertson: If necessary we can continue the meeting when Carla is available again. She is available again this afternoon at 2:30 p.m. If there is something we need to do, we can continue the meeting until that point and time when she is off the plane and available. So we are being asked to look at buying two golf courses, Eagle's Nest, and all of the machinery to run it for \$200,000 to \$250,000. I am suggesting that we risk as a community \$1,200 of our monies at the rate of \$240 a year because it gives us five years and \$2 million to figure out a problem that everyone is saying is about \$300,000 a year right now. Then when the membership turns up, it should be nothing. So this year it is \$300,000 and next year it is \$200,000 and then the following year it is \$100,000 if my math is right. For \$1,200 apiece we have \$2 million. What will we do with the rest of that money? What we will do is not have to increase our operating assessments. We can actually reduce them if that is what happens. The golf course should be profitable. That is what we paid NGF to do for us. We have a profitable golf course if we get to 420 memberships. We may actually be making money if we get to 450. So we are talking about risking \$1,200 versus risking the loss of the golf courses in general. That is what we are risking from my perspective.

Ms. VanSickle: I would like to address a couple of those things. First of all, I would like to say I recognize the appeal of the golf course. That is why I think a lot of us bought here. It is absolutely beautiful when we drive in. I also agree with Stan that just because an outsider buys it that may not be a bad thing because I think they will be onboard with the community. As far as cart paths go, part of the cart paths we own, so I think they will be willing to work with us to work that out. Do I think it would be best if

we had control of the land? Absolutely. Do I think it is a bad price? No. But you have to look at all of the other costs that you are not looking at. I am not sure your figures and guaranteeing that we will have all this money is going to work. There are no guarantees and we are being rushed into things. I think we are being bullied. If we want it, it has got to be now or not. I don't think this is a bad thing, but I think we need to take our time. I am not ready to make an offer. There is information I need to know. I need to know how it is going to be structured and how it is going to be run. The CDD Boards should not be running it. There are too many things we have not come to term on. We have to agree on that first. I can't see going forward in the time we have been given. I think it is ridiculous. I think we need to be allowed that time we need. He is rushing us.

Mr. Deane: I am not saying I don't think the CDD should own the property, but I think we have to do our own work to find out what it is going to cost us and then see a plan of how to breakeven because 90% of the golf courses don't make money today. They try to breakeven. Doug, I hear your numbers and I hear your membership and all of that, but that is based on estimates. NGF gave us no guarantee that we would breakeven in three years. There is no guarantee with regards to anything. I just think we have to have more information and more numbers before we can make any kind of decision.

Mr. Murphey: Doug, as usual we have a very persuasive argument and for once I agree with you, but I also agree with what the others are saying. I don't think we should be rushed into this. I do think we should proceed. I think it would be an advantage to the community that we do control that property as a golf course or whatever else, but I am really very hesitant for us to rush into it. I don't think we should let, like someone said before bully us into rushing into it. I do have one comment about if someone said if you buy into this community you don't have to participate in golfing. What they are talking about is you don't have to join the golf club. The members who want to play pay about \$5,500 to \$5,600 to play. I do think everybody in the community does have an interest in maintaining the looks, the beauty, and facilities. I think if it really does cost \$200 a year at most to maintain it, I think it is well worth it, but again, I agree with I think it was Carol and Brenda said the same things and I don't think we need to be rushed into

it because I think everybody here wants to see some more information and some more facts and figures and costs. I think your estimates are fairly reasonable to cover the initial losses that we will incur, but I think in a couple years we can pretty much breakeven.

Mr. Robertson: It is not a bullying issue. It a contractual issue. From their perspective, their costs go up by \$200,000 if we say no today, which is a choice we have, but our cost to buy the golf course goes up by \$200,000. The taxes are going to be in place for next year. The cost of the listing agent will be in place. Those are real costs the golf course owns and he is going to increase his price by that cost. He has already offered a price of \$200,000 for a property he thinks is worth \$1.9 million on the marketplace. He would rather sell it to us, but if we say no right now, he is going to say his price went up \$200,000. And he will still sell it to us, but he is not going to eat another \$200,000 in costs. When he first talked to us about the \$477,000 as being a reasonable number, he didn't understand the issue of the bonds being retired. At that point, he said okay, if there is \$425,000 worth of bonds, he would then negotiate another \$240,000 payback for the other. That was kind of an offset against the bond activity. At some point there is a limit of elasticity as to how long he is going to go. He will just say okay I can give it somebody else and then we live with the consequences of that choice. The insurance policy against all of these things happening is about \$1,200 so do you want to risk \$20 a month to eliminate those risks, or do you want to say let it ride and take those risks.

Mr. Mecsecs: I understand that and quite honestly you can't get to home plate until you get to first base. I am not saying we should rush into it, but we have to make some kind of commitment and then our due diligence goes forward with that. If something comes up, we can always say we are not interested and he can go on and find someone else. Does anyone watch Cash Cab? The first question he asks is "Are you in?" That is what we have to determine here. Are we in or are we not? If we are not, then we will close up shop, that is it, and we will have to deal with what comes in the future. If we don't even give it a shot, then we can never say we didn't have a dog in the fight.

Mr. Costello: Quite honestly, the figures you wrote out, Doug, I have to agree with you. Now would be the time to try to make a decision. The biggest problem, and I think

Jill and Andrew will also agree, that what we agreed on in that conference room was for Andrew to write it up, he did, sent it on to them, it came back, and there was so much red and it changed so dramatically it looked like somebody actually bled on the pages. And some of it was so minor that you wouldn't care, but some of it, they want to walk away with half the money for the dues. They are taking away a considerable amount of our property costs and operating capital. At this point can we afford that?

Mr. d'Adesky: We can't do anything without your explicit authorization and explicit terms you would like us to come to. Now whether or not those are from a delegated committee again, or direction of this Board, we do need that to go forward before we can do anything. We can come up with a contract tomorrow with our terms and send it to them, but they would probably throw it in the trash.

Mr. Robertson: I think the term of 10 years was one of the things that was on the table. So put it back in, put it where we want it and say you have got to go for this contract. If you don't want that contract, that is probably the last chance you get to sell it to us. And now we just put the pressure right back on them and we are bullying them.

Mr. Costello: I agree we cannot go forward with what we have in-hand right now. The entire time that we sat there, Mr. Lee I don't think said even 10 words for the hour and half, two hours that we sat there. I don't think he said 10 words. Then all the sudden when we got the document back, it looked like somebody bled on the page. That is how much red was on there in comparison to what Andrew had written up that was agreed upon at the meeting that day.

Mr. Robertson: So let's change it back.

Mr. Meccics: I was sitting alongside Mr. Maxwell and Mr. Lee was sitting across the table, we did talk about how we might need a little more time to pay for this. He asked how long? I said 10 years and he said that was do-able. My mouth dropped because I thought he was going to say no, four or five. We need the lawyers to go back and forth and flushing out what needs to be. If we cannot come to agreements it will just die. We might as well just close our mouths.

Mr. Ference: Andrew, do you have enough information for what we said about the environmental study and the 10 year period and the survey to be put in? Can you draw up again a do-able contract that you saw come back? Can you adjust that from what you have heard today in another contract to go forward so we would have something in black and white on paper?

Mr. d'Adesky: The conversation still hasn't addressed all of the terms in the agreement. There are still other terms. We need to talk about exactly what the payment plan would be. Exactly what the payment plan will be, not hey, we are going to do it over 10 years. We need specific numbers. And I haven't heard Board consensuses that have been agreed on by all five members of both Boards, or a majority of the members of both Boards.

Mr. Ference: Then let's take some consensus to get you that information so we can have something reasonable.

Ms. Carpenter: May I suggest, I think there are a couple things the Boards need to do. One, each Board needs to decide do they want to go forward with a proposed contract. If that is the case, after they decide that, then we would need an agreement as to how the Boards together want to propose the contract with an interlocal between the two sharing on a basis per lot, which would match statutory requirements, at least initially. Then you can work with me to direct specific terms, payments, due diligence period, and then probably delegate back to a committee on each side with a little room for us to negotiate the smaller terms. The second part would be to say no, we are not ready to make an offer, we want to move forward and do some more investigation. Another option would be we are not ready to go forward, let them go ahead and put it out on the market.

Mr. Ference: Let's get a consensus. Do we need a motion from the Board that we want to move forward with the contract?

Ms. Carpenter: I think the Boards need to each decide how they want to proceed from this point. Would you like to continue to look into it and go back and ask the seller if he would agree to exclude the CDDs from the listing contract so at least that fee won't

be incurred or to decide not to go forward? It is really up to each Board what they want to do. I think those are really your options, not go forward and see if there is some other due diligence you can do while he lists it, or enter into a contract and see if we can get to terms. Right now it doesn't sound like they are going to like our terms, but there is certainly no harm done to prepare a contract and submit if the Boards agree on the terms.

Mr. Ference: Are we intending to go forward before the end of the year so we do not incur property taxes next year? Isn't that why we want to get it on paper now?

Mr. d'Adesky: I think one of the points initially was the end of year date would not allow you to do enough due diligence. If we were to try to close by 12/31, it is commercially unreasonable to expect a survey or environmental report before that period of time.

Ms. Carpenter: And if you could possibly do it, it would cost an extreme amount of money because you would be paying super-rush fees. You could probably do the environmental, but I don't think you would get the survey and title work that quickly.

Mr. Ference: So if we don't close by the 31st, the possibility we incur a \$200,000 increase in the cost of the property because of his tax bill going up?

Ms. Carpenter: What happens is the taxes would be assessed for the year on their property at the level they are now. Let's say we close in April. He would be responsible for the first four months and the District would be responsible for the rest of it. It is pro-rated over time.

Mr. Mecsecs: When we first talked about this, it was the attorney that said the 31st of December with not too much after that. That is what we talked about and agreed upon. Now that has changed, the deadline, and I think that is causing most of us to go back and say we don't concur with that and would like to go back to those original terms we made at our face-to-face meeting. Is that a fair assessment?

Mr. Deane: What were the original terms?

Mr. d'Adesky: We didn't have a firm closing date in the agreement. He said a preference, but we said okay, we hear it, but how about later, he said okay, and Mr. Lee said no, we need to close before that.

Ms. VanSickle: I have one question and I think it is something we are going to have to determine and it comes back to the interlocal on a per house per lot basis. Currently our interlocal is not done that way. We changed our road interlocal where we paid \$191,000 to get out of that portion where we split it by lot number so first I think we need to agree whether this is going to be a 50/50 split or is it going to be 70/30. I don't know what the numbers are, but I think it is something our people need to be aware of.

Ms. Burns: There are 986 lots within Lake Ashton and 680 lots in Lake Ashton II.

Mr. Deane: Lake Ashton has 962 homes. That is it.

Mr. d'Adesky: We are talking about assessable lots.

Mr. Deane: So that includes the RV lot and other commercial ones?

Mr. d'Adesky: Yes.

Ms. VanSickle: Does that include the golf course?

Mr. d'Adesky: Currently yes.

Ms. Carpenter: Under statutory law in Florida, generally you base assessments on the benefit received by the property. That is the statutory requirement and why I suggested initially that it would probably be per lot, which seemed to be a better way for the Boards to equalize assessments rather than 50/50 unless there is another reason why 50/50 would work or some other amount.

Ms. VanSickle: We are two separate CDDs so the only way we could do this is to purchase our own, correct?

Ms. Burns: Yes.

Ms. VanSickle: So we would be paying a larger amount for the same thing? I see a problem with that.

Ms. Carpenter: There would be a lot of things to work out in an interlocal. It would probably be part of the contract you would have to negotiate based on an interlocal where each will pay a pro-rated share. Lake Ashton I might pay more than Lake Ashton II on a per acre basis to make it work out as part of the interlocal or 50/50 or per acre on the lot, those are all things up in the air. Acreage, number of holes, etc. There are a number of ways to look at it.

Mr. Costello: Well if we are going to have an equal say in this, then I would think it should be 50/50 quite honestly. If we are going to pay more money, we should have a larger voting. I can't see it working otherwise. It should be a 50/50 split.

Mr. Williams: Maybe I am misunderstanding, but if we do nothing and tell him to go ahead and go out on market while we do due diligence or whatever we have to do, the cost could go up based on that?

Mr. Robertson: Yes.

Mr. Williams: If we decide to go forward we lock in that price, but as we do due diligence, our cost to do due diligence is going to go up. I don't know why.

Ms. Carpenter: It is really uncertain. Some real estate contracts will allow to carve out parties that you talk to before you sign a listing so the real estate broker may agree to not charge if the CDDs end up buying, but you don't know along the way. If they get a lot of interest, the price could go up. If they don't get any interest it could go down. It is really market-driven.

Mr. Williams: But if we go forward our cost is definitely going to go up.

Ms. Carpenter: If we enter into a contract, then we are obligated to do the due diligence and at the same time I would probably recommend going out for management bids for running things so you would have administrative and legal fees for those.

Ms. VanSickle: I asked a question before and I don't think I got an answer. This property is intertwined between the golf course and the CDD. I don't see how an outside buyer could buy it because we own parts of the golf course. I see that as a major issue.

Ms. Carpenter: That is one thing we thought of and I wasn't sure to bring up, we are concerned that if we buy the property there will be a lot of title issues and if a private owner buys it they can prohibit use of the golf cart paths. If a private owner buys it, they will have to come to the CDD because the CDD owns some portions. So we have some leverage to try to work to make the paths public or sell the lots or paths or do something.

Ms. VanSickle: It is my understanding and Doug mentioned it before, there are cart paths on private residents' property. That is another issue we need to look at.

Ms. Carpenter: I understand that there will be quite a few title issues for whoever the buyer is, whether it's the CDD or anyone else, but I think some of the property is CDD-owned so if the buyer does, the CDD will be involved and we will have some leverage to try to work on some of those things and come to some agreement.

Mr. Robertson: Back to the cart paths, although some of the cart paths are owned by CDD I more-so than CDD II, it was set up with easements in it already for the golf course. There is an easement already in place that says they are allowed to use the cart path for golf course operations.

Ms. Carpenter: I remember with the boat dock issues there were paths that didn't have them. I am not sure on the golf course.

Mr. Robertson: My understanding is that there are easements already in place to allow them to use those paths.

Ms. VanSickle: Wouldn't the CDD have a record of that? If it is our property and they have an easement for that, wouldn't we be aware of that?

Ms. Carpenter: It would be on the plat or in the title report. We can find out.

Ms. Pontious: Is the S.W.F.W.M.D. property part of the environmental study?

Ms. Carpenter: Yes. The District has permits on the stormwater ponds and I think we have easements on the ponds to maintain those, so there are easements we can access through the golf course to maintain the ponds. They wouldn't have to get it changed in the permits to own the golf course.

Ms. Pontious: I was thinking more in terms of if there are improprieties in the S.W.F.W.M.D. rules and regulations. We have had several come forward already with different things that they have told us they owned and can give to us, then we find out that they really don't own it to give to us. So I am concerned about the environmental issues and whether or not we are going to find bridges in improper places and if so we need to find out ahead of time because I can see major dollars needed.

Ms. Carpenter: That is actually a separate study. Environmental generally covers the pollution side of it. Because we have those ponds, it may be helpful to have the water management people do a study on those ponds and assess those and the locations.

Ms. Pontious: I think that needs to be a part of the plan.

Mr. Robertson: Our permits for the ponds are inspected every 18 months to 2 years. We are due for another inspection this fall and we were in compliance the last time around so we are actually in good standing right now. They are going to revisit them in the next month or so, though.

Ms. Carpenter: And we also want to have a building inspection on the building. The other concern we have is the lease for the golf cart storage. We don't really want for that to be assignable. That is just an interesting term to us because a private buyer would probably not agree to that so that is something of concern that if the Districts bought it, then it would be impossible to sell without a place to store the golf carts. So that is a constraint we have to make a contractual term that would be assignable or that we have the right of first refusal to buy or do something to make it a term that would be reasonable for the Districts.

Mr. Deane: That is the storage of the equipment to maintain the golf course. We have a separate area for golf cart storage. It is just for the equipment.

Mr. Robertson: The issue there is he suggested at one point a 99 year lease. I think the only sticking point on that would be if we were to buy the golf course and then close it down immediately, which is not logical, but would put them at risk of their \$9,200 for the unsold lots. So the only issue there is how do you assure them that we will have the golf course in operation until the seller of the property can realize the income from that? I think that's the biggest issue. Once we figure that out, there will be no restriction on the maintenance building.

Mr. d'Adesky: We requested multiple times at this point that.

Mr. Costello: He said he'd give us a contract stating as long as we were the owners of the golf course the rental agreement would stay in place with no increase in fees.

Mr. d'Adesky: I think Doug brought up the new home sales at purchase contract, and once again, I haven't seen that contract yet. That is a good point that they need to have that contractual obligation. So actually, they really couldn't close the golf course

until they fulfill that contractual obligation. And vice versa, they want a guarantee that we would keep it open.

Mr. Robertson: And that's why I said the only thing about the maintenance building in the lease is really just tied to if the golf course remains in operation and I can make my money, you need to give me another way of solving that problem and I will absolve you of any restriction on the lease. It is only to make sure we stay in operation until we are sold out, which I think everybody wants anyway, but they want it in a contract form.

Mr. Costello: Right now in order for us to get together something that we can present to them, what do we have to do? Do we have to go through this item by item in order to? We don't want to just send it back to them the way we sent it to them originally or we will receive the same red marked pages back that we received before. Do we want to go through this item by item to make a decision on what we are going to keep and what we are going to throw out so we can present it to them and then have the Boards vote or what?

Ms. Carpenter: I think you should make the decision on whether you want to go forward with presenting a contract now because I think it should be a legal contract with the terms included or at least a finding terms sheet and not just a proposal because now we are talking back and forth and the terms keep changing.

Mr. Costello: Then I think that we should go through this real thoroughly and decide what we are going to keep and what we are going to throw out, we will present it with the contract, and fortunately for us we have a meeting on October 15th and then at that meeting we will have to make a decision whether we are going to go forward with whatever they bring back to us.

Ms. Carpenter: When you present a contract, they could accept and then you are bound to it. You have to be prepared that they could sign it and say we have a deal.

Mr. Robertson: Yes. That is fine.

Mr. Costello: If they come back with it and at that point agree with what we are saying, we have no reason not to accept the contract. If they don't like it, they will argue the slightest little thing and we can say no.

Ms. Burns: I think the best course of action right now would be for each District to decide if they want to move forward with the terms of the contracts or not. If both Boards agree they want to go forward with the contract, then we go to offering the terms. But I think that Step 1 is going to be #1, if anyone wants to make a motion to move forward with the contract, or #2 if nobody wants to make such motion than we aren't going to be moving forward with the contract. I think we need both groups onboard if we are going offer a contract or not at all.

Mr. Robertson: A lot of people don't like the idea of the December 31st deadline. We could make a March 31st deadline, which would be more acceptable to everybody and we would recognize that as we do this, the price will go up a little bit because there will be a new tax year and to expect the selling party to absorb all of those costs is probably not reasonable and we will have to accept that we will be spending a little more money, which is okay. It is a pretty good deal in terms of the pricing, and six months is a lot of time to resolve any issues we want to have resolved.

Mr. Ference: The motion is very simple. We either move forward or not.

Mr. d'Adesky: Yes. The date of closing is a term.

Mr. Ference: So I make a motion that we do go forward and issues of which will come afterward, but the motion is very simple, we go forward or not, so I make a motion that we go forward with presenting a contract.

Mr. Ference moved to move forward with presenting a contract to buy the golf courses.

Ms. Pontious: I would like to discuss the context of what's good for us and what's good for the Maxwell Group. What's good for them is of no concern to us. We are here for our residents and our finances and that is the end of the discussion. So if we move forward, it needs to be with no penalties for getting out of this, for all of these things to

be done, either they give it to us, or we are going to pay have it done, but Mr. Maxwell and his taxes and all of this is none of our concern and we need to separate that from what we need to do to support our community.

Mr. Ference: It is very simple, do we go forward with the contract or not? The conditions of which will follow. Do I understand that correctly?

Ms. Burns: We have a motion from Bob. Does anybody on Lake Ashton I want to second it?

Mr. d'Adesky: Not hearing any, the motion will die for a lack of second.

Ms. Burns: We have no second. Motion dies for lack of second.

Ms. Carpenter: And I would just suggest that the next thing to look at is do you want to continue to consider the golf course and look into options while he is listing it or ask for him to potentially carve the Districts out from his listing contract, or do you want to just let it die for now and see what happens over the next couple months?

Mr. Costello: I make a motion that we continue forward looking at it, but not that we enter any kind of binding contract.

Mr. Deane: Second.

Mr. Costello moved to continue investigation of the golf course purchase and continue delegation of Supervisor Costello and Supervisor Mecsics to look into negotiations and authorize staff to do further research on operational costs and due diligence costs associated with the purchase of the golf courses, but not to enter into any binding contracts and the motion was seconded by Mr. Deane.

Ms. Burns: Motion from Mike, second from Borden. Any discussion on that?

Ms. VanSickle: We need to ask staff how this would go forward and what our costs would be. For me to vote yes on a contract, I need to know exactly what it is going to cost our residents. What is it going to cost us? Not we are going to project this but have a pretty accurate fee of what it will be now.

Ms. Carpenter: We can have one of our real estate paralegals go through and do a due diligence sheet so we can get some proposals for costs for surveys, environmental

studies, at least a range if not flat costs. I would also probably suggest that the Districts explore some management companies to be able to get a feel for how much it will really cost to have a professional management company come in and at that point you can get a pretty good idea of the costs.

Ms. VanSickle: That is what I want. To know what the expenses are.

Mr. Deane: That is what we need.

Mr. Costello: But unfortunately at this point even after talking to them, we are somewhat feeling blindsided on this. We don't need that. This could end up becoming a tragedy and we could end up with more problems than we ever anticipated so I think that is the right way to go right now. Let's have our people do what they can do.

Ms. Carpenter: And we will be happy to share with the manager to assist with keeping the costs lower for things like getting bids for building inspections and those kinds of things because that is time consuming and there could be some issues there also.

Ms. VanSickle: I think one thing that is very important we have the support of our residents because this is going to affect them. I know we have the responsibility for that vote, but I think we need to get their input on this. I know we had one meeting, but I think it needs to go further than that. This is major. We have never done anything this major before. Without the support of the community, I don't think that it is going to fly.

Mr. Costello: One of the first things we were told from another community that purchased their golf course about a year and a half ago was not to do it without the support of the community and to take your time, don't rush. We are being rushed.

Ms. Burns: I just want to let both Boards know that Jan's group charges by the hour and we charge a flat fee and since the work we have done to this point is well above and beyond the scope of the management contract and should we decide to go forward, we would present for authorization for additional funds towards the golf course purchase. Just so everybody is aware of that. There is going to be other staff fees involved, as well, like for the engineer if needed, but just so everyone is aware.

Mr. Williams: Did CDD I vote yet?

Mr. d'Adesky: No. They haven't taken a vote.

Ms. Burns: We have a motion and a second to continue to look into costs associated with the purchase of the golf course while the owner lists.

Ms. Carpenter: Are we continuing with the same delegated group to work with and answer questions?

Ms. VanSickle: I would like to suggest the same group because I think you have done an excellent job. Thank you Mike and Jim.

Mr. d'Adesky: That motion includes delegation? Mike and Borden, do you agree?

Mr. Costello: Yes.

Mr. Deane: Yes.

Ms. Burns: So we have a motion and second. All in favor?

On VOICE VOTE with all in favor the prior motion was approved.

Mr. Williams: I would like to make a motion that we join our colleagues for that endeavor and follow it just the way they have and have Jim and Mike work on that.

Mr. Williams moved to continue investigation of the golf course purchase and continue delegation of Supervisor Costello and Supervisor Mecsics to look into negotiations and authorize staff to do further research on operational costs and due diligence costs associated with the purchase of the golf courses, but not to enter into any binding contracts and the motion was seconded by Mr. Murphey.

Ms. Burns: Any discussion?

Mr. Robertson: Can you restate the motion?

Mr. d'Adesky: The motion was to continue investigation of the golf course purchase and continue delegation of Supervisor Costello and Supervisor Mecsics to look into negotiations and authorize staff to do further research into the operational costs and due diligence costs associated with the purchase of the golf courses.

Mr. Robertson: What is this going to cost us?

Ms. Carpenter: Probably around \$10,000 for each Board. Hopefully it will be less so that we can get proposals, costs, the terms sheet of what we believe appropriate terms will be. I think that will be close. There are probably contracts we would want to get proposals for to make sure you have an idea and good timeframe for the surveys, management companies, inspection contracts, etc. We need to find out how much all that is going to cost because it will certainly help with the price negotiation. The information they have is so old that it is really not usable to us. The reports are from 2008 and 2009. So that I would say it shouldn't be more than \$10,000 each and hopefully it will be less, but we won't know until we start talking to surveyors and the others. The surveyors are the most difficult right now to get information from.

Mr. Robertson: And what about GMS's price to do work on this?

Ms. Burns: We were proposing \$2,500 a month split between the two CDDs. Instead of doing an hourly fee we will use a flat fee for the Boards to consider. That is our proposal to work on this issue.

Mr. Robertson: For about six months because that is probably what it is going to take to do this? We just said it will be at least through the end of December.

Ms. Carpenter: We hope it will only take a month or two to get proposals so the Boards can make a decision as to what it will cost.

Mr. Costello: What extra is GMS having to do?

Ms. Burns: It is a lot of legwork with the contracts, committee meetings, conference calls that we have been a part of. We have had quite a few calls in the past two weeks and have spent several hours on the phone each time and coming here for additional meetings. There is a lot more going on than just the regular District management contract.

Mr. Mecsics: I think we have to go back to the seller and ask them if they will extend while we do our due diligence. That is still out there so I am just bringing this back to reality.

Ms. Carpenter: Our discussion with Lake Ashton was that we would go back and tell them the District is still interested and ask them to carve out the Districts from their

fees. They may say absolutely not, we are going to sell no matter what. We don't know what they are going to do.

Mr. Robertson: That is actually what they said that they were not going to do in prior discussions. They are not going to accept that as an option. So what we are looking at is spending \$26,000 to continue our investigation with no commitment from them to sell it to us at that point. So over the course of three months we may spend \$26,000 and have no idea if they will accept a contract at that point. That is what we are looking at.

Mr. Costello: I thought we were going to go back and present something to them. We do have a meeting on October 15th and we can see what happens around then.

Mr. d'Adesky: That is why I clarified regarding the delegation. The delegation allows Supervisor Costello and if approved Supervisor Mecsics to go back next week and try to schedule a meeting before the 15th with all of us in the room to try to negotiate that and see what we can do on that. At the same time, simultaneously we can do a lot of the work. Some of it is due diligence work that we have been doing regardless.

Mr. Robertson: What are the terms that we want to put in this so that we understand? What are some of the things we want to add to see if we have any hope of getting a contract?

Mr. d'Adesky: I think after this motion we were going to go through the terms to get the Board's feel about each term, go line-by-line through the term sheets. It is not very long. We can get a consensus. We can do that, or we don't have to.

Mr. Costello: Let's be honest. You don't buy something in this short amount of time. Prior to him accepting the contract, do you think we really should be doing any background work? I realize that a big part of it is the fact that we are so limited by time.

Ms. Carpenter: Yes, and this is a large purchase by two Boards. I think the basic terms have been somewhat laid out and the decision is are the Boards going to rush and put together a contract by the 15th without the complete knowledge of what it would cost to go forward or not. It sounds like Lake Ashton I made a decision to let's keep talking, tell them we are interested, and in the meantime we are working to get our proposals, costs, and are interested, so carve us out from this and hopefully we can get this ready to

go within the next month or so. In the meantime we will have to work out contractual terms based on what we know, and if questions come up and the folks want to meet together to weed out some of the issues, the delegation is there if there are any issues we think are pressing or they want pressed. The other part I hate to bring up, but it is going to be very important for the Boards to make a decision how they want to go forward together because it is impossible to figure out what the costs will be and how this will work without knowing if this is going to be 50/50, based on acreage, lot counts, etc. It all makes an impact on just about everyone. It is a pretty key issue. It is hard to know the costs until you know that. So you have a motion and have had discussions and it is a similar motion like Lake Ashton I to not present a contract today, but inform the seller that the Districts are interested and are moving forward to get the costs to be able to present a contract.

Mr. Robertson: One of the things is if in this process we come up with terms that are absolutely impossible we are going to spend around \$30,000 and he is going to say no again. Before we agree to spend that kind of money, I would like to know what the terms are. If the terms are something reasonable, then I would be willing to risk spending that money, but if the terms are so offline from what we think he might settle on, why would we spend any money at all? So the point is, if I knew the terms, and I thought the terms were reasonable, I would be much happier to spend \$13,000. I thought we were actually proceeding to a positive conclusion, but if we are just doing it as a delay factor, and just take the risk on somebody else buying it, why do we want to spend \$13,000 of our money for no reason? That is my perspective. So if we discuss the terms and get terms we like we can invest the money.

Mr. Mecsecs: Andrew, you said we have the terms right here and it is not a long list. I know folks are probably getting hungry, but we have the terms right here and we can discuss it.

Mr. d'Adesky: Does everyone have a copy? We can go through them.

Mr. Costello: They have a motion still.

Ms. Carpenter: Currently there is a motion and second so I think you should vote on that motion that you don't present a contract right now and go forward with gathering enough facts to be able to present a contract. If you want to present terms within a contract, that is a different motion.

Mr. Robertson: It is a different motion, but it would be more appropriate to discuss the other one first then we can have that motion. Do we want to withdraw the motion and reinstate it after we discuss the terms?

Ms. Carpenter: If Mr. Williams will withdraw his motion. That is up to him. There is a motion and second very similar motion to Lake Ashton I.

Mr. Williams: We spent \$30,000 on this NGF study that gave us some information. What this motion would do if we went forward with it, for probably around \$13,000 you get additional information. Frankly I think we should vote on it. I think we should join our colleagues and go along with them and be a community.

Mr. Robertson: Okay. We have a motion. All those favor?

On VOICE VOTE with all in favor the prior motion was approved.
--

Ms. Carpenter: I think we have good direction. Now the next issue before we go forward with talking any more details, and if the Boards want to talk more details on what the terms would be, the discussion of the relationship between the two Boards, if that is something that can be decided today, because that is a significant term in the work the manager put together on what the actual cost is going to be per resident. You have total costs and it really isn't possible to look at the issues per District.

Mr. Murphey: Are you talking about how to split them between the two CDDs? I think the only way to do it is per household. If you split it 50/50 then each household on the West is going to be paying a higher proportion than the people on the East.

Ms. Carpenter: The Boards can make the decision today, or we can present several options on what the cost will be based on 50/50 or acreage or lots. It is really up to the

Boards how they want to handle that. It is a pretty significant term in drafting the contract on how that will work.

Ms. Burns: If you'd like to see it both ways, I am happy to present it both ways.

Ms. Pontious: Well it is 50/50 or 60/40 or 41/59. It is not a significant difference.

Ms. VanSickle: If we did it by house number, we would be paying more for our golf course than they would be paying for their golf course so we would be paying a higher premium on ours. Am I understanding this correctly?

Ms. Carpenter: Yes. There are a lot of ways to look at it. We can bring up the purchase price on acreage, on the number of holes, on amenities, split the ongoing operations per lot. There are a lot of things to think about in the actual proration.

Mr. Costello: And the only thing there, if it isn't split 50/50 quite honestly shouldn't we have a higher say in what goes on? It should be a 50/50 split because in essence a lot of people from one side and from the other are going to be deciding which direction it should go.

Ms. Carpenter: An alternative also is can they be sold as two separate golf courses?

Mr. Deane: Part of the West's golf course is on Lake Wales property.

Ms. Carpenter: We are going to have to look at the surveys to resolve that. I guess it is not something the Boards can do now. We can present some different options, but it is something that needs to be decided really before you issue a contract because you cannot suddenly be bound to pay all of this money and not really know who is going to pay for what and how the relationship will work.

Mr. Robertson: If both Boards were combined at some point, you would have a higher operations and maintenance for one group for the West versus East if you don't do it by per lot. If you try to put the two Boards together, all the sudden you are representing everybody and the houses built in the West will have a higher operations and maintenance cost than the houses in the East based on a 50/50 split.

Ms. Carpenter: If you merged the Boards you could redo your assessment the way you have the interlocals and any relationship among the parties.

Mr. Robertson: So then the costs would go up for the East and the cost would go down for the West if we chose the 50/50 route.

Ms. Carpenter: I am not sure. Your administrative costs would certainly go down.

Mr. Robertson: We are talking about the golf operations.

Mr. Costello: Everything would be the same if it were per household.

Mr. Robertson: That is why I thought per household made sense, but if you say 50/50 then you are putting more of a burden on the West to pay for it than the East.

Mr. Williams: Didn't Jillian say she would look at it both ways and bring it back to us? Is it really necessary to debate this now?

Ms. Carpenter: Yes, and you may also want to look at acreage, so if for some reason there was a split at some point there would be an actual value for the purchase price versus acreage and operational by homes. There are a lot of different ways we can look at it and I know GMS has a lot of experience in assessments and we will look at the real estate part to come up with some options.

Mr. Williams: Then we don't need to discuss it any more. Let's wait until we get the information and then go from there.

Ms. Carpenter: Then I guess the last part, Mr. Robertson, you said you wanted to talk about terms. Did we want to discuss further the terms or continue them as they are?

Mr. Robertson: They are unacceptable as they are so we need to.

Mr. d'Adesky: We will start with the \$477,000 base price. So I think the thing that everyone commented on for this is the three year term for repayment and wanted it to go to 10 years. Can I get a general consensus on that?

Mr. Costello: How about we go to 6 years?

Ms. VanSickle: Are we talking an interest rate on this?

Mr. d'Adesky: It was presented with no interest.

Mr. Meccsics: We talked about 10. You start with 10, then if we have to fall back, we fall back. I would say 10, then negotiate and get some leeway down to 6.

Mr. d'Adesky: Are there any other objections or comments on the base price, the \$477,000 for fee simple? Not hearing any, with regards to the long term lease, I think one

thing Jan brought up, and I think we want to demand is assignable. Is everybody amenable to that change?

Ms. Carpenter: And perhaps we can agree to a two year or very short term to make sure that is not expected to continue further.

Mr. Robertson: Perhaps it should be like 5 years for the time the golf course expects to sell the property?

Ms. Carpenter: I would suggest that we agree to a year or two and see what comes back. The initial contractual term should be a short term. He is probably not going to like it, but again, we don't know what his real deal is. I would hate to negotiate something we may not have to.

Mr. Robertson: Can we give the negotiating group a range to work with? Maybe between 2 to 5 years?

Ms. Carpenter: He has come back and said unassignable so I think we should come back and say we will agree to 2 years and see what he comes back with. We are not presenting a contract at this point. This is just the terms sheet to see if we can get close enough by the next meeting to be able to understand.

Mr. Deane: I think that what he is looking for is the security to build all of the houses. So why don't we say to build all of the houses?

Ms. Carpenter: No, we don't want to do that if all of the houses aren't built within a certain timeframe so I don't think you want to be tied to that, at least not unless we know a little bit more.

Mr. d'Adesky: Next is a bigger one, which is the membership fees. The 50/50 split of the membership fees.

Ms. VanSickle: No.

Mr. Deane: No.

Mr. d'Adesky: We want all of the membership fees?

Mr. Costello: Pro-rated at the time of closing. Whatever it is, that is what they would keep. Anything beyond that is ours. We need operating capital.

Mr. d'Adesky: Okay, so 100% of the pro-rated membership fees. The next one is the date of closing.

Mr. Deane: Negotiable.

Mr. d'Adesky: Do we want to set a minimum? Doug had mentioned the 31st.

Mr. Robertson: I said March 31st.

Ms. Carpenter: Yes, 120-180 days is reasonable.

Mr. d'Adesky: The next one is paying all of the assessment fees. I think he has agreed to that, city, county, local, HOA, O&M, bond debt. At this point he has agreed to pay the bond debt conditioned upon us 50/50 splitting the membership fees, so would you want us to come back and say no, we want you to give us the membership fees and pay the bond debt and not be flexible at all?

Ms. Pontious: Because we know he is still getting the \$10,000 per house.

Ms. Carpenter: As a part of the bond debt, one thing we will need to do is check when the bonds were refunded on both sides, there are restrictions on other financing. We have to look more carefully now at that language to see if we have to get bondholder consent to acquire the golf course and enter into any transaction. So we will explore that at the same time we can explore to see if there are any options on the bond debt.

Mr. Robertson: Is that restriction on CDD I only?

Ms. Carpenter: I think almost every set of bond documents includes that you can't have any other financing without their approval if the Districts are going to owe any money to the purchaser.

Mr. Robertson: If we acquire another asset what happens? Are we allowed to?

Ms. Carpenter: If you paid cash out of your operating expenses, then yes.

Mr. d'Adesky: If you would still owe money after closing, that is the debt.

Mr. Robertson: I understand that it is the indebtedness, but there is also an asset there as well. You can say I am indebted for \$200,000 for a \$1 million asset.

Ms. Carpenter: But if they foreclose, they won't get the golf course because that is not covered by the assessments because those will pay off and they will not be getting the benefit of it. We just wanted to tell you that because we have to look at the language

and make sure if we have to get the consensus that we do start that process because it is time-consuming.

Mr. d'Adesky: The next one is survey and title. They agreed to provide the title by a reputable national company, First American I believe. It has satisfied everything to our satisfaction. The survey, normally with typical commercial transactions, it requires a survey. So that will be proposed going forward. We also will be paying for the environmental study. They can provide us with an older updated one that will help with getting the current one quicker, but we are still going to have to pay for that to be done. We need a new one because it is too old.

Ms. VanSickle: How much is it going to cost?

Ms. Carpenter: That is one of the things we need to get pricing on. We need building inspections and additional reports to determine costs of anything else we are not aware of.

Mr. d'Adesky: Next was member retention information. They said they only had it for the last two and a half years. Are you comfortable with that?

Mr. Deane: No.

Mr. d'Adesky: We can ask for more.

Mr. Robertson: You would have to go back to the developer from Mark Schreiber's side and get information from him. He retained that information.

Mr. d'Adesky: We will try to see what they can provide us with, the seller to pay off the equipment contracts and transfer all of the equipment. The next one is a big one. The upfront payment of \$240,000 to satisfy the free golf requirement whereby we would be required to provide any new home purchaser with free golf for a year in exchange for a one-time upfront payment.

Ms. VanSickle: I think we need to have some sort of time limit on that. It could be dangerous if we find out we are continuing to lose half a million dollars on the golf course a year we might have to make some changes. This might pull us into a contract where we can't make those changes.

Mr. d'Adesky: So maybe a 3 year time limit?

Ms. VanSickle: Maybe 2?

Mr. d'Adesky: Start with 2 and if they don't agree to that, come back?

Mr. Costello: One of the things they have to remember is by them giving away a free membership it does entice people to join the golf course. People like Stan for example, who said he never golfed before he came down here, he started golfing and all the sudden he is a member. So you do have to remember that by giving it 3 years, you are taking the chance that you may have somebody golf here for 10.

Ms. Pontious: What about changing from a year to 3 or 4 months?

Mr. d'Adesky: No, because that is their contractual obligation. They are trying to have us assume their contractual obligation. They are trying to make sure that their obligations are fulfilled so they can still collect on that.

Mr. Murphey: How did they come up with \$4,000 per membership?

Mr. Robertson: That is the average membership.

Ms. Pontious: We have a single sitting behind you saying she has paid more than that.

Mr. Costello: Yes. I paid around \$4,200 with tax.

Mr. Murphey: I don't like this provision at all. He is still collecting \$1.8 million for those lots.

Mr. d'Adesky: I will say the justification is and this was expressed at our meetings, they have said we are getting a reduced purchase price that is offset.

Mr. Murphey: It is in his best interest if we do buy this course for us to keep it in good shape if he is offering people free memberships so it is actually worth something. I think he is getting off lightly there.

Mr. Mecsecs: We do have a builder here that does have a vested interest and while that \$10,000 or whatever that amount is, that is between him and Mr. Maxwell, maybe there needs to be some discussion between the Boards and Mr. Schreiber saying we need some backup here, what can you do to help us.

Ms. Carpenter: That is part of the due diligence and I was planning to try to reach him to see if I can do that.

Mr. d'Adesky: So to be clear, the direction is to ask for a 2 or 3 year limit on that particular item. The next one is to provide copies of current membership information. We are going to get that since he already agreed to that. The next one is to provide all existing appraisals for the property, which he also agreed to do. The next one is to provide all of the copies of permits, licenses, and other authority governing the golf club and for them to pay for all of the transferring permits, which was also agreed upon. The last one is to provide copies of all of the contracts, leases, and any other agreements that will need to be assigned. That is it.

Mr. Robertson: Okay, so this is going to be presented to negotiation within the next 10 days?

Mr. d'Adesky: I will send it as soon as I get back to the office. I will send an email to their attorney and get it going.

Ms. Carpenter: We will put together the revised term sheet, have Mr. Mecsics and Mr. Costello review it, and once it is okay, we will tell them on Monday that we are interested, we are not ready to present a contract, but we are working towards terms for the Boards to agree at their next earliest meeting.

Mr. Costello: And prior to any agreement, you are not going to start any of the work, are you?

Ms. Carpenter: We will go ahead and get the costs for you so when you are deciding whether you want to present a contract with these terms, you will know what the cost is really going to be and you can decide how to proceed.

Mr. Robertson: What happens if in this process of the next 10 days and he says no and that he is going to sell it to someone else? Are we still going to spend the \$26,000? If he says no, those are unacceptable, do we continue to spend the \$26,000?

Mr. d'Adesky: No. We wouldn't do more work if it is clear to everybody to not proceed. Of course not.

Mr. Robertson: That was my point originally that I don't want to spend \$26,000 if he says thank you very much, I am going to sell it to someone else. We will cease any of those costs, right?

Mr. d'Adesky: Right.

Ms. VanSickle: However, if he does show interest in this, before we approve an actual contract I would want some of these other considerations taken care of. How do we do that?

Mr. Meccsics: That is part of the negotiations.

Ms. VanSickle: Okay, that's what I would need. Thank you.

Mr. Ference: Is there any other business that needs to be discussed?

Ms. Burns: Do we want to set another joint meeting? We can always cancel it if we don't need it, but we should get that coordinated because we will need to advertise.

Mr. Costello: We have a meeting on the 15th.

Ms. Burns: We can't advertise for a joint meeting on the 15th. It is too late to get an ad in by Monday.

Mr. Robertson: We can continue this meeting. We can legally continue the meeting to the 15th or another date. We just need to select when now so the public knows.

Mr. Deane: That is true.

Ms. Carpenter: The 15th is not a very long timeframe to be able to get proposals for costs for title and survey. I don't think we can reasonably if we are going forward have a good cost and get those so quickly.

Mr. Robertson: I am not suggesting it has to be the 15th. I am saying we can continue this meeting to a date of whenever it is convenient for us and to have all of that.

Ms. Burns: I think if we are not trying to get something under the advertising deadline I think staff's recommendation would be to advertise the new meeting, as we have time to advertise. It is a big issue. If it is beyond the 15th we will have enough time to advertise a new meeting.

Mr. Deane: Then we have to pick a date.

Ms. Carpenter: October 22nd or 29th? Those are Mondays. The 29th would probably be better. It is the 5th so that would give us 3 weeks.

Mr. Williams: I am not here on the 22nd.

Ms. Carpenter: The 29th perhaps? That shows good faith that we are trying to get this thing wrapped up, the contract issue by the end of October.

Mr. Deane: So can we make it the 29th after Monday Morning Coffee?

Ms. Burns: Christine, does that work?

Ms. Wells: Yes.

Ms. Burns: So 10:00 a.m. on October 29th. We will advertise for that joint meeting.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Supervisor Requests and General Public Comments

Mr. Robertson: We will invite Supervisor Requests and General Public Comments.

A resident: I have a question for attorneys. How many CDDs do you operate with that have golf courses?

Mr. d'Adesky: That have them or own them?

A resident: Own them.

Ms. Carpenter: They are suggesting we take comments and answer the questions at the end.

A resident: Okay. My comment is there are 1,172 CDDs in the state of Florida. In a handful, and I don't know if that handful is 5 or 10, the first thing I want to say is that I am in favor of buying the golf courses, but I am not so sure I am in favor of buying the golf course by the CDD. The reason being is that tax dollars. Regardless of what happens, we are responsible for those tax dollars. We can't even agree, as you can see at this meeting today, so there has to be another way of doing this. I think moving forward to finding out what the ownership wants is one thing, but we don't even have a plan even if we get that back, how will we run the golf course? Are you going to lease it out to a golf management company? Are we going to have a Board of Governors? How are we going to do it? I think while we are looking at ways of buying it, I think we need to look at the ways of how we are going to spend our money operating it. I think we have to come together with those two plans at the same time. Then we can move forward. And if it comes out that the CDD proves that we can operate without upping assessments, let's look at it and present a contract. I have heard from one member here today that I don't

know if he represents the CDD, the neighborhood, or Mr. Maxwell, and I am not comfortable with that so I would like everybody to understand, let's move forward, let's do the investigation, but let's not spend another penny because I think the NGF report was not right. They didn't even look at or examine the water systems. The water system is 15 years old and about ready to burst. That is from experience of living on five golf courses in the state of Florida. That is a lot of money. They didn't even inspect the soil samples the University of Florida Agricultural Department provided to find out what we need to do with the greens in the very near future. Those are the things that need to be answered. Those are things that get expensive. I appreciate everybody's work. I definitely appreciate Jim Mecsics and Mike Costello getting involved in this situation, and the attorneys and the rest of staff and their time, but please let's make sure when we get together how we are going to buy it and operate it at the same time and where is the membership coming from. Mr. Robertson quoted the NGF report, but he didn't give the whole truth. NGF said it looks like it operates successfully.

Ms. Burns: That was 3 minutes.

A resident: Thank you. Let me just say to Brenda and all of those who are concerned about doing our due diligence. I 100% agree with you. Carla is right. I am in favor of the golf course, but we should not do it if it is not the fiscally responsible thing to do. I want to talk about the short timeline. You can go back to the first joint meeting in February, the joint meeting in May, and the joint meeting in August, and the same discussion points were made by everybody at this table and we have made no movement towards a decision. So now we are coming up at the 11th hour so I would ask how many meetings did the lawyers and our people meet with Mr. Maxwell's group? I assumed from the discussions it was once. There has been no dialogue, no back and forth. We are going into this with, accept it for a discount. We needed to go in with a position that these Boards in almost a year should have come up with a position that was acceptable to us and so whatever it is, we met for more than 2 hours today talking about the world and in 20 minutes you solved what was acceptable to the Board members here. In agreement of those things and new members, rather than 30% or 60% or whatever, I

would say be a cost certain, you pick the number, be it \$3,000 a home, \$2,000 a home, \$5,000 a home, whatever, and get your money upfront. That gives you an additional \$300,000 in your pockets because you are betting against people not joining. Bet against people joining is all I would say. Thank you.

Mr. Tom Scali: I just have a question on the taxes. If we were to purchase the course, because we are CDDs, are we liable for any state taxes or any taxes?

Ms. Burns: We will address all of the questions at the end. You have 3 minutes to ask questions if you have any others.

Mr. Scali: Okay. If we are not, which I believe we aren't but I don't know for a fact, then this whole issue of December 31st becomes our review because when we do take title, then the developer only has to pay that percentage and it is not \$300,000 or \$250,000. It is significantly less than that. So please keep that in mind when negotiating.

Mr. Steve Realmuto: I was glad to see the Boards give the management company direction to investigate and present the different options with regards to how this will be paid for between the two Districts. It is my understanding that the two options are by number of lots or 50/50. I would like to know if that is correct when you answer questions, but how you pay for it is only half of the equation. Personally I can live with either of those, provided, and this is a big if, if the ownership interests were proportional to how you were paying for it. So that is saying if you decide to do it by lot, then the ownership interest of each District should be proportional to that so that if you went with per lot, CDD I would own the greater portion of it than CDD II. On the other hand, if you went 50/50, each would own 50% of the assets regardless of which side they are on. That is important to point out because Eagle's Nest is entirely in CDD II and also the voting interests should be proportional to the payment. So those need to go together. I can live with either of those, but you have to make the ownership interest and voting interest proportional to those. Moving forward, you are going to need to decide. It might be simpler for each CDD to simply pay for it and own the golf course, or if you want to make this one community you need to look at a way of owning it jointly and not necessarily each CDD owning the piece that happens to be on its side. Perhaps you need

to form a separate corporation to hold it in the same proportion as you pay for it. So please consider this as you move forward as you present those options and I will be looking to see how that gets assigned. Thank you.

Mr. John Velebir: I am not opposed to owning the golf course. In fact I think Bob Zelazny makes a great point that it would be great to control that 200 acres of land and be able to do whatever we want to. The fact that it is operating as a golf course now provides some income stream to offset the operations costs. What concerns me is that we are just rushing along here, even though you have been doing this for like a year. I am not opposed to owning the golf course. What I am opposed to is rushing through this thing, taking it on when we don't have any real idea beyond the purchase price of what it is going to cost us. We don't know the cost of the operations and everything else. Yes, there is a ticking time bomb out there for assessments. There is a community over here that just had assessments of a million dollars to operate the irrigation system, which you need for the golf course. I would just like to see a plan as to how we are going to do this, how we afford to buy it, how we afford to operate, what the plan is. What does rushing headlong into this thing do for us? I cannot believe one single person up there would do this with their own money. It is other people's money. Jim said I am a risk manager. This is other people's money, though. I can't believe anybody up here would spend their own money as recklessly as what I see you proposing.

Mr. John Castelli: I am not in favor of buying the golf course. We have 75% of the people here in Lake Ashton up in age. Most of them can't play golf and most of them don't want to play golf. I don't think we should be forced into paying for this for the people who want to play golf. People who want to play golf spend \$5,000 a year to play golf. They can golf anywhere. If someone does buy this golf course, more power to them. This just boggles my mind and I am afraid because if we do go into this, you are going to assess me up the nose where I will need to sell my house. Everything keeps going up. You think running this golf course is high now? In a year or two it will be even more because you have so many unknowns. You don't even know what you are dealing with.

And if you do buy it, you will have losses against you. With the residents here, you will have a lawsuit. Believe me, not everyone is interested in owning this golf course.

A resident: As I was listening today, I was making notes, so I am just going to give you my notes and you can figure it out as we go along. My first question was has a proforma ever been done? It seems like no and there are no answers to comment on money. I keep hearing the same thing over and over again, what is this going to cost us? It has not been answered. I get a lot of it could be this much or scare tactics and rush to judgement to make this purchase. I don't understand for all of the time that has been spent as of this last meeting with Mr. Maxwell, all the sudden he wants it done by October 31st. We have been talking to him for a long time, and now it is October and close by the end of the year.

Mr. Costello: We haven't spoken to him all that long. We spoke to him only 3 weeks ago. Everything else was through different residents who have spoken to people from the golf course, but actually sitting down and speaking with Mr. Maxwell and Mr. Lee, it only occurred with myself and Mr. Meccsics I think around September 24th. That was the only time we spent with them.

A resident: It sounded as if there had been conversations going on and now all the sudden it is just this once.

Mr. Costello: And you have to remember, I am sorry to interrupt, but I think everyone will agree that what we spoke about that day and the agreements that were made, had changed quite dramatically. So no, we are not trying to rush into it. He is trying to rush us through it. They are trying to push us through it. We are not trying to push doing it quickly.

A resident: That is not the feeling I was getting earlier in this meeting. It sounded as if oh my goodness we need to go through with this, ready, shoot, aim. That scared me.

Mr. Costello: Quite honestly I think maybe you misinterpreted some of that. It would be helpful if we had more time. He is trying to get rid of something that is costing him money. We are trying to look at it as how we could possibly buy it and at that point if we make money, great. If you look at some of the figures that were brought out today,

it is quite possible we might make this an asset. We don't know that this is going to be a deficit to us and I am sorry I ate up some of your time.

A resident: That is okay. If I misunderstood it, I misunderstood it, so thank you for the clarification. I agree that a lot of the same questions keep resurfacing and are not being answered.

Mr. Costello: We have been trying to get answers to the same questions.

A resident: This environmental study. Why are we paying for it? Why is it not included in whatever monies Mr. Maxwell may be getting per house? Typically when you are trying to sell a property you try to give your buyer as much information as possible. It seems like we are absorbing an awful lot of costs from Mr. Maxwell. If they put the golf courses on the market, are they such a hot ticket that he is going to have a rush of people coming in? I don't think so. I am not a golfer and when I first came to this meeting, I thought I understood after all of the conversations that yes, we should buy it for our own benefit. Today, I am not sure where I stand anymore. I don't have any answers. I feel like I know less now than I did coming in the door today. That bothers me. At one point I thought okay, let's do this, it makes sense, but I am not so sure now. I am also concerned about the idea of 50/50 or whatever. That is why we have the electoral college so California can't decide what the rest of the country is going to do and somehow we need to figure out how to do this so everybody has a say.

Ms. Carol Rowe: 1053 Sawgrass. I have lived in Lake Ashton for almost a year and when I bought my home it had this amazing greenspace. I don't play golf, but I do use that greenspace. When the golfers aren't out there I use my golf cart and take my daughters for a little drive. I think it is supremely important that we own that land. I am happy for it to be a golf course, other than that I really think it is an asset that I had when I bought in this community and I do not want to see somebody else have it and other residents here be denied the opportunity to use it unless we pay whatever the golf fee is. And I trust that the CDDs are doing an awesome job.

Mr. Williams: Anyone else?

Ms. Pontious: We have to provide answers.

Ms. Burns: The first question was how many Districts do we represent that have golf courses? GMS represents 3 that own golf courses right now and 1 that is considering and likely going to purchase it.

Ms. Carpenter: The ones we represent, we don't have any that the CDD owns it, but one has considered, projected the idea and it hasn't sold so it is still out there. The questions on the taxes, I think we answered that earlier. In Florida it is a case-by-case basis based on the county tax assessor. Governments generally are exempt from paying taxes, however if there is a question it is left to the county to decide whether amenities like golf courses and recreational facilities are actually governmental facilities and should not pay taxes. So it is uncertain. We had a lawsuit against the county appraiser for another amenity building to reduce the taxes to only the restaurant portion to be liable for taxes and the rest. So there is no certain area on that whether a golf course would be considered an amenity or if it would be looked at as a private facility. So I can't give an idea which way it would go or not. And just to respond to the other questions, I think the Districts have agreed to do pretty much what everyone has questioned, have some basic terms that have been bantered about. I think we finally have some actual terms to begin to look at and the Board directed us to go out there and get the costs for surveying and environmental and all of these various inspections. The costs they have offered to pay are the customary costs of the seller and commercial transaction in Florida. Unfortunately the purchaser is the one who pays for a majority of the inspections. That is very typical. We could ask, but it is probably not anything that they would sway on because it is not typical and anybody else would agree to pay those costs.

Mr. Robertson: I have a comment. With the golf course ponds that are within our permits, but within the golf course area, if they aren't maintaining them to the proper standards, what is our next recourse on that?

Ms. Carpenter: The District has easements so it is the District's responsibility to maintain those. The District will have to take on a vacancy of those if the golf course stops doing it.

Mr. Robertson: So they have no legal obligation to maintain the permits and ponds? They can just stop?

Ms. Pontious: If we don't like it we get to do it.

Ms. VanSickle: I would like to make one comment. A lady was concerned that we were moving forward with this. We are still looking into it. We are not entering into a contract. We are going to want to know what the costs are before we do it. Like I said earlier, if we do this, we have got to have the community's support just like whatever else we do. Like Mike said it was recommended by another community that did that. I wouldn't be willing to move forward on this until we had that. When I asked Jillian about how many CDDs that own golf courses are making money or losing money? She is checking into those figures for us, but I believe they are losing. This is important information. We need to know if we are going to do this how we are going to do it and we can't do it on the weight of everybody's back. I can see a small nominal fee per resident because we all enjoy how beautiful it is. We enjoy using the golf carts, but I think the golf course for the most part should be able to pay for itself.

Ms. Burns: Before we adjourn real quick I think we need to make a decision if we are going to continue this one? I think we are going to go right into Lake Ashton II's meeting since it is already past time for that.

Mr. Robertson: We will take a 10 minute break then we will have the CDD meeting. We will reconvene at 12:37 p.m.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

There not being any further business to discuss,

On MOTION by Mr. Ference seconded by Mr. Deane with all in favor the meeting was adjourned.

Assistant Secretary/Secretary

Chairman/ Vice Chairman

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

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Lake Ashton Community Development District was held on Monday, October 15, 2018 at 10:30 a.m. at the Lake Ashton Clubhouse Ballroom, 4141 Ashton Club Drive, Lakes Wales, Florida 33859.

Present and constituting a quorum:

Carol Pontious	Chairman
Borden Deane	Vice Chairman
Brenda VanSickle	Assistant Secretary
Bob Ference	Assistant Secretary
Mike Costello	Assistant Secretary

Also present:

Jillian Burns	District Manager
Jan Carpenter	District Counsel
Andrew d'Adesky	District Counsel
Rey Malave	District Engineer (by phone)
Christine Wells	Community Director
Matt Fisher	Field Operations Manager
Numerous residents	

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call and Pledge of Allegiance

Ms. Burns called the roll and established a quorum was present and Ms. Pontious led the pledge of allegiance.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments on Specific Items on the Agenda *(speakers will fill out a card and submit it to the District Manager prior to beginning of the meeting)*

Ms. Pontious: We have public comments next for items that are on the agenda.

Ms. VanSickle: Carol, can I make a request also? There is one request that is not on the agenda but I think the Board would agree I would let him to be allowed to go ahead and speak in the beginning. Let the others go first.

Ms. Pontious: Ok. Do we need a vote or a hands up? Do we want to take a comment not on the agenda?

Mr. Deane: Doesn't make any difference.

Mr. d'Adesky: If we ever do any modifications to public comment it has to be uniform so if we are changing it for one person we would have to say anybody who wants to make a comment.

Mr. Deane: Exactly.

Ms. VanSickle: I would add that I wanted to put this on the agenda but since it was last minute we are going this route. I agree if anyone was to speak on this topic they would be allowed to also. The topic is the golf course. So if anyone else was waiting to the end to give us comment about that they may also speak in the beginning.

Ms. Pontious: I also have one from Jack VanSickle on 7A, the attorney's report.

Mr. VanSickle: It is a question for the attorney on last month's meeting.

Ms. Pontious: Ok.

Mr. Jack VanSickle: Jack VanSickle. Lot 573, 4060 Ashton Club Drive. My question is last meeting I asked the Board to consider sending a letter to the city to look into developing the sidewalks as the developer 15 years ago did give the city money to do that. They are starting on Thompson Nursery Road a repave. The development across the street is going to be putting in sidewalks. It is an opportune time to get sidewalks in front of our development that the developer paid for so we can ensure that maybe they will do something smart and tie all these together so we can eventually have a path from here up to the shopping area on 27. I don't know whether the comment that I made last month was ignored. It is on the agenda somewhere to be written. I am just trying to get a status. If there is a status or a plan to do that I would appreciate it. Thank you.

Mr. Deane: Jack, I have already spoken to one of the city administrators about it. They are aware of it. I am giving them a copy of the letter and I have asked them to put it in this year's program and for them to put the sidewalks in front of our development.

Mr. VanSickle: I appreciate that. I also talked to the city and unless they get something official it doesn't become a public record down there so it is just politicians

saying they are going to do something. I would like to have an official record down there so we do have traceability. That is all I am asking for.

Ms. Pontious: Do you have a comment?

Ms. Carpenter: Would you like us to follow-up and send the letter confirming? We will get with you to get the specifics.

Ms. Pontious: Tom Scali?

Mr. Scali: Tom Scali, 3884 Dunmore. You are going to be discussing the bocce courts this morning and I was hoping, in fact I am a little bit disappointed because I understand it is now going to be piecemeal rather than the complete repair as was promised in the June meeting. I understand that there are other things on the agenda but there was a commitment by the Board to complete. I was somewhat disappointed that it may not be completed. I would encourage the Board to do whatever it could. When we turned the bocce courts over we gave the committee over \$2,000. We didn't challenge how it was spent, we just gave it to you. We encouraged you to put lights in, which you did and you used some of that money to put lights around the pool, too. I am just saying please, those courts are in bad shape and they need to be repaired. Thank you.

Ms. Pontious: Thank you, Tom, and we will address that when we get to the bocce. Is there anyone else that wants to speak? Then the one that Brenda is referring to is Mr. John Costanza. He has some information about the golf course.

Mr. Costanza: John Costanza. The reason why I am here is to address the golf course evaluation and the evaluation in general. I do live here in Lake Ashton. Though my business background is I have owned a consulting company around the world with the headquarters out of Denver. Our European headquarters was in France. We had offices across the country, had consultants that were doing evaluations predominately in the manufacturing arena. I have done evaluations for hundreds of companies all around the world. So as far as my background is concerned I am also the author of the Quantum Leap which is in five languages sold around the world. I have been selected to be the person of the year by Odyssey of the Mind and I have also been nominated for a Nobel Prize in economics.

Mr. Costello: Excuse me, could you speak into the microphone?

Mr. Costanza: I am doing this predominately as a neighbor and a friend of a lot of people here in the community. My background is substantial in the world of manufacturing. I have taught and consulted in 51 countries around the world and I have done a lot of business in the industrial world. I said my Nobel Prize nomination came from the U.S. Congress for my contribution to the financial community. The evaluation here is my primary point in addressing this group. I have done evaluations of commercial business for a lot of years. When you do evaluations for a commercial business it is totally different. It is not personal. It is not an opinion. It is strictly numbers. You get to the numbers pretty fast. Evaluations in business in the commercial world are based upon earnings. When we do an evaluation of a business it doesn't make any difference if it is a manufacturing business, it is always based upon multiples of earnings. If you are making \$5,000,000 a year and you have been in business for a substantial period of time then you have a track record of growing it to get to that number. Then your business multiples are taken to an evaluation of somewhere between \$25,000,000 and \$40,000,000 if you are making \$5,000,000 a year. If it is \$1,000,000 that you are making you have a track record, then your evaluation goes to somewhere between \$5,000,000 and \$8,000,000. If you are losing money and you get a track record doing it then it gives you earnings of zero. It is negative earnings. As we all know any number multiplied times zero gives you the same answer. The evaluation of commercial property such as a golf course that loses money every year is zero.

Ms. VanSickle: He has given us his credentials and I asked him to do that because I wanted you to know where this information was coming from. I ask for the Board to extend his time.

Ms. Pontious: Yes.

Mr. Costanza: So the evaluation of this golf course issue, it has no commercial value. You can get into salvage value. When you buy a golf course typically you buy a golf course and you would have property around the golf course and you would use that property to develop. Lake Ashton Golf Course has done exactly that. They have done a

great job developing around the golf course. The golf course was a calling card to sell houses. They make their money on the golf course through the houses. So you know it is losing money every year they offset that by growth in their housing industry which is totally legitimate and totally great. I am very impressed by the developer for doing that. Also as a developer, any developer that goes into an area always puts a clause to get out of the development so when they are done with the development they have the right to leave. They also have the right to deed property back to the community. If I am a developer and I build a guard shack out there, I built it and paid for it and I have taxes associated to my guard shack. I move my sales office over here to the maintenance building. I need that to do my development but I don't expect to pay taxes on it when I no longer use it for developing. I have the right to deed it back to the property. I would deed it back to the property and say that guard shack is now yours. That sales office is now yours. You can tear it down or use it however you wish but it doesn't require me to stay here and pay taxes for the rest of my life for something that no longer has value to it. I can totally understand why the developer would and should be wanting to deed to you the golf course sales office or whatever it has that no longer has value after the sales process. From an evaluation standpoint that evaluation that was done, that shot my dander up is an insult on the consulting world. I live in the consulting world. We have responsibility and we have liability. So if it gives a bad evaluation or I do something bad and you take my advice and you do what I tell you to do and lose money on it then you have loss. You have liability come back at you. No one in the consulting industry would put a value on a business based upon gross earnings. That is insanity. It is always on net earnings. Example, Sears Roebuck filed for bankrupt today. They are gross incoming millions of dollars every day. They filed for bankruptcy. They are not solvent. According to his evaluation they would be worth hundreds of millions of dollars. You never ever put a value based upon gross sales. That is incompetent. When we get into putting a value on the assets that are left that is where you would take a look at the facilities, the equipment and you start putting a value on that if you wish to break it up and sell the pieces off. We would offset our costs on acquisition by the value of whatever

you could sell off. Here you are not selling very much. You have equipment and that is about it. The golf course is already developed. You can't do types of things that you would typically do. If we bought it at a loss we would get our money back out of mineral rights, sold lots and property and get rid of equipment but there is no value there at this point in time. What it boils down to is the developer going to deed the property back to the development. It is the right thing to do. He should do it. We should take it. We may not even have a choice. That is a question for you legally. Do they have the right to deed it back to the property including the sales office, the guard shack and whatever else he has? As a developer I think he has that clause. He probably has that right and we should be ok with that. I talked to people that are in a community that have old golf courses and by the way I am a golfer. I would love for the golf course to stay but with a price sale attached to it, it is not worth buying the golf course to lose money. Taking it as a deeded property makes all the sense in the world. The only question should be for the powerful here is can we break even on it? I think that is a yes. I don't know if you would break even on two courses but you certainly can break even on one. There is a lot of discussion about some of the maintenance costs. The sprinkler system and those type of repairs that are in need by people in the community that know the golfing business not as a golfer but as a homeowner. As far as the right of developer to deed it to us we as a community should say yes we will take it. We don't have a choice but we will take it when you are done. As a developer, if I were developing and I had a losing proposition like the golf course I would try to tell you, you have to take it this month as a matter this week, as a matter of fact it has to be at the end of this meeting because I want to get rid of losing property if I can find some person to take it then more power to you as a sales person. I would assume our developer is a very good sales person and probably a very good developer. Buying it before they are done with it makes zero common sense because you at best can break even, more than likely you are going to lose money. So why would you want to lose money earlier as opposed to later. When they are done with it and they deed it to us, then we put together the budget and go after hard numbers. We figure out what the expenses are. How much are we paying for fertilizer? Can we get with three cutters,

not two cutters? Those discussions should be had at the point where you are ready to take deed. That certainly shouldn't be now. This pressure on picking up and buying it as quick as possible and all that kind of stuff is having a negative impact on the community. Rumors are flying all over the place. We have had good friends who have moved out because they are speculating that it is going to get so ugly. It shouldn't be ugly. It should be a very smooth thing. The golf course is currently in the developers hands. You have a handshake that says we are going to deed it to you and then the legal people get involved. Commercial evaluation and commercial selling when we actually decide to sell it and do all the paperwork that takes somewhere between six months to a year typically. The golf course is no minor discussion. Just surveying that so you can get an idea as to what the heck you are buying is going to take you some serious time. The paperwork that you are going to have to go through getting any of those commercial sales is horrendous and attorneys, you will be spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on legal fees for those types of things to get to the bottom of it. To say that you need to buy it now or by the end of the year is ridiculous. It is insane. It is part of the industry standard. I have done this for hundreds of companies. In the United States it is simpler than if you go to Europe where it is more bureaucratic. It takes years to get this stuff through. So the rush, stop it. From a creditability standpoint of the consultant, it is embarrassing to see a consultant create a document that says evaluation based upon gross sales. That is incompetent. As far as my credibility, I have been in this around the world for lots of companies. If someone were to hire me to do this I would take a look at the overview and synopsis of this thing and I wouldn't take the job. You don't need me. It is an evaluation of zero. The only other discussion is are you going to salvage it? It already has houses around it so that commercial value is gone. You don't need a consultant to write a fabulous report. It has no value. As far as time, and I hope I am slowing you guys down and my recommendation is real simple. Do nothing. Then if you want a handshake with your developer that you are going to deed it, no doubt then let's just talk about that time and you have a couple of years. There is no rush. Stop the vicious emails that are scaring people to get out of this community. As far as the actual

paperwork I would highly suggest you take at least a year no matter who tells you differently. I will tell you having done hundreds of these things, allow yourselves at least a year just to get the paper work from the legal shenanigans.

Ms. Pontious: Thank you, sir. We appreciate your credentials and your concerns. I am also very thankful that you were willing to bring expertise forward to us.

Mr. Ference: John, having said what you did, is there a danger near or not near as the developer's anxiety to be rid of the property would sell it to a third party?

Mr. Costanza: I hope and pray that he can find somebody that would pay to lose money every year and still continue to maintain the golf course. Nobody in their right mind would buy a losing property to lose money.

Mr. Ference: There are those people who would say we are going to open it up to the public. We are going to reduce our maintenance etc. etc. Might see it as a not for what it is, but for what it might be if they were to make some major changes like opening it up to the public, reduce fees etc. etc. Does that play into this at all?

Mr. Costanza: Do you have the right to limit interest in the ads to sell that gate first of all?

Mr. Deane: No.

Mr. Costanza: So that is a possibility that you could worry about. The second question is let's say they do that, are there any other golf courses around here in the community in the area here that already are currently doing that?

Mr. Deane: Yes.

Mr. Costanza: Are there any out in this community that have gone out of business?

Mr. Ference: Right absolutely.

Mr. Costanza: It has worked out very well for them right so as an investor if I were to come and buy your course, would I do my homework and at least ask that question. Can we get in? Yes, we can get in. Second of all, has anybody tried this before in the community? Yes. How are they doing? They all went out of business. That would be the end of that agenda item on the conversation of the Board. So if they were thinking about doing that why would you want to do it when you are going to lose money?

Mr. Ference: If the seller were to make the price right just to get out from under his tax liabilities somebody might think I will give it a try, what do I have to lose if I am getting it for little or nothing.

Mr. Costanza: To answer your question, if you got it for zero, nothing, then you still lose \$500,000 a year on day one. So at a Board level if somebody brought that up at a Board level they would have a hard time retaining their job after that conversation.

Mr. Ference: I was just looking at possibilities and that third party ownership is a possibility. I just thought I would bring it up to you sir.

Mr. Costanza: No one in their right mind would pay for it. If you gave it to me for nothing it has no value.

Mr. d'Adesky: We have to follow some of our public comments. If you could come up, Mr. Scali. At this point because we waived time for one individual, we have to apply that for all.

Mr. Scali: Thank you for taking your time and your expertise and sharing it with us. The question I have is if the developer continues to own and he continues to lose money his options are cut back on maintenance, cut back on a lot of things and by the time he gives it to us two and three years out, do we have a golf course or do we have just a grass field? In your opinion what is the right thing for us to do?

Mr. Costanza: The right thing to do for the community is to sit down and have a conversation with him about deeding it to us. The question is deeding it. That is the question that you should have. You have a couple of years to have that conversation starting today you have a couple of years to plan for that discussion. He still wants to maintain that golf course. He is not in the golf course business. He is here to sell houses.

Mr. Scali: I understand that but there is not much left. There are not that many lots left.

Mr. Deane: There are over 200 houses to be built.

Mr. Costanza: He is here to sell houses. If you have a civil conversation and say you are here to sell houses we understand that you are going to get out and have 200 lots left to go, can we have a discussion about the deeding and when that would happen?

Make a progression so you start getting out and we start getting in. At some point in time can we have control of the maintenance even though it is still your course until the day of deeding. Those are business discussions not personal. Just keep it at the business level. We are going to let you get out. We are going to take it on. This is how we are going to make that transition. You should be having that conversation today. You shouldn't be talking about throwing away \$500,000 so you can lose \$ 500,000 forever. We should be talking about when you deed it to us can we have a transition here where we take over ownership.

Mr. Scali: Do our attorneys agree with that?

Ms. Carpenter: We are in the middle of public comment. Is it ok from the Board for us to get into this now?

Mr. Costello: Quite honestly you, Andrew, Jill, myself and Mr. Mecsecs are still in the middle of talking with the developer. Until we are done to make any kind of comment I think would be overstepping the five of us plus the developer.

Ms. Carpenter: The only legal comment I will make is I don't believe there is anything in any documents requiring the developer to turn over the golf course when they leave. I have not read all the covenants and restrictions for that point. We haven't done research on that but that is not something under Florida law we have ever seen. Other than that, I agree I don't want to make any comment because it is probably not appropriate to put it out in public right now.

Mr. Costanza: The thing I want to say is it is not an issue of law. It is an issue that the developer has the rights. You can check your legal documentation on the corporation of this development and I highly encourage you to do so. It is not forcing him to turn the golf course over to anybody. The issue is does he have the right to deed it to you. That is not a force.

Mr. Costello: I do not know law, but I would imagine that you can give anything to anybody. Personally what is to stop me from gifting a million to Lake Ashton?

Ms. Burns: I think you are right, Mike, we probably shouldn't have a discussion of pros and cons. He has presented his opinion on his view of the report.

Mr. d'Adesky: Another important part is this is not an agenda item. This was not placed on the agenda or noticed. From this point the public comments have been received. If there is any written material we can take that and it becomes part of the public record when it is submitted.

Ms. Pontious: Alright, we'll save the further discussion from our representatives then at the next joint CDD meeting.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting held on September 14, 2018

Ms. Pontious: We have to look at the minutes from the September 14, 2018 meeting. Do we have any additions or corrections to those?

Mr. Deane: Motion to accept the minutes.

Mr. Costello: Second.

On MOTION BY Mr. Deane seconded by Mr. Costello with all in favor the Minutes of the September 14, 2018 Meeting were approved.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Engineers Report

Ms. Pontious: Ok we are ready for our engineer's report.

Mr. Malave: A couple of things from a memo that I wrote dated October 11 that follow up on four items that are in front of us and trying to provide responses to and direction. The first one, and one thing that I did not put on there for everybody's information was an issue brought up a few months ago about a lot that had drainage issues in the back. That permit was issued as the Board directed us to do, as well as their inspection. So that has been taken care of.

Ms. Burns: Rey, hold on one second.

Ms. Wells: He sent something to me, but I didn't know it was for the meeting. He didn't say it was for the meeting.

Ms. Burns: Sorry, Rey, we didn't print the memo. We can forward it to all of you after the meeting.

Mr. Malave: Basically it provided a couple of the facilities we expected to check. The first one is the inspection of the Waterford Drive where we had the stormwater pipe system that created a depression in the street and movement in the driveway of the residence. A few years back we repaired a hole that was in the pipe around this structure. There was no evidence of other issues in this roadway. Therefore that was the only thing that was repaired. One of the things that was done was a TV camera was put into the piping system to determine the damage to the pipe and what were the issues. Several hoses of the pipes were dislodged and not connecting. The same with the pipe connecting to the structure therefore showing why dirt and pavement was becoming depressed. Therefore that dictates when you should do some repairs. Summary of this basically shows two options that we can do. One option that was provided to us by the contractor, I assume you all have copies of the two proposals from All-Terrain. One of them is for using a liner within the pipe. We are looking at some options on how to get it repaired a less expensive way. The other one is the full open cut, redo the pipe and that was a lot more expensive. The concern that I believe the Board members and the residents had we believe that we probably should repair the pipe totally. The concern we have with using the liner is if there is any movement at the joint, will this liner be a problem in the future. So going back we would recommend going with the higher cost which would be replacing the entire pipe making sure it is stabilized and compacted. The price for that is approximately \$97,171.65. Any questions so far on that?

Mr. Deane: Rey, you are recommending the complete replacement of the pipe is that what I understand?

Mr. Malave: Yes. The liner, my concern is if there is some misalignment between the two pipes where they join at the joint, will this liner get some extra forces in there that could make it crack in the future, therefore we have a problem two, three or four years from now versus restoring and replacing it will give us a better feel that you won't have a problem in the future. Now the deterrent of this is it will be inconvenient to people who live there. There is a lot of equipment required, but we can work around that.

Mr. Deane: There is the time difference between the two of them also.

Mr. Ference: Rey, I see qualifications and exclusions. No permits, they are extra. No testing, that would be extra. Any work that is associated with it would be extra. So this \$97,000 looks like it is not the total. Of course we would want to have some testing done. We want to have permits drawn.

Mr. Malave: That is correct. We did not believe you wanted them to do the testing. We would get a firm that can verify the result for us. We envision that being in the level of approximately \$2,000 to \$3,000 worth of efforts for the compaction test. We don't believe that there should be anything else in there. I know they qualify contamination of soil and stuff like that. We don't believe that any of that will be there. The permit we are going to have to check with the city and that will be a fee that we will have to pay for that based on whatever the city will charge. We believe it is a repair maintenance issue but do not know what the permitting cost will be for that. We believe it should be nothing but until we go to the city we won't know.

Mr. Ference: Now bonds are not required are they, Rey?

Mr. Malave: Yes, they would have to provide a bond. That would be an additional cost also.

Mr. Ference: How much are we talking about?

Mr. Malave: For a couple hundred thousand it will probably be \$3,000 to \$4,000.

Mr. Ference: We added another \$5,000.

Mr. d'Adesky: The contractor usually pays for the bond.

Mr. Ference: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Malave: It will be part of his cost that he will pass it onto us.

Ms. VanSickle: Number one says there are no bonds included. If they are required there will be an additional cost. Then we are going to pay it.

Mr. Deane: We are looking at over \$100,000.

Mr. Ference: Already over \$100,000.

Mr. Malave: For sure.

Ms. VanSickle: Rey, my concern is this is one area that we have seen a problem with. I know we have had other areas in the community where we have seen indentations

in the roads, depressions near storm drains. Would that be the first sign of this occurring somewhere else?

Mr. Malave: No, I do not believe that any place else has had this issue. This big depression in front of structures previously, they were directly related and each structure had these little holes that are used to lift them up and lay them in the hole that they put them in. This particular structure which has not occurred in any of the other structures has been a place that has been unstable. We have had a split there already. Something like this hasn't shown up any place else. We believe this is an isolated location, nothing like the other areas that we have looked at.

Mr. Deane: So we are looking at around \$105,000 for the testing and the permits and everything else.

Ms. VanSickle: It looks like to me that we really don't have a choice.

Mr. Deane: We don't. Something has to be done. The homeowner has already said that he is thinking of contacting legal.

Mr. Ference: I just want to get real numbers that is all.

Mr. Malave: I totally agree. I think if we can get approval up to \$105,000 then we can finalize the contract that we use with them and see what the costs are. If it is more than \$105,000 then we will have to come back to you, but I believe it won't be higher than that based on previous contracts that we have had.

Mr. Deane: I make a motion that we approve up to \$110,000 to make these repairs.

Mr. Costello: Second.

Mr. Malave: Make a note on that including bond and permit.

Mr. Deane: Including all costs.

Mr. Ference: All costs if you run into any electrical associated with it etc. That is all costs, that \$110,000.

Mr. d'Adesky: Except for Rey's time.

Ms. VanSickle: Because it is something that needs to be taken care of right away if it should come in above that could we be notified to authorize more? I don't want to, I think you want to keep the price down, but I think it needs to be done.

Ms. Carpenter: Why don't you delegate authority to one Board member with the discretion to go up to \$110,000 but they are authorized to negotiate and sign the contract.

Mr. Costello: That should go to the Chairperson.

Ms. Carpenter: Borden, will you amend your motion to delegate authority to the Chairperson to sign the contract and if there is any minor overage or underage has the ability to do that?

Mr. Deane: So moved.

Mr. Costello: Second.

Ms. Pontious: We have a motion from Borden and a second from Mike to approve the full replacement not to exceed \$110,000 hopefully and if it does go over that we will review the expenditures and make a decision at that point.

Mr. Deane: The Chair will.

Ms. Pontious: Ok. All in favor?

On MOTION by Mr. Deane seconded by Mr. Costello with all in favor a not-to-exceed amount of \$110,000 for pipe repair including all costs with the Chairperson delegated to make any decisions should the expenditures exceed \$110,000 was approved.

Ms. Pontious: I think that is one of the things that we would like to do with this as quickly as possible, efficiently but quickly because we are just coming into the busy season when more people will be affected.

Mr. Malave: The next issue is Dunmore Drive. There was an issue regarding a depression in front of the manhole. We have looked at and again it is very similar to some of the previous repairs we have done along Dunmore Drive where the depression is directly associated with the holes within the structure. We would recommend repairing that just like we have done previously. The cost previously has been in the range of \$2,500 to \$3,500 depending on the area. We would get a final proposal from All-Terrain and bring it forward. The one we believe is not urgent as the way it is right now. So we'll get the proposal from the contractor to do that repair.

Ms. Pontious: There is a lot of mobilization money involved here so if we can have this done while they are here that would be the smart thing to do.

Mr. Malave: Yes and that is what we will try to do so we won't get another mobilization cost. We have done this before very similar and have costs from before so we can easily get them to say here is what you charged us before, add it to your current work on Waterford.

Ms. VanSickle: Rey, in the past there has been occasions where we have had work done and they have included minor things for nothing. Might you suggest that?

Mr. Malave: I agree. This one is a little bigger than some of the minor stuff that we have done before but we will work towards doing that and see if we can.

Mr. d'Adesky: We would propose to delegate the Chair to sign off on any expenses. Is there a motion to that effect?

Mr. Deane: So moved.

Ms. VanSickle: Second.

Ms. Pontious: We have a motion from Borden and a second from Brenda to proceed with the Dunmore depression repair, get estimates and move forward. Hopefully at the same time that they are working on Waterford.

On MOTION by Mr. Deane seconded by Ms. VanSickle with all in favor motion to proceed with the Dunmore depression repair, get estimates and to do the work at the same time as All-Terrain is doing Waterford repair was approved; and the Chair was delegated to sign off on any expenses.
--

Mr. Malave: Proceeding after the next one for Board approval was the damaging of the pool heater equipment which you already have in your package, proposals for the placement or movement of that equipment. The pool equipment area we already know that there is a replacement of the pool heating equipment in this area. One of the causes of the heating equipment to do badly was the flooding that occurred to it. In replacing the equipment we believe that we need to also regrade or provide some improvement to the area so it won't cause pool heating equipment to get flooded again. We are proposing

two recommendations. One that heating equipment be raised at least six inches from the current pad. It would be done as part of the improving of the new equipment. Also we are looking at the option of installing a drainage pipe that would relieve some of that runoff that goes into this area and basically floods there. Stays there. This would include drains, a length of pipe which is approximately 65 feet to do that. We are talking about \$5,000 to \$6,000 to be able to do that. It would take the cost of this equipment and protecting it. The minimum we would need to do is at least raise it the 6 inches which can be done with block and a little bit of concrete. We hope that the installer could probably give us a price for that. Having just looked at this last week I don't have any prices for it but it can also be added to getting a price from the contractor or whoever we select for the heating equipment. Questions?

Mr. Deane: We only need to do one, we don't necessarily need to do both, Rey?

Mr. Malave: Raising the equipment is definitely a must. The second one could probably be off to see how that works. Since we are spending a lot of money right now try to do that as part of our work next year.

Mr. Deane: Ok that sounds good.

Mr. Malave: The last is the clubhouse parking lot paving. There is a concern that we got on a west side. We are working with the contractor and the asphalt provider. We believe the asphalt provider provided a batch of asphalt that did not meet specifications. There is a meeting that was moved but is going to happen between the supplier and the contractor and staff to help get the work complete. What we are expecting and anticipating is milling and repaving that area so we end up with a product that we want.

Mr. Costello: Have we paid a bill on that yet?

Ms. Wells: No.

Mr. Deane: Hold it.

Mr. Malave: Don't pay anything on that until that happens. Payment should not occur until everything gets completed.

Mr. d'Adesky: To your satisfaction.

Mr. Malave: That is all I have. Anything else the Board might have or questions?

Mr. Ference: That is enough, Rey, thank you.

Mr. Malave: Sorry I am bringing more bad news. Everything else looks in really good shape with the rains. I am glad that we are not in the panhandle. We are in good shape. With that I thank you all. Talk to you all soon.

Ms. Pontious: Thank you, Rey.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Unfinished Business

A. Consideration of Janitorial Services Proposals

Ms. Pontious: We have been displeased for the last while here with our janitorial services so Christine has solicited some proposal from other vendors. I don't think we even want to maintain a proposal with these people. We have asked for help and tried to point out things on several occasions and it hasn't been improved much. We are going to look at some different proposals today.

Ms. Wells: We received four proposals back. We did send out five. One declined to respond just because of the scope of work. They didn't have the manpower to do it. I will just do these in alphabetical order. The first was Anago. They proposed a total of \$4,820 per month to perform the scope of services. The next one was Magic Genie. They proposed \$4,420 per month. Then we received, I just went out of order. We received one from CBM and they proposed \$3,700 per month. We received one from Service Master and it was \$3,030 per month. I did just a quick cost comparison. Currently we pay \$3,465 per month to Statewide. So if we went with the Service Master we would save \$435 per month, then a savings of \$5,220 per year. If we went with CBM it would be an increase of \$235 per month and \$2,820 per year. If we went with Magic Genie it would be an increase of \$955 per month or \$11,460 per year. If we went with Anago it would be an increase of \$1,355 per month or \$16,260 per year.

Mr. Ference: You evaluated their work and the discrepancy in price is over \$1,000 between Magic Genie and Service Master. Are they all providing the same service?

Ms. Wells: They are all providing the same services. They all did site inspections here so they have seen the facility. They provided all the requested services in their quote.

We checked references for all of them. Of course all the references came back great for all of the companies.

Mr. Ference: So the unit prices are a little less, is that how they get to numbers?

Ms. Wells: The only thing I could think of is hourly rates or it could just be volume of business.

Mr. Ference: But apples for apples?

Ms. Wells: They are all apples for apples. They all received the same RFP. They all received the same site inspection visit. We handed them a laminated copy of the scope of services that would be included in their contract. They provided a quote based on that.

Mr. Ference: I would tend for the cheapest price since it is equal to all the other apples in the basket. I say let's go with Service Master for \$3,030 a month. Why would we do anything less?

Mr. Deane: Are we sure of the people that rated their service? That is more important to me. The references, that is more important than anything else.

Mr. Ference: They all had fine references from what I can see.

Mr. Deane: Who is going to give you a bad reference?

Ms. Pontious: I think some of the places are an issue because they are dealing with a lot of medical facilities and those typically don't tolerate anything other than excellence.

Mr. Deane: Service Masters is doing a lot of medical facilities?

Ms. Wells: Yes. They had Florida Cancer Institute and Heartland for Children as part of their recommendations.

Mr. Costello: Would we have an out on any contract?

Mr. Deane: Yes 30 days.

Mr. d'Adesky: We always do it.

Mr. Costello: We have an out so worst case scenario we end up going with another company a month or two from now.

Mr. Deane: Bob made the motion, I will second it.

Ms. Pontious: We have a motion from Bob and a second from Borden to accept the agreement with Service Master. Any further discussion?

On MOTION by Mr. Ference seconded by Mr. Deane will all in favor proposal from Service Masters Commercial Services for \$3,030 per month for janitorial services was approved.

B. Consideration of Proposals for Bocce Court Paver Repairs

Ms. Pontious: We have some bocce pavers.

Ms. Wells: There was a capital project that was approved for refurbishing of the bocce ball courts. This is a just a piece of it. Just kind of knowing what was coming down the pipe with the storm water structure is why staff was recommending doing it in pieces. It is not that we are not going to plan on refurbishing the entire court but just to do it in phases just to keep mindful of budget monies. The first quote we received was from Freedom Brick Pavers to pull up existing pavers and to relay the existing pavers is \$3,325. We also received one from MJ Landscaping for the same scope of services. It was \$3,623.75. The final one received was from Unlimited Property Solutions and the total for that was \$3,750.

Mr. Deane: My question is why didn't we get a bid for all the work?

Ms. Wells: Staff was trying to do it in phases just so we don't spend all the money.

Mr. Deane: It seems to me it would cost twice more to do it in phases. Whenever I have tried before, unless we get it all done at once it is cheaper to do it that way.

Ms. Wells: It was really just going to be done in two phases. One was going to be the brick pavers and the rest was going to be the relaying of the carpet and all the repairs that needed to be done to the actual court. So it is really just in two phases, just take care of the pavers first.

Mr. Deane: It is different vendors then you are saying.

Ms. Wells: Yes, exactly. It wouldn't be the same vendor that would do all the work.

Mr. Deane: I understand.

Ms. Pontious: This is all labor work. We are going to take up our pavers and replace our pavers. We are going to pay to do that. I guess my question is Matt, how bad are they and are we better off to do the courts first so that the playing surfaces are better or is this a safety issue?

Mr. Fisher: The pavers are substantially separated on the southern side of the court. It a safety issue. It is a gap of about 4 inches and it is falling off. The concrete that supports those pavers has broken away thus the pavers are falling. I would recommend that just to avoid anybody causing a lawsuit. I can quickly get quotes on the carpet and installation no problem. Whichever direction the Board would like to take, but I recommend pavers first.

Ms. Pontious: Ok.

Mr. Ference: The difference between both quotes is that one charges \$350 per square foot and one charges \$375, so \$25 difference per square foot. They are doing the same work. I think we recommend that we take Freedom Brick for \$3,325 instead of \$3,750 since we are only talking about some labor costs, not any quality work difference just their per hour square foot work.

Mr. Fisher: Freedom has been given kudos by several residents so that is who we got our contact from.

Mr. Ference: I make a motion we accept Freedom's bid.

Ms. VanSickle: Second.

Ms. Pontious: We have a motion from Bob and a second from Brenda to accept the bid from Freedom Brick Pavers to repair our bocce courts. Any further discussion?

On MOTION by Mr. Ference seconded by Ms. VanSickle with all in favor proposal from Freedom Brick for \$3,325 to repair bocce court pavers was approved.

C. Consideration of Proposals for Pool Heaters

Ms. Pontious: Then we have this pool heater situation.

Ms. Wells: I sent a memo and quotes from three companies to the Board of Supervisors. Staff is seeking approval to purchase at least one propane pool heater for the clubhouse pool. As Rey mentioned our current propane heater is not working. It would cost approximately \$1,000 to \$2,000 to repair the current one. Two heaters were approved as part of the 2019 capital project so staff was moving forward to see if we could just get a new one approved versus investing money into one that is broken. Three

different propane heaters were sent in per quote. The Raypak Non Pro Series carries a one year manufacture warranty. That Raypak Pro Series and the Pentair brands both carry a three year manufacture warranty. The Raypak brand runs at about 85% efficiency and the Pentair brand runs at about 95% efficiency. A quote was received from Cool Breeze Pools. They submitted just one quote for Raypak Non Pro Series pool heater for \$3,795. It includes the removal of the existing propane heater and full installation. It is good to note since the other two did other pool heaters is that this is the only brand that the company installs so no other pool heaters were provided for that. Cool Breeze pools also did not provide a quote for the replacement of both heaters as it was not recommended by the company at this time. Three quotes were received from Heartland Pools. The first was for Raypak Non Pro Series propane heater. That cost was \$3,700. It includes releveled of the existing concrete pad, removal of the existing propane heater, installation and plumbing costs. They provided a second one for Raypak Pro Series. The cost of that heater was \$5,300, includes the releveled of the existing concrete pad, removal of the existing propane installation and plumbing. The final was for a Pentair which was \$9,750, includes a new concrete pad to accommodate a larger heater. Then as well as the removal of the existing installation and plumbing costs. They also said if Supervisors decided to replace the existing heat pump as well as the propane heater these prices would double and Heartland would offer a \$500 trade-in credit for the electric heat pump. There were again three quotes provided from Spies. The first was for the Raypak Pro Series propane heater and that was \$5,295, includes removal of the existing propane heater, installation and plumbing costs. The second was for Pentair propane heater and that was \$10,892 with the same inclusions. Then if Supervisors decide to replace the existing electric heat pump as well as the propane heater they included a quote for two Pentair heaters and it was \$19,992, included a removal, plumbing and installation costs.

Mr. Deane: What was budgeted for the new heater?

Ms. Wells: I believe it was \$20,000. It was replacing both of them, just to be more efficiently run. Right now we just have one that is broken. The propane heater. The heat pump does work. Right now we have a non-pro series Raypak. That is why I kind of did

it single propane heaters in case Supervisors given the money we spent with the engineer earlier, if we wanted to just replace the one propane heater with one that is more efficient than the one that we have now and wait to see about replacing the electric heat pump with a propane heater.

Mr. Costello: What is the age of the one that we are replacing?

Ms. Wells: I am not sure about that. I know it is a non-pro series. I am not sure. I know it has been here over five years. I am not sure when it was installed.

Mr. Fisher: It is a good five years old.

Mr. Costello: So we are saying five to seven years old, somewhere in there.

Mr. Fisher: Yes.

Ms. Wells: It could last longer once we get our issue. The issue with it was that water was flooding the wires and the wires were corroding.

Mr. Costello: We are in Florida. We think that the solar heat that we receive, I mean isn't it quite substantial that it heats the pool without these heaters?

Mr. Fisher: Solar is a benefit from the sun but gas heaters do play a deterrent role.

Mr. Costello: I am not telling you that we don't want to keep them because I don't want to see Brenda freezing in the pool.

Mr. Fisher: As far as replacing one I think that is what staff recommends now. One gas heater is down. We can replace it with a gas heater. The unit that is behind it is a HVAC unit that is an electric heater. It has been said to us by our pool vendor to adequately heat the pool he recommends two gas heaters. In that quote we provided a price to replace the electric heater in the back with another gas heater. We can see how the one works. It seems the Pentair has 95% efficiency rating. It is a bigger unit. It is a commercial unit. We may get by with one. We will have to see. What we know now is one is not working. I would say we just replace one gas heater now, raise the pad to get it out of the water when it rains and go from there.

Mr. Costello: How much of a detriment has it been with the padding now?

Mr. Fisher: The padding now when it rains it gets flooded back there.

Mr. Costello: We are going to make that repair before we put the new one down.

Mr. Fisher: I believe Heartland included that in their quote. They will take that work on to raise the pad up.

Ms. Pontious: We have three prices. A low, medium and a high. What are you recommending from a standpoint of efficiency versus money?

Mr. Fisher: From what I gather and Kevin is a reliable source of information and he does many properties. We reached out to Spies, who does a lot of GMS's Orlando properties, and they are reputable as well that both recommend Pentair as the high efficient unit. Even though it is costly, I believe it is going to benefit the pool just from what I have gathered from the vendors. The Raypak is a unit that Kevin wasn't familiar with. When you venture out to brands our vendors aren't familiar with, it becomes a maintenance pain in trying to get other vendors in to work on it rather than working with our contracted vendor. We sort of did that with our AC units.

Ms. VanSickle: It says if you go with a Pentair with Heartland the new concrete slab, would that include raising it the six inches?

Mr. Fisher: Yes that price is included they are going to raise it for us. Yes ma'am.

Mr. Costello: Now Rey had said we are going to need additional drainage on that area back there.

Mr. Fisher: That was another option if this raising is good and the pad keeps it out of the water during the next rain then maybe we can river rock down there.

Mr. Costello: We can raise and then see whether it is being effected by the drainage or the lack of drainage.

Mr. Fisher: Just to get it out of the water for now. We will see if it gets through.

Mr. Ference: Is it more economical to run a propane as opposed to gas?

Mr. Fisher: Propane is by far the more efficient to heating the pool. The Association has recommended 88 degrees. It is a struggle to keep that pool heated with those electric heaters. Those are in place to help cool the pool more than anything.

Mr. Deane: To cool the pool?

Mr. Fisher: Yes, to cool when you reach a certain degree it will go on. The gas units are ideal for winter months from November to late March.

Mr. Costello: How much of the time does it actually run to cool that pool?

Mr. Fisher: It runs pretty much from I would say about 10:00 till 4:00 and then it will shut off when it reaches the desired temp. It is constantly going with that equipment.

Ms. VanSickle: I think we need to concentrate on the heating part. I have to say that pool, if it is 90 - 92 degrees I am fine. There are people in the pool that say it gets too warm and have requested that it be cooled. My concern is also sometimes heating up to a certain temperature and cooling to a certain temperature that they work against each other. That is costing us more money. I am going to get into a lot of heat for this comment but I think we need to concentrate on the heating portion being cost effective.

Mr. Fisher: There are a lot of folks that have problems with joints that enjoy the pool for the warmth. When it gets above 90 that is a problem so we come out there three or four times a day checking that temp. Staff manages that equipment.

Mr. Deane: Matt, do you think that we need to do both heaters?

Mr. Fisher: Personally right now no. It was recommended, but let's do the Pentair with the higher efficiency rating and see how that does. Then we can approach it later. It benefits both ways.

Mr. Ference: I make that motion.

Ms. VanSickle: Second.

Ms. Pontious: We have a motion from Bob and second from Brenda to do with the Pentair Propane heater at a cost of \$9,750 from Heartland Pools.

On MOTION by Mr. Ference seconded by Ms. VanSickle with all in favor proposal from Heartland Pools for \$9,750 to install a Pentair Propane heater was approved.

Ms. Pontious: Thank you for all your work in putting these proposals together both of you. We appreciate that. Ok, I think we have spent enough money.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

New Business and Supervisor Requests

Ms. Pontious: Next on our agenda is any New Business and Supervisor Requests.

Ms. VanSickle: I have several Supervisor requests. At the joint meeting I asked Jill how many CDDs they had that managed golf courses and she told me several. I think there were three or four of them. I asked whether they were making money or losing money and I asked for her to send me that information. Very efficiently I had that very quickly. I thought the rest of the Board might want access to that information. It might be useful. She said that it went out, Darrin made this information, sent it out to previous members of the committee. I wasn't sure the old committee negotiating the golf course or the new one so I wasn't sure who had it. I wanted to formally request that go out.

Ms. Burns: We can send that to everybody.

Ms. VanSickle: There also lies my concern that it hadn't already gone out to everybody. I thought in the past that we all received the same information. That if one Supervisor requested information it was automatically sent to others and it was said per request by Supervisor you are receiving this information. I would like to see that continue. Some of these concerns I want to make clear they are just concerning our Board. The other Board may offer it differently than we do so that doesn't apply to them but as far as we are I have some concerns I am going to bring them forward and see if you all agree with me or not. I really don't want to be censoring information to Board members. I think we are entitled to all that is available. Another concern is I feel like some of the information is being withheld and yet it is out in the public. There is nothing more embarrassing than for me to be out and find out something that I should have been aware of that has been released to other sources. I think that is very important we all be kept aware. In the past when one Board member was designated to meet with someone such as Borden when he negotiated the restaurant contract, staff would write a brief summary to keep the rest of us informed. I know currently Mike and Jim are working on the golf course. I would like to see us get a summary of that from staff so we are up-to-date. Do you have a problem with that, Mike?

Mr. Costello: No.

Ms. VanSickle: The rest of the Board?

Mr. Deane: No.

Ms. VanSickle: Several times I have asked Christine stuff of recent something she is not being kept abreast of. I want to see Christine kept in the loop on all issues because if I go to Christine, she is my first contact for information. I know in the past that was done and I would like to see that continue. I know that there is certain things I need to go to District management or attorneys but I feel any emails that come to us Supervisors she should be copied on. This one is a stickler and Jan brought this up at the joint meeting. Staff and legal need to represent each client with the best interest of that client. If loyalties are divided I think they need to make a choice. Just because one Board operates one way and we operate differently I don't want to have to change our way of doing business. I don't think the way another Board operates should impact us.

Mr. Deane: Correct.

Ms. VanSickle: I think we should be able to freely discuss whatever we choose at our Board meetings in the best interest of our residents. I think we have had interruptions before when we have discussed things and I think we ought to be able to bring up whatever we want and Jan says that should be the case also. This last one, any Board member can request information be sent to other Board members for informational purposes between meetings without violating the Sunshine Laws, is that true?

Mr. d'Adesky: We have to review the information to make sure it doesn't contain comments, facts, any opinion that would violate the Sunshine Laws, which is why we have if you would like information distributed send it to Jill or us to take a look at it.

Ms. VanSickle: Exactly. I don't send it directly.

Mr. Costello: It would be wrong if I was to say something where my opinion was written. Facts are facts. Opinions are something that could sway a vote either way.

Ms. Carpenter: That is why we ask that it go through Jill or us just in case it is an article that appears factual but maybe there is an inclination towards an opinion. If we can look at it with a clear eye or Jill we can help decide, well maybe you better not send that one or sure we will forward it on to everybody.

Ms. VanSickle: My concern was over a document authored by I believe it was Darrin that I asked that had already been sent out to some Board members and I was

requesting between Board meetings that it go out to the others. There was a concern that it possibly being a violation of Sunshine because one Board member is requesting information to go out to the rest of the Board members. This is nothing I wrote. None of my opinions. Darrin had already sent it out to one Board member, why should I have to wait for a meeting to ask it to go out to all of them?

Ms. Burns: You would not have to unless there was something in there that someone asked for specifically to support their side or their opinion on something. I am not sure what the exact email was but not just anything should be sent to anyone.

Ms. VanSickle: I think information as long as it is fact should not be a problem for informational purposes. I have been told to operate on a level playing field and if there is any stuff that I am not aware of that might change my opinion but as long as it is fact going out that is not authored by one of us I don't see what the issue is.

Ms. Burns: To be clear you requested it on Thursday and what I said was the meeting is on Monday, let's be safe and make sure everyone wants the information so it was waiting two days. It wasn't an unwillingness to send the information.

Ms. VanSickle: My only concern was with the Sunshine thing because I take that very seriously.

Mr. d'Adesky: It is on a case by case basis so we would really have to look at what it is and once again the law is very conservative in terms of what is interpreted as opinion versus fact. If there is a question between the two they would probably look kindly on it being on Sunshine law being applicable versus not. So we tend to err on the side of caution and look at the information and really boil it down. Sometimes we will take information and summarize it or request it to be summarized by the District Manager so that it is purely factual information.

Ms. Carpenter: Just an example so you can see how tough it is sometimes to make a decision. If for example someone said GMS you represent golf courses and are they losing money. GMS said yes, the majority of ours are and they said good, send us that information. That might support a view where if you got the information you didn't understand it was just those particular courses or something so that is why we just ask to

be able to look at it first to make sure it's not supporting a position one way or the other or somehow having you vote for it having an explanation of what the request was. That is the only reason otherwise everything is free for everyone.

Ms. VanSickle: That information was basically facts and figures correct?

Ms. Burns: Correct.

Ms. VanSickle: The sign out front, did anybody ever address this? We were going to ask the HOA if we could add no soliciting to the bottom. Did that take place?

Ms. Wells: I have an email. I don't want to comment whether I sent it. It may still be in my draft to send to the Board of Directors. I missed their October meeting so I did talk to Bob and he said to send it to him for discussion at their next meeting. I do have an email but I think it may still be in my drafts to send to them to discuss at their November meeting.

Ms. VanSickle: I just wanted to make sure it didn't fall through the cracks. I think that is something we need to update. I think that is all I have. Thank you.

Mr. Costello: One of the things that I would like to do is and part of it comes from Jack VanSickle, some of the stuff that I have read is look into solar panels for the roof of this building. We pay out substantial amounts of money every month. If there is a grant out there maybe we can get a grant but it doesn't cost anything to investigate it. I think that it could probably be something that would come up in our favor as far as we can save. Christine what would our normal electric bill be for the month?

Ms. Wells: I am sorry I didn't bring it with me.

Ms. Pontious: It is about \$17,000.

Ms. Wells: I can look in the check run summary.

Mr. Costello: We are paying a lot of money. We have a lot of solar energy hitting this roof here. We could more or less bottle it and pay part of that bill, I think we could save substantial amounts of money. Like I said I spoke with the mayor from Lake Wales and he said they have a grant and we could contact them. If there is a grant out there which I would imagine there probably is because renewable energy is a very hot ticket

item right now. If we fall within the parameters of what is reasonable as far as accepting a grant I think that quite honestly we could save a substantial amount of money.

Ms. VanSickle: There is a community north of here called Trilogy that a lot of their houses has solar. That is the one thing they're pushing in the beginning and it was included in the price of the house. Now they have to pay for it but they have an investor. I am not sure how it works. I have not been able to get that information and I wish somebody could. They have an investor that is putting in a solar farm in the property across from the community. It is going to power their clubhouse. Their clubhouse is over two times bigger than this one. The way they are going to pay it back is they are going to pay what their normal electric would be and I believe it is five or seven years something along that and then it will be paid for. Then it is going to power their clubhouse, which sounds like a really wonderful idea, but I haven't been able to get that information.

Mr. Costello: Who was that?

Ms. VanSickle: It is Trilogy. It is north of Clermont. I called their HOA. Now my contact, my brother, is getting ready to move into that community so I am hoping that once he is there he can do a little bit more research for me. The solar farm I believe they were just starting to clear the area. It hasn't been installed yet. But if it is going to work for one community, I think there is about 900 houses.

Mr. Costello: Let's be honest this is the way of the future. I mean renewable energy didn't really come along in our earlier years but it is here now. I think that we should if we can cut the bill, let's cut the bill.

Ms. VanSickle: It doesn't hurt to investigate it.

Mr. Costello: It doesn't cost a lot.

Ms. Pontious: You have LEGOLAND too with their solar farm there.

Ms. VanSickle: Disney has put one in, too.

Mr. Costello: Like I said if we investigate to see if there is a grant out there because we are from what I understand are entitled to grants. I realize that some of the grants you don't want to take some of the stipulations that go along with the grants and are something that you don't want to be involved with. Quite honestly like Brenda said

investigating doesn't cost anything. If we could come up a winner in the long run I think it is the thing to do.

Ms. Pontious: We have investigated the installation of the solar a couple of times.

Mr. Costello: That was for the pool I thought.

Ms. Pontious: Well if you are going to do it for the pool, then you might as well also do it for everything else. The cost has just been so prohibitive so the grant idea would be wonderful.

Mr. Costello: Tricia looked into it. Wasn't that just for the pool?

Ms. Pontious: Probably was.

Mr. Costello: Like I said have we investigated grants? There is also a sell back on it. I mean we have extensive amount of roof on here. We may have to bite the bullet for a year but after that we may be paying half the price that we are paying now. To investigate it I don't think it is going to be the wrong thing to do.

Ms. Pontious: Is there anything else to discuss under New Business and Supervisor Requests?

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Monthly Reports

A. Attorney

Ms. Pontious: Attorney?

Mr. d'Adesky: Nothing other than the ongoing issues unless there are any questions that anyone would like to ask.

Ms. Pontious: I guess in the back of my mind I have a concern about how we are going to move forward with the golf course situation if our voting tends to be different from one CDD to the other. How does that affect the attorney issue?

Ms. Carpenter: As we noted at the last joint meeting and I think the meeting before that if the Districts become divergent when they get to the point they need to negotiate an interlocal there would have to be other counsel brought in. Again I don't want to put a whole lot on the record before we talk with the other. Given the way the last meeting was I sensed there may be some differences and at that point we would either have to resign or stay on and ask them to bring special counsel in to deal with these issues. I

think the time is coming very quickly that we need to do that. It does appear there were differences coming up at the last meeting.

Ms. Pontious: So you are on top of that and will let us know.

Ms. Carpenter: We have been very aware of it.

Mr. Costello: I was under the impression at the joint meeting that you said that if one CDD went one way and the other went the other way that whichever decided not to be involved would have to give permission to the other.

Ms. Carpenter: Yes. A CDD doesn't have authority of property outside of their boundaries so if one went forward and the other didn't, they would need an interlocal still. If the deal dies we are fine. If everybody goes forward we will need someone to assist with the interlocal agreement of how it will be put together. If one goes forward and the other does not, it is not the same case. We would need to have other attorneys involved. We have been talking about it since that meeting of how best to address it. I think the time is coming where we will have to resign from one or both CDDs because it appears there could be a divergence of opinion. Hopefully not, but there may be.

Ms. VanSickle: I guess my concern is after listening to John Costanza this morning, he has brought up some things that haven't entered my mind before like Mr. Maxwell would probably be interested in deeding it back to us when he was done selling houses. That was an issue I never thought before but makes perfect sense. How hard do we want to push forward on this? Do we want to spend a lot of money? We don't have any money.

Mr. Deane: We spent all our money today.

Ms. VanSickle: This might be an issue that is a non-starter for us.

Mr. Deane: I don't see how we can go ahead with purchasing any kind of golf course. That is my opinion. Mr. Maxwell has an agreement with Mr. Schreiber. He has to maintain the golf courses for the next three or four years till all the houses are built. What is the rush? If it is going to take three or four years to build the houses why are we even talking about purchasing the golf course?

Ms. VanSickle: I agree and I think people are worried that he won't maintain it. I think as long as it is a sales tool it is going to be maintained.

Mr. Deane: He has an agreement to maintain it.

Ms. VanSickle: Maybe we need to decide.

Ms. Pontious: We have a representative that is representing us and we have a meeting coming up so we will see what happens there.

B. Community Director - Monthly Report

Ms. Wells: A copy of the community director report was included in the agenda packet for Supervisors review. I don't have anything to point out but if you have any questions regarding that report?

Mr. Deane: No it was straight forward.

Ms. Wells: Thank you.

C. Field Operations Manager - Monthly Report

Ms. Pontious: Matt is next.

Mr. Fisher: Good morning again. I included in the agenda is the operations manager's report, I do have to point out that we are constantly battling the ponds on Berwick and Aberdeen. They are algae growing ponds for whatever reason and they have been since I have taken over. I am working with Applied Aquatic and Archie is telling me he is doing everything he can. He can't explain why they are growing algae at the rate this year that it is. He did try a different product and it just caused the blooms to be more. The algae blooms. He stopped that and in fact he has been treating with copper. He can only treat it with what the state allows. He did explain that oxygen levels are low in the ponds and he recently had a fish kill in another property and is dealing with the paperwork with that so he is a little tentative on treating our ponds right now particularly those two ponds with the recommended copper. He did treat a little bit of it because when you mix copper with oxygen it causes the fish to de cease. He is keeping an eye on that. Hopefully with the colder weather the algae will stop and we can look at preventative measures for next year during the rainy and sunny season. The public forester we did meet with the forester from Yellowstone to look at the medjool palms on the Boulevard. They haven't gotten me any prices or preventative maintenance measures yet. Chris ensures that I will have it by next meeting. So that is that. The trees are

scheduled to be cut down on the 17th. They will take on the traffic control. I will be out there. Other than that is there any questions?

Mr. Deane: Thank you for everything.

Mr. Fisher: There were some annuals that weren't thriving around the clubhouse. The truck was here to replace those red annuals that are in front of the yellow ones. I am not sure the name of them. They are replaced. The place is looking good.

Ms. VanSickle: We have some residents that tend to pull some of those out periodically. I noticed that.

D. CDD Manager

Ms. Pontious: Jill, do you have anything for us?

Ms. Burns: We have the joint meeting scheduled for October 29th at 10:00 in this building. That would be our next meeting. I will get all that information on the other GMS managed golf courses to the Board today. Other than that nothing to report unless anybody has any questions I would be glad to answer them.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Financial Reports

A. Approval of Check Run Summary

B. Combined Balance Sheet

Ms. Pontious: Did anyone find any questions in the check run summary?

Mr. Deane: Motion to accept.

Mr. Ference: Second.

Ms. Pontious: We have a motion from Borden and a second from Bob to accept the check run summary. All those in favor.

On MOTION by Mr. Deane seconded by Mr. Ference with all in favor the check run summary was approved.
--

Ms. Pontious: Would you like to talk to us about our combined balance sheet.

Ms. Burns: These are through August 31 so almost the end of our fiscal year. We will have the September ones out shortly. Nothing to point out. These are unaudited financials. If anybody has any questions I would be glad to answer them for you.

Ms. Pontious: Thank you, Jill.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments

Ms. Pontious: We are ready for audience comments.

Mr. VanSickle: Lot 573. I am a little concerned when I saw proposals come in for different pieces of work and haven't had disclaimers or it does not cover this and this. That puts a big burden on Supervisors to say we better add money to that proposal so we go forward. I think that we should be looking at proposals that cover the cost of the effort. That leads me into the next effort. The work that is going to be done on Waterford is \$97,000 of repair. Capital improvement budget, I couldn't get it up on my phone. I thought that was budgeted and we had \$25,000 for repairs. So we have a \$75,000 overrun into our current budget. Where is that coming from? Are you paying now for things that you are not going to be doing or are we just not going to do them? Budget looks like it is going to be very tricky this year and it is also projected to be less reserve money going forward then we planned. We are going to get pretty close to not having any reserve funds. It is a concern.

Ms. June Young: Good morning. First of all I would like to thank you for changing your meeting time to 10:30, it suits me just fine. You spent a lot of money today but I am going to tell you where you can get some of that back if you will listen to me. I would like to talk to you today about a concern I had for many years and that is the LA Times newsletter. There are several concerns I have but I would like to start with the cost of it. As you know the newsletter is the responsibility of our management company. They write and collect the articles. Valerie does the layout, the soliciting, accepts ads, they get it printed and distributed to the residents of Lake Ashton in Lake Wales and Winter Haven. The newsletter costs \$2.26 per issue. Since the beginning of the development of Winter Haven we have given copies of this newsletter to the residents. That means at the present time around 300 copies are being printed and given to Winter Haven. That costs us \$678 a month that equals to \$8,136 a year that you are simply giving away. When you figure it out from the beginning of the time of the development in Winter Haven it comes

to somewhere between \$65,000 and \$100,000 a year we have given them. No wonder they have money for the golf course. I think it is way past time that their CDD pays for their residents if they want them to have the newsletter. The fact that there is ad money collected has no bearing on the fact that the CDD II should not be charged. I have gone back into the records to find out exactly how many copies have been printed each year. Obviously there was not as many in 2006 as there are now. I hope you understand why it is necessary for you to ask the CDD II to pay their share. On a smaller scale personally I think the newsletter should be totally re-evaluated. It is being printed on very expensive paper which really isn't needed for the newspaper. By the end of the day many of the copies the day they are received are already in the recycle bin. There is \$2.26 being tossed away. I am asking the Supervisors to begin charging Lake Ashton II for their copies of the newsletter for their residents and for you to appoint several people or a Supervisor to dig deeper into the way the LA Times should be published with cost being the first concern. Thank you for listening to me and for all for your service to our community.

Ms. Pontious: Thank you, June. We will take that under consideration.

Mr. Scali: During the bocce court proposal I didn't hear when the second phase is going to occur. As a bocce court user I am very much interested in understanding that.

Ms. Pontious: Do you have a timeline for that?

Ms. Wells: I didn't.

Ms. Pontious: We do not have a current timeline, Tom, but we will keep that under consideration.

Mr. Goldstein: Morning, I just have a question. Al Goldstein. We have talked about a lot of dollars today and I know all of it is important. I would like to suggest at the next meeting I know we can get it on the internet etc. etc. but I think we should have a financial standings report what is in our budget and what is in our reserves. I get about \$160,000 this morning and I don't know if it is coming from column A or column B. I would like if you would for the next meeting to have our financial reports on the table where we can pick it up with the agenda. I would appreciate that thank you.

Ms. Pontious: We are at the end of a fiscal year, are we going to have all the information for the fiscal year for the next meeting?

Ms. Burns: Yes. We should depending on if we get all the final invoices through September 30. Sometimes it is into November before we get all those September year end to close out. Hopefully it just depends on if we receive all those invoices.

Ms. Pontious: Any further discussion from the Board?

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Adjournment

There not being any further business to discuss,

On MOTION by Mr. Ference seconded by Mr. Deane with all in favor the meeting was adjourned.

Assistant Secretary/Secretary

Chairman/Vice Chairman

RESOLUTION 2019-01

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors, hereinafter referred to as the "Board", of the Lake Ashton Community Development District, hereinafter referred to as "District", adopted a General Fund Budget for fiscal year 2018, and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to reallocate funds budgeted to re-appropriate Revenues and Expenses approved during the Fiscal Year.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE LAKE ASHTON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT TO THE FOLLOWING:

1. The General Fund Budget is hereby amended in accordance with Exhibit "A" attached.
2. This resolution shall become effective this 19th day of November, 2018 and be reflected in the monthly and fiscal Year End 9/30/18 Financial Statements and Audit Report of the District.

**Lake Ashton
Community Development District**

by: _____
Chairman

Attest:

by: _____
Secretary

Lake Ashton
Community Development District
 Budget Amendment #2

FY 2018

General Fund

<u>Category</u>	<u>Current Budget</u>	<u>Proposed (Increase/ Decrease)</u>	<u>Amended Budget</u>
<u>Revenues</u>			
Carryforward Surplus	\$34,746	\$50,366	\$85,112
Special Assessments - Levy	\$1,572,079	\$13,261	\$1,585,341
Rental Income	\$56,675	\$4,750	\$61,425
Entertainment Fees	\$144,406	\$13,005	\$157,411
Newsletter Ad Revenue	\$92,804	\$4,946	\$97,750
Interest Income	\$6,413	\$1,786	\$8,199
Miscellaneous Income	\$16,427	\$1,878	\$18,305
Restaurant Lease	\$12,000	(\$6,516)	\$5,484
Total Revenues		<u>\$83,477</u>	
<u>Expenditures</u>			
Engineering Fees	\$20,000	\$8,993	\$28,993
Attorney Fees	\$20,000	\$12,660	\$32,660
Newsletter Printing	\$32,000	\$6,862	\$38,862
Clubhouse Maintenance	\$105,000	\$17,108	\$122,108
Gas	\$15,000	\$10,926	\$25,926
Special Events	\$130,000	\$19,679	\$149,679
Operating Supplies	\$25,000	\$7,249	\$32,249
Total Expenditures		<u>\$83,477</u>	



To: Lake Ashton CDD Board of Supervisors

CC: Lake Ashton CDD District Manager

Re: Community Director's Report

Date: November 9, 2018

Monday Coffee

- Featured speakers in the upcoming weeks include Small World Tours, Lake Wales Museum, State Attorney Brian Haas on Preventing Fraud Crimes, and more.
- Fresh Cut Produce is now at Monday Coffee in the west parking lot selling fresh fruits and vegetables.

Activities & Resident Services

- Upcoming activities and special events set up by staff include Bloodmobile Blood Drive, Bookmobile, Blood Pressure & Glucose checks, AARP Safe Drivers class, "Veteran's Project" Live Performance, British Invasion Dinner Show, Tea Talk, CPR/AED/First Aid Training, Wine Glass Painting class, Christmas Sock Hop Show, and more.
- New Resident Orientation is scheduled at the Clubhouse December 19 (Borden Deane).
- New season ticket for the 2019 Entertainment Series will go on sale November 14. There are approximately 85 seats available at the 5 pm show and 94 seats available at the 8 pm show
- A promotional poster announcing the 2019 Featured Shows and ticket sales information was released in the October edition of the LA Times. Tickets will be available to residents and their non-resident guests 6 weeks prior to each show date.
- Staff has secured a \$3,500 sponsorship for the Entertainment Series and five (5) sponsorships at \$500 each and two (2) at \$750 each for the Featured Series of shows.

Room Rental

- The Ballroom was rented out eight (8) times in October; a report is attached. Rental revenue is \$5,000.

Restaurant

- Two (2) receipt printers have been installed to complete the conversion to using the Square POS system in the Restaurant. One system is completely up and running while the second has the receipt printer installed and is just waiting on a 2nd iPad to be purchased by the Restaurant and the menu to be loaded to allow them to use the second system.

- NiNi's at Lake Ashton is providing sandwiches for sale at Bingo every Monday.
- Entertainment is scheduled for Saturday, November 10.
- The last maintenance walk-through was completed in August and all areas were well-kept with no significant items to report. The next maintenance walk-through is tentatively scheduled for November 26.
- NiNi's at Lake Ashton will be hosting a Thanksgiving Dinner on Wednesday, November 21.

Security, Guest Registration, & Public Safety

- The pool emergency phone was tested in October and no problems were reported.
- Thompson Nursery Road Security Officers processed 7,490 guest vehicles in October.
- Staff and Security Officers registered 91 guests in October.

Capital Projects & Other Updates

- The approved meeting schedule for FY 2019 is posted on Ashtonliving.net. The Board is scheduled to meet December 17 and January 14 (exception due to Martin Luther King Day on January 21) at 10:30 a.m. in the Clubhouse Ballroom.
- The Joint Resident Feedback survey will be released electronically soon and paper copies will be available at either Activities Desk.
- Parking lot resurfacing is pending repairs to the west parking lot.
- ServiceMaster started on November 2. Staff has been in communication with them regarding expectations and to formulate a schedule of daily, weekly and monthly tasks.
- The propane gas heater for the pool is now installed and is operational. The Spa propane heater needed to be replaced as well as all of the copper piping from the heaters to the propane tank. This was completed on Friday, November 2.
- Construction on Waterford should be completed by November 16 per contractor. Staff met with All Terrain to go over other areas of concern regarding curbing, inlet and asphalt repair that could possibly be repaired while they are on-site.
- A stormwater inlet at the intersection of Dunmore and Birkdale was recently reviewed and staff will bring information to the Board of Supervisors as soon as it is received.
- The patio awning is tentatively scheduled to be installed the week on November 12. This project will take approximately 30 days to complete.
- The bowling alley scoring system is tentatively scheduled to be installed the week of November 12. Residents will be informed via electronic media as soon as it is installed.
- Quotes for carpet and scoring replacement at the Bocce Ball courts will be sent under separate cover for Supervisor consideration.
- Quotes for replacement of the leased Clubhouse Wi-Fi access points are going to be sent under separate cover for Supervisor consideration.
- Staff will be presenting quotes for replacement of the Activities Desk and Clubhouse lawn lighting at the December Board of Supervisors meeting.

Ballroom Rental Fee Report
 From: 10/1/18 - 10/31/18
 Meeting Room: Grand Ballroom

Meeting Date	Meeting Title	Room Fee Collected
10/1/2018	Monday Coffee	\$0.00
10/1/2018	Bingo	\$400.00
10/3/2018	Yoga	\$0.00
10/3/2018	LA (LW) HOA BOD Meeting	\$0.00
10/4/2018	Shufflin' Squares Dance	\$0.00
10/5/2018	Parkinson's Support Group	\$0.00
10/6/2018	Guitard/Lopez Wedding	\$1,000.00
10/8/2018	Monday Coffee	\$0.00
10/8/2018	Bingo	\$400.00
10/10/2018	Yoga	\$0.00
10/11/2018	Square Dance Lessons	\$0.00
10/14/2018	Community Potluck	\$0.00
10/15/2018	Monday Coffee	\$0.00
10/15/2018	LA (LW) CDD Meeting	\$0.00
10/15/2018	Bingo	\$400.00
10/17/2018	Yoga	\$0.00
10/17/2018	New Resident Orientation	\$0.00
10/18/2018	LA Democratic Club	\$0.00
10/18/2018	Shufflin' Squares Dance	\$0.00
10/19/2018	Heroes of Rock & Roll Dinner Show	\$0.00
10/20/2018	Wedding Brenna Martin	\$1,000.00
10/22/2018	Monday Coffee	\$0.00
10/22/2018	Bingo	\$400.00
10/24/2018	Yoga	\$0.00
10/25/2018	Square Dance Lessons	\$0.00
10/26/2018	Matt Malia Seminar	\$0.00
10/27/2018	Class Reunion Sandra Earely	\$1,000.00
10/28/2018	Shufflin' Squares Special Dance	\$0.00
10/29/2018	Monday Coffee	\$0.00
10/29/2018	Bingo	\$400.00
10/31/2018	Yoga	\$0.00
10/31/2018	Joint CDD/CDDII Meeting	\$0.00
Total		\$5,000.00

Lake Ashton Community Development District
135 W Central Blvd. Suite 320, Orlando Florida 32801

Memorandum

DATE: **November 19, 2018**

TO: Darrin Mossing
 Jillian Burns
 District Managers **via email**

FROM: Matthew Fisher
 Operation Manager

RE: Lake Ashton CDD Monthly Managers Report – November 19, 2018

The following is a summary of activities related to the field operations of the Lake Ashton Community Development District:

Ballroom:

1. Staff replacing lights and ballasts as needed.
2. A/C working properly.

Pool/Spa:

1. The Pool and Spa are operating properly.
2. Handicap lifts have been tested and are working properly.
3. Spa gas heater replaced.
4. Pool gas heater replaced.
5. New gas lines installed to spa and pool gas heaters.
6. Two pool loungers repaired.
7. Start/stop switch replaced to pool pump motor.

Lakes/Ponds:

1. Lakes are being treated according to our contract with Applied Aquatic.
2. Aberdeen and Berwick ponds are in bad shape due to algae and slender spikerush growth. Applied Aquatic is aware of abnormal growth.

Landscaping:

1. Staff has been meeting on a weekly basis with Yellowstone Landscape to review CDD property. There are some areas of concern on Lake Ashton Blvd that are being addressed and should be completed soon.
2. Mulch applied around Clubhouse and Lake Ashton Blvd.
3. Four stumps removed on Lake Ashton Blvd.
4. Two declining medjool date palms on Lake Ashton Blvd removed.
5. Four robellini palms installed on Lake Ashton Blvd.

Other:

1. Fan speed control switch installed in Bowling Alley.
2. Décor light switch in Game Room replaced.
3. Pavilion pressure washed. Treated for algae.
4. Shuffleboard Court pressure washed. Treated for algae.
5. Reattached wind screen at Tennis Court.
6. Replaced spot light at Shuffleboard Courts.
7. Replaced three ballasts at Shuffleboard Courts.
8. Pavers at Bocce Ball courts leveled and pressure washed.
9. Guard House pressure washed. Treated for algae.
10. Pressure washed Basketball Court area.
11. Column caps along the Thompson Nursey Rd. fence line pressure washed.
12. Two new computers installed in the Media Center.
13. Ice/water machine in Fitness Center area cleaned. Prefilter replaced.
14. Battery backup that powers DVR replaced at Guard House.
15. Light fixtures around pool and restaurant patio cleaned.
16. Florida pest control installed rodent traps at the Guard House.
17. Clocks and timers adjusted for daylight saving time.

Should you have any questions please call me at 863-956-6207

Respectfully,

Matthew
Fisher



Enhancement Proposal

Job Name: Lake Ashton 1 Medjool Palm Program
Property Name: Laker Ashton 1
Client: Lake Ashton CDD- c/o Matt Fisher
Address: 135 W Central Blvd. Suite 320
City/State/Zip: Orlando , Florida
Phone: 0

Proposal #
Date: October 17, 2018

Yellowstone Landscape will complete the work described below:

Description

Inject Medjool Palms on Lake Ashton 1 Blvd. with preventative tree care program. (See attached program)

Inject Medjools with preventative program.	18	\$ 140.00	\$ 2,500.00
TOTAL PRICE		\$	2,500.00

ACCEPTANCE OF TERMS

Signature below authorizes Yellowstone Landscape to perform work as described above and verifies that the prices and specifications are hereby accepted.

Payment terms: Net 30 days. All overdue balances will be charged a 1.5% a month, 18% annual percentage rate.

Limited Warranty: All plant material is under a limited warranty for one year. Transplanted plant material and/or plant material that dies due to conditions out of Yellowstone Landscape's control (i.e. Acts of God, vandalism, inadequate irrigation due to water restrictions, etc.) shall not be included in the warranty.

Client:

Prepared by:

Chris Bower

Date:

Date: October 17, 2018

Internal Use Only	
Project Number:	Davenport
PO Reference:	Date Work Completed:

**Lake Ashton
Community Development District**

Check Run Summary

November 19, 2018

<i>Date</i>	<i>Check Numbers</i>	<i>Amount</i>
<u>General Fund</u>		
10/15/2018	6242-6257	\$11,743.26
10/22/2018	6258-6274	\$49,250.84
11/6/2018	6275	\$2,028.00
11/8/2018	6276-6295	\$46,950.11
General Fund Total		<u><u>\$109,972.21</u></u>
<u>Capital Projects Fund</u>		
10/12/2018	251-254	\$20,844.68
10/22/2018	255-256	\$5,850.00
10/30/2018	257	\$2,889.96
Capital Projects Fund Total		<u><u>\$29,584.64</u></u>

AP300R
*** CHECK NOS. 006242-050000

YEAR-TO-DATE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE PREPAID/COMPUTER CHECK REGISTER RUN 11/09/18
LAKE ASHTON CDD - GF
BANK A LAKE ASHTON - GF

PAGE 1

CHECK DATE	VEND#INVOICE..... DATE INVOICE	...EXPENSED TO... YRMO DPT ACCT# SUB SUBCLASS	VENDOR NAME	STATUS	AMOUNTCHECK..... AMOUNT #
10/15/18	00075	9/25/18 205237 SEPT 18	201809 320-57200-34500 - GOLD CARS MAINT	ARTS GOLF CARS, INC.	*	80.00	80.00 006242
10/15/18	00062	9/25/18 05794960 OCT 18	201810 320-57200-41000 - INTERNET/VOICE	BRIGHT HOUSE NETWORKS	*	1,115.15	1,115.15 006243
10/15/18	00561	9/28/18 1056 SEP 18	201809 320-57200-54500 - SVC CALL-GLYCOL	DRAFT MEDIC LLC	*	137.50	137.50 006244
10/15/18	00003	9/04/18 99807085 OCT 18	201810 310-51300-42000 - DELIVERIES/POST	FEDEX	*	29.86	29.86 006245
10/15/18	00077	9/11/18 829940 SEPT 18	201809 320-57200-54501 - PEST CONTROL	FLORIDA PEST CONTROL	*	123.00	123.00 006246
10/15/18	00059	9/03/18 16947 OCT 18	201810 320-57200-45300 - POOL SVC/FOUNT.	HEARTLAND COMMERCIAL POOL SERVICES	*	200.00	1,490.00 006247
		9/03/18 16948 OCT 18	201810 320-57200-45300 - POOL SERVICE		*	1,290.00	
10/15/18	00300	9/19/18 9192018 HOLIDAY	201810 320-57200-49400 LIGHTING DEPOSIT	HOLIDAY LIGHTSCAPES INC.	*	2,500.00	2,500.00 006248
10/15/18	00014	9/26/18 L060G0IL NOTICE OF JOINT MEETING	201809 310-51300-48000	LAKELAND LEDGER PUBLISHING	*	59.00	59.00 006249
10/15/18	00443	9/24/18 09242018 REFUND OF DAMAGE DEPOSIT	201810 300-22000-10000	MEALS ON WHEELS OF POLK COUNTY, INC	*	500.00	537.50 006250
		9/24/18 09242018 REFUND OF DAMAGE DEPOSIT	201810 300-36200-10500		*	37.50	
10/15/18	00552	9/27/18 1033 FOOD CATERED IN BALLROOM	201809 320-57200-49400	NINI'S AT LAKE ASHTON	*	3,375.00	3,375.00 006251
10/15/18	00345	9/24/18 0013301 REKEY LOCK CYLINDER	201809 320-57200-54500	PRECISION SAFE & LOCK, LLC	*	166.50	166.50 006252

LAKA LAKE ASHTON SROSINA

AP300R
*** CHECK NOS. 006242-050000

YEAR-TO-DATE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE PREPAID/COMPUTER CHECK REGISTER RUN 11/09/18
LAKE ASHTON CDD - GF
BANK A LAKE ASHTON - GF

PAGE 2

CHECK DATE	VEND#INVOICE..... DATE INVOICE	...EXPENSED TO... YRMO DPT ACCT# SUB SUBCLASS	VENDOR NAME	STATUS	AMOUNTCHECK.... AMOUNT #
10/15/18	00217	9/14/18 0654-000	201810 320-57200-43300		*	387.77	
		OCT 18 - PICK UP SERVICES					
		9/30/18 0654-000	201809 320-57200-43300		*	378.79	
		SEP 18 - PICK UP SERVICES					
				REPUBLIC SERVICES #654			766.56 006253
10/15/18	00054	8/27/18 40812	201808 320-57200-54500		*	796.00	
		GYM FLOOR RESTORATION					
		9/17/18 40930	201809 320-57200-52000		*	138.24	
		SEP 18-OPERATING SUPPLIES					
				STATEWIDE BUILDING MAINTENANCE			934.24 006254
10/15/18	00430	10/02/18 50053274	201810 310-51300-42502		*	187.00	
		OCT 18 - COPIER LEASE					
				WELLS FARGO FINANCIAL LEASING			187.00 006255
10/15/18	00346	9/18/18 2114329	201809 320-57200-54100		*	208.45	
		SEPT 18 - FIRE EXT MAINT.					
				4TH ELEMENT FIRE & SAFETY, INC.			208.45 006256
10/15/18	00316	9/04/18 99807085	201809 310-51300-42501		*	33.50	
		BALANCE OF INV 99807085					
				ULINE			33.50 006257
10/22/18	00057	9/20/18 172260	201809 320-53800-46801		*	7,300.00	
		QRTLY PLANT MGMT SVC					
		9/30/18 172487	201809 320-53800-46800		*	1,545.00	
		SEPT 18 - PLANT MGMT SVC					
				APPLIED AQUATIC MANAGEMENT, INC.			8,845.00 006258
10/22/18	00228	6/30/18 INVR0006	201806 320-57200-54000		*	2,770.05	
		CONCURRENT USERS MRM PRO					
				ASURE SOFTWARE			2,770.05 006259
10/22/18	00268	9/28/18 48546	201810 320-57200-49400		*	348.95	
		SEASON TICKETS - 2 GROUPS					
				CROMER PRESS			348.95 006260
10/22/18	00003	10/16/18 63399666	201810 310-51300-42000		*	40.38	
		OCT 18 - DELIVERIES					
				FEDEX			40.38 006261
10/22/18	00068	10/10/18 62076	201809 320-57200-54500		*	216.04	
		EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE					
				FITNESS SERVICES OF FLORIDA			216.04 006262
				LAKA LAKE ASHTON SROSINA			

AP300R
*** CHECK NOS. 006242-050000

YEAR-TO-DATE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE PREPAID/COMPUTER CHECK REGISTER RUN 11/09/18
LAKE ASHTON CDD - GF
BANK A LAKE ASHTON - GF

PAGE 3

CHECK DATE	VEND#INVOICE..... DATE INVOICE	...EXPENSED TO... YRMO DPT ACCT# SUB SUBCLASS	VENDOR NAME	STATUS	AMOUNTCHECK..... AMOUNT #
10/22/18	00077	9/21/18 108465 SEP 18 - MOSQUITO CONTROL	201809 320-57200-54501	FLORIDA PEST CONTROL	*	225.00	225.00 006263
10/22/18	00215	10/19/18 320 OCT 18 - PAYROLL REIMBURS	201810 320-57200-34000	GMS-CENTRAL FLORIDA, LLC	*	23,080.44	23,080.44 006264
10/22/18	00067	8/06/18 176109 REMOTES DELIVERED 7/20/18 9/19/18 179058 SECURITY SVC THRU 9/18/18	201807 320-57200-34500 201809 320-57200-34500	THE HARTLINE ALARM COMPANY, INC.	*	740.00 317.00	1,057.00 006265
10/22/18	00098	9/11/18 4572195 SEPT 18 - OPERATING SUPP 9/11/18 4581122 SEPT 18 - OPERATING SUPP 9/27/18 8572975 SEPT 18 - OPERATING SUPP 10/01/18 4590836 SEPT 18 - OPERATING SUPP	201809 320-57200-52000 201809 320-57200-52000 201809 320-57200-52000 201810 320-57200-52000	HOME DEPOT CREDIT SERVICES	*	138.26 13.98 48.93 9.98	211.15 006266
10/22/18	00504	8/20/18 93180 AUG 18 - ELECTRICAL SVCS 8/27/18 93196 AUG 18 - ELECTRICAL SVCS 10/09/18 93580 OCT 18 - ELECTRICAL SVCS	201808 320-57200-54500 201808 320-57200-54500 201810 320-57200-54500	KINCAID ELECTRICAL SERVICES	*	1,866.67 760.12 347.50	2,974.29 006267
10/22/18	00164	10/17/18 82966 SEPT 18 - ATTORNEY FEES	201809 310-51300-31500	LATHAM, SHUKER, EDEN & BEAUDINE,LLP	*	4,046.57	4,046.57 006268
10/22/18	00562	10/19/18 10192018 HEROES OF ROCK/ROLL SHOW	201810 320-57200-49400	MUSIC ENTERTAINMENT PROS	*	2,535.00	2,535.00 006269
10/22/18	00538	9/28/18 176894 OCT 18 - CART REPAIRS	201810 320-57200-34500	PERFORMAMCE PLUS CARTS	*	481.78	481.78 006270
10/22/18	00528	10/12/18 21938 OCT 18 - EQUIPMENT SVCS	201810 320-57200-54500	RAYMON BROTHERS	*	616.50	616.50 006271
LAKA LAKE ASHTON SROSINA							

AP300R
*** CHECK NOS. 006242-050000

YEAR-TO-DATE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE PREPAID/COMPUTER CHECK REGISTER RUN 11/09/18
LAKE ASHTON CDD - GF
BANK A LAKE ASHTON - GF

PAGE 4

CHECK DATE	VEND#INVOICE..... DATE INVOICE	...EXPENSED TO... YRMO DPT ACCT# SUB SUBCLASS	VENDOR NAME	STATUS	AMOUNTCHECK.... AMOUNT #
10/22/18	00399	10/03/18 10066	201809 320-57200-54500	ALEX SMITH	*	1,048.13	1,048.13 006272
10/22/18	00054	9/04/18 40909	201809 320-57200-54500	TILE RESTORATION-CLUBHOUS	*	222.00	
		10/04/18 41057	201810 320-57200-52000	OCT 18 - OPERATING SUPPLI	*	232.56	
				STATEWIDE BUILDING MAINTENANCE			454.56 006273
10/22/18	00563	10/19/18 10192018	201810 320-57200-49400	WINE/CANVAS PRIVATE EVENT	*	300.00	
				WNC TAMPA, LLC			300.00 006274
11/06/18	00552	10/19/18 1034	201810 320-57200-49400	HEROES OF ROCK & ROLL SHW	*	2,028.00	
				NINI'S AT LAKE ASHTON			2,028.00 006275
11/08/18	00085	10/04/18 114427	201810 320-57200-54500	OCT 18 - PLUMBING SERVICE	*	215.00	
				A.D. BAYNARD PLUMBING, INC.			215.00 006276
11/08/18	00522	10/04/18 30832563	201810 320-57200-43200	PROPANE - POOL HEAT	*	649.30	
				AMERIGAS			649.30 006277
11/08/18	00557	10/12/18 P6854305	201810 320-57200-52000	OCT 18-OPERATING SUPPLIES	*	11.90	
				BATTERIES PLUS BULBS #819			11.90 006278
11/08/18	00062	10/25/18 05794960	201811 320-57200-41000	NOV 18 - CABLE/INTERNET	*	981.88	
				BRIGHT HOUSE NETWORKS			981.88 006279
11/08/18	00055	10/15/18 20735-10	201810 320-57200-43100	OCT 18 - WATER/SEWER SVC	*	746.69	
		10/15/18 20740-10	201810 320-57200-43100	OCT 18 - WATER/SEWER SVC	*	36.60	
		10/15/18 22109-10	201810 320-57200-43100	OCT 18 - WATER IRRIGATION	*	111.70	
		10/15/18 37764-10	201810 320-57200-43100	OCT 18 - WATER IRRIGATION	*	114.95	
				CITY OF LAKE WALES			1,009.94 006280
11/08/18	00013	10/01/18 72235	201811 310-51300-54000	ANNUAL FEE	*	175.00	
				DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY			175.00 006281

LAKA LAKE ASHTON SROSINA

AP300R
 *** CHECK NOS. 006242-050000

YEAR-TO-DATE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE PREPAID/COMPUTER CHECK REGISTER
 LAKE ASHTON CDD - GF
 BANK A LAKE ASHTON - GF

RUN 11/09/18

PAGE 5

CHECK DATE	VEND#INVOICE..... DATE INVOICE	...EXPENSED TO... YRMO DPT ACCT# SUB SUBCLASS	VENDOR NAME	STATUS	AMOUNTCHECK.... AMOUNT #
11/08/18	00329	10/15/18 1602512 SEP 18 -	201809 310-51300-31100 ENGINEERING SVCS	DEWBERRY ENGINEERS, INC.	*	180.00	180.00 006282
11/08/18	00133	10/26/18 8237 TECO -	201812 320-57200-43000 RENEW POLICY	EGIS INSURANCE ADVISORS, LLC	*	1,083.00	1,083.00 006283
11/08/18	00003	10/30/18 63541696 OCT 18 -	201810 310-51300-42000 DELIVERIES	FEDEX	*	29.38	29.38 006284
11/08/18	00077	10/09/18 830834 OCT 18 -	201810 320-57200-54501 PEST CONTROL	FLORIDA PEST CONTROL	*	123.00	123.00 006285
11/08/18	00036	11/01/18 166 NOV 18 -	201811 310-51300-34000 MGMT FEES		*	4,873.50	
		11/01/18 166 NOV 18 -	201811 310-51300-35100 COMPUTER TIME		*	83.33	
		11/01/18 166 NOV 18 -	201811 310-51300-31300 DISSEMINATION		*	83.33	
		11/01/18 166 NOV 18 -	201811 310-51300-35101 WEBSITE ADMIN		*	55.56	
		11/01/18 166 NOV 18 -	201811 310-51300-51000 OFFICE SUPPLIES		*	14.64	
		11/01/18 166 NOV 18 -	201811 310-51300-42000 POSTAGE		*	71.61	
		11/01/18 166 NOV 18 -	201811 310-51300-42500 COPIES/PRINTS		*	156.80	
				GMS - SO FLORIDA, LLC			5,338.77 006286
11/08/18	00067	9/28/18 179180 SEP 18 -	201809 320-57200-34500 GATE SERVICE		*	355.00	
		10/16/18 179993 CLUBHOUSE CAMERA SOFTWARE	201810 320-57200-34500	THE HARTLINE ALARM COMPANY, INC.	*	222.00	577.00 006287
11/08/18	00059	10/02/18 17119 NOV 18 -	201811 320-57200-45300 POOL/FOUNTIAN SV		*	200.00	
		10/02/18 17120 NOV 18 -	201811 320-57200-45300 POOL SERVICE	HEARTLAND COMMERCIAL POOL SERVICES	*	1,290.00	1,490.00 006288
11/08/18	00020	11/01/18 1271131 ACC# 182927-865152-002700	201811 310-51300-31400	JOE G. TEDDER, TAX COLLECTOR	*	13,179.96	13,179.96 006289
				LAKA LAKE ASHTON SROSINA			

AP300R
*** CHECK NOS. 006242-050000

YEAR-TO-DATE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE PREPAID/COMPUTER CHECK REGISTER RUN 11/09/18
LAKE ASHTON CDD - GF
BANK A LAKE ASHTON - GF

PAGE 6

CHECK DATE	VEND#INVOICE..... DATE INVOICEEXPENSED TO.... YRMO DPT ACCT# SUB SUBCLASS	VENDOR NAME	STATUS	AMOUNTCHECK..... AMOUNT #
11/08/18	00512	11/01/18 1575482	201811 320-57200-41000	EMERGENCY PHONES	*	42.00	
				KINGS III OF AMERICA, INC.			42.00 006290
11/08/18	00217	10/14/18 830844	201811 320-57200-43300	NOV 18 - REFUSE SERVICE	*	493.92	
				REPUBLIC SERVICES #654			493.92 006291
11/08/18	00470	10/29/18 10292018	201810 320-57200-52000	OPERATING SUPPLIES	*	31.01	
				SHUFFLIN'S SQUARES			31.01 006292
11/08/18	00054	10/01/18 40980	201810 320-57200-54500	OCT 18 - JANITORIAL SVCS	*	3,465.00	
		10/22/18 41072	201810 320-57200-52000	OCT 18-OPERATING SUPPLIES	*	138.24	
				STATEWIDE BUILDING MAINTENANCE			3,603.24 006293
11/08/18	00061	10/15/18 10152018	201810 320-57200-43000	OCT 18 - ELECTRIC SERVICE	*	17,235.81	
				TECO			17,235.81 006294
11/08/18	00564	10/29/18 102918	201811 300-22000-10000	REFUND DAMAGE DEPOSIT	*	500.00	
				SANDRA EARLEY			500.00 006295
				TOTAL FOR BANK A		109,972.21	
				TOTAL FOR REGISTER		109,972.21	

LAKA LAKE ASHTON SROSINA

AP300R
*** CHECK NOS. 000251-050000

YEAR-TO-DATE ACCOUNTS PAYABLE PREPAID/COMPUTER CHECK REGISTER RUN 11/09/18
LAKE ASHTON CDD - CPF
BANK B LAKE ASHTON - CPF

PAGE 1

CHECK DATE	VEND#INVOICE..... DATE INVOICEEXPENSED TO... YRMO DPT ACCT# SUB SUBCLASS	VENDOR NAME	STATUS	AMOUNTCHECK..... AMOUNT #
10/12/18	00085	9/26/18 2436	201809 600-53800-60070	COMPLETE SCORING-2 LANES	*	10,762.20	
				BEST BOWLING ELECTRONICS SERVICES			10,762.20 000251
10/12/18	00084	9/12/18 3292	201809 600-53800-60069	WINDOW SILLS,GRANITE	*	1,720.00	
				GOLDEN MARBLE & GRANITE, INC.			1,720.00 000252
10/12/18	00053	9/24/18 17000	201809 600-53800-60078	REPLACE SPA JET	*	75.00	
				HEARTLAND COMMERCIAL POOL SERVICES			75.00 000253
10/12/18	00050	9/28/18 10067	201809 600-53800-60070	MONITORS/LABOR INSTALL	*	8,287.48	
				ALEX SMITH			8,287.48 000254
10/22/18	00011	10/11/18 3714	201809 600-53800-60069	BALL ROOM REPAIRS	*	975.00	
				BOCK & HOEFT			975.00 000255
10/22/18	00053	10/19/18 10192018	201810 600-53800-60084	50% DEPOSIT - POOL HEATER	*	4,875.00	
				HEARTLAND COMMERCIAL POOL SERVICES			4,875.00 000256
10/30/18	00022	10/23/18 41350	201810 600-53800-60089	50% DEPOSIT-INDOOR FURN	*	2,889.96	
				WORKSCAPES			2,889.96 000257
				TOTAL FOR BANK B		29,584.64	
				TOTAL FOR REGISTER		29,584.64	

LAKA LAKE ASHTON SROSINA

LAKE ASHTON CDD
FY 2018 CASH RECEIPTS

	October-17	November-17	December-17	January-18	February-18	March-18
ENTERTAINMENT	\$ 96,050.00	\$ 14,974.00	\$ 10,991.00	\$ 9,342.00	\$ 3,998.00	\$ 1,753.00
BALLROOM RENTAL	\$ 5,450.00	\$ 3,475.00	\$ 6,750.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 5,400.00	\$ 3,900.00
DAMAGE DEPOSITS	\$ (1,000.00)	\$ -	\$ 3,250.00	\$ (1,000.00)	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 500.00
NEWSLETTER INCOME	\$ 23,056.70	\$ 9,769.74	\$ 5,298.66	\$ 17,570.86	\$ 7,846.66	\$ 8,808.16
COFFEE INCOME	\$ 600.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 465.00
CLERICAL	\$ 125.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 83.00	\$ 96.00	\$ 219.00	\$ 209.90
SECURITY FEE	\$ 1,037.50	\$ 418.75	\$ 512.50	\$ 568.75	\$ 512.50	\$ 771.00
CLICKERS	\$ 148.00	\$ 111.00	\$ 185.00	\$ 111.00	\$ 148.00	\$ -
RESTAURANT LEASE-DEFERRED	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,000.00	\$ -	\$ 1,000.00
RESTAURANT LEASE	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 483.87
INSURANCE PROCEEDS	\$ -	\$ 4,716.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 182,946.49	\$ 5,183.45
MISCELLANEOUS	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,100.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 833.33
SALES TAX PAYABLE	\$ 70.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 148.00	\$ -	\$ 38.71
	\$ 126,537.20	\$ 34,874.49	\$ 32,340.16	\$ 36,186.61	\$ 203,320.65	\$ 23,946.42

	April-18	May-18	June-18	July-18	August-18	September-18
ENTERTAINMENT	\$ 3,138.31	\$ 2,130.00	\$ 1,205.00	\$ 825.00	\$ 11,125.00	\$ 1,880.00
ENTERTAINMENT-DEFERRED	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,500.00
BALLROOM RENTAL	\$ 14,100.00	\$ 3,950.00	\$ 2,800.00	\$ 3,600.00	\$ 3,800.00	\$ 1,200.00
BALLROOM RENTAL-DEFERRED	\$ 3,500.00	\$ -	\$ 4,750.00	\$ 4,325.00	\$ 8,117.00	\$ 583.00
DAMAGE DEPOSITS	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 4,200.00	\$ 625.00	\$ 1,925.00
NEWSLETTER INCOME	\$ 5,916.66	\$ 5,419.66	\$ 4,461.30	\$ 4,655.23	\$ 4,771.46	\$ 175.00
NEWSLETTER INCOME-DEFERRED	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,402.50	\$ 5,196.46
COFFEE INCOME	\$ 200.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 400.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 513.00	\$ 100.00
COFFEE INCOME-DEFERRED	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 450.00
CLERICAL	\$ 258.20	\$ 136.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 110.00	\$ 230.50	\$ 108.00
SECURITY FEE	\$ 450.00	\$ 1,031.25	\$ 185.00	\$ 1,450.00	\$ 593.75	\$ -
SECURITY FEE-DEFERRED	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 550.00
CLICKERS	\$ 37.00	\$ 74.00	\$ 259.00	\$ 74.00	\$ 296.00	\$ 37.00
INSURANCE PROCEEDS	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
MISCELLANEOUS	\$ 183.80	\$ -	\$ 43.00	\$ 4,166.67	\$ -	\$ -
RESTAURANT LEASE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
SALES TAX PAYABLE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	\$ 28,783.97	\$ 14,890.91	\$ 17,118.30	\$ 23,555.90	\$ 32,474.21	\$ 13,704.46

FISCAL YEAR 2018 TOTAL	
ENTERTAINMENT FEES	\$ 157,411.31
BALLROOM RENTAL	\$ 61,425.00
BALLROOM RENTAL-DEFERRED	\$ 21,275.00
DAMAGE DEPOSITS	\$ 15,500.00
NEWSLETTER INCOME	\$ 97,750.09
COFFEE INCOME	\$ 3,578.00
CLERICAL	\$ 1,630.60
SECURITY FEE	\$ 7,531.00
CLICKERS	\$ 1,480.00
INSURANCE PROCEEDS	\$ 192,845.94
MISCELLANEOUS	\$ 9,326.80
RESTAURANT LEASE	\$ 5,483.87
SALES TAX PAYABLE	\$ 396.71
	\$ 585,733.28

LAKE ASHTON CDD
SEPTEMBER 2018 CASH RECEIPTS

ENTERTAINMENT

DATE	DESCRIPTION	NAME	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
9/1/2018	657		\$ 50.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/1/2018	657	Rodney Saunders	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/4/2018	658	Harry Krumrie	\$ 45.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/4/2018	658	Harry Krumrie	\$ (5.00)	Refund for Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/4/2018	658	Gaynelle Henderson	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/4/2018	658	James Carlin	\$ 50.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/4/2018	658	Mr Ziegler	\$ 25.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/4/2018	658	John Stakowski	\$ 5.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/4/2018	658	Debra Crosby	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/4/2018	658	James Carlin	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/4/2018	658	Thomas Williams	\$ 20.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/4/2018	658	Michael Whitaker	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/5/2018	659	Jane Milner	\$ 25.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/5/2018	659	Debra Stobbe	\$ 50.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/5/2018	659	Iris Realmuto	\$ 75.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/5/2018	659	Allen Goldstein	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/5/2018	659	Joyce Wiberg	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/5/2018	659	Pamela Kinel	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/5/2018	659	Mary Odonnell	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/5/2018	659	Veronica Thrower	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/5/2018	659	Robert Sosinski	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/5/2018	659	Gunnar Semberg	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/5/2018	659	Larry Hudnall	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/5/2018	659	Phyllis Kessler	\$ 5.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/6/2018	660	R Johnson	\$ 5.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/6/2018	660	Steven Sparks	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/6/2018	660	Beverly Buckman	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/6/2018	660	Vivian Harmon	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/6/2018	660	James Phillips	\$ 20.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/7/2018	661	Jerome Brockway	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/7/2018	661	William Hart	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/7/2018	661	Paul Hess	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/7/2018	661	Patricia Amstutz	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/7/2018	661	John Brodzik	\$ 5.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/7/2018	CK 3296	David & Charlene Shupp	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/7/2018	CK 6932	Ray & Loretta Hieronimus	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/7/2018	CK 1022	The Floyd Investment Group	\$ 200.00	Cinema Rental for 9/24/2018
9/7/2018	CK 0919	Michael & Judith Costello	\$ 125.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/7/2018	CK 1273	Brenda & Lloyd Vansickle	\$ 50.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/7/2018	CK 1172	Joanne & Larry Hiltack	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/7/2018	CK 1614	Linda & Rondal Langston	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/7/2018	CK 1783	Nancy Zaggrafos	\$ 10.00	Sneak Peek - 9/7/18
9/17/2018	663	Angie Craft	\$ 25.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/17/2018	663	LowJean Steenberg	\$ 100.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/17/2018	663	Rita Sebastian	\$ 50.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/18/2018	664	Carl Chirico	\$ 50.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/18/2018	664	Robert Boyer	\$ 50.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/20/2018		Gary Fako	\$ 50.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/21/2018		Performance Plus Carts	\$ 750.00	Sponsorship - Jan 25 & 26 2019 ETS
9/21/2018	CK 1235	James & Teresa Sullivan	\$ 5.00	Sneak Peek Q 1
9/21/2018	CK 210	Gary & Carolyn Bishop	\$ 75.00	Oktoberfest Table 21
9/21/2018	CK 259	Nancy Gray	\$ 75.00	Oktoberfest Table 26
9/21/2018	CK 4133	Carl & Becky Mistretta	\$ 50.00	Oktoberfest Table 23
9/21/2018	CK 1400	John & Jean Fantelli	\$ 50.00	Oktoberfest Table 27
9/21/2018	CK 6132	Anna & Alfred Cooney	\$ 100.00	Oktoberfest Table 25
9/24/2018		Dan Begy	\$ 150.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/24/2018		Rosalie Fruedenberger	\$ 50.00	Oktoberfest - 9/26/18
9/27/2018		Matthew Grubb	\$ 750.00	Sponsorship March 22 & 23 2019 ETS
			\$ 3,380.00	

RENTALS

DATE	DESCRIPTION	NAME	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
9/7/2018	cash	Kandis Chadwick	\$ 83.00	Balance of Ballroom Rental - 10/19/19
9/7/2018	cash	Tiffany Livingston	\$ 500.00	Balance of Ballroom Rental - 6/22/19
9/21/2018	CK 1150	Lake Ashton Bingo	\$ 1,200.00	September rent
TOTAL			\$ 1,783.00	

LAKE ASHTON CDD
SEPTEMBER 2018 CASH RECEIPTS

NEWSLETTER

DATE	DESCRIPTION	NAME	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
9/20/2018		James Mecsis	\$ 175.00	LAT Inserts - October Issue
9/21/2018		James Mecsis	\$ 175.00	LAT Inserts - October Issue
9/21/2018		James Mecsis	\$ (175.00)	Refund Issued for LAT Inserts - October Issue
9/21/2018		Dan's City Fans	\$ 175.00	LAT Inserts - October Issue
9/21/2018	CK 0092	Robert Plummer Campaign Fund	\$ 175.00	LAT Inserts - October Issue
9/21/2018	CK 50209	United Refrigeration & AC	\$ 250.00	LAT Inserts & Advertising for October Issue
9/21/2018	CK 06117596	Edward Jones - Matt Simpson	\$ 175.00	LAT Newsletter Inserts For September Issue
9/27/2018		Accurate Advisory Group	\$ 175.00	LAT Inserts - October Issue
9/28/2018		Arts Golf Carts	\$ 323.08	LAT Ad - October Issue
9/28/2018		Blackburn's Interiors	\$ 400.00	LAT Ad - October Issue
9/28/2018		Pamela McGuire	\$ 275.00	LAT Ad - October Issue
9/28/2018		Dramatic Design	\$ 292.50	LAT Ad - October Issue
9/28/2018		Family Elder Law	\$ 332.31	LAT Ad - October Issue
9/28/2018		Florida Dermatology	\$ 350.00	LAT Ad - October Issue
9/28/2018		G & M Drywall	\$ 90.00	LAT Ad - October Issue
9/28/2018		Performance Carts Plus	\$ 395.00	LAT Ad - October Issue
9/28/2018		Rainbow Wicker	\$ 130.00	LAT Ad - October Issue
9/28/2018		Select Rehabilitation	\$ 338.57	LAT Ad - October Issue
9/28/2018		Southwood Builder Supply	\$ 1,320.00	LAT Ad - Oct-Dec Issue
TOTAL			\$ 5,371.46	

LAKE ASHTON CDD
SEPTEMBER 2018 CASH RECEIPTS

CLERICAL

DATE	DESCRIPTION	NAME	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
9/7/2018	cash	Clerical	\$ 25.00	Directories, Faxes, Copies, Postage
9/21/2018	CK 1175	Diane Mavuro	\$ 10.00	Photo ID Replacement
9/21/2018	cash	Clerical	\$ 73.00	Directories, Faxes, Copies, Postage
TOTAL			\$ 108.00	

COFFEE

DATE	DESCRIPTION	NAME	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
9/7/2018	661	Window World of Polk County	\$ 100.00	Monday Morning Coffee 10/29/2018
9/18/2018	664	Southwood Garage Doors	\$ 100.00	Monday Morning Coffee 10/22/2018
9/21/2018		Servpro of Bartow	\$ 100.00	Monday Morning Coffee - October 15, 2018
9/21/2018	CK 1689	Christine Graves Insurance	\$ 150.00	Oct-Dec 2018 - Monday Coffee 1/2 quarterly invoice
9/21/2018	CK 06103630	Edward Jones - Matt Simpson	\$ 100.00	Monday Morning Coffee - 9/17/2018
TOTAL			\$ 550.00	

DEPOSITS

DATE	DESCRIPTION	NAME	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
9/4/2018	658	Nivia Guitard	\$ 500.00	DD for Wedding on 10-6-2018
9/21/2018		Tonya Boatwright	\$ 500.00	DD & Security Fee for Wells/Martin Wedding on 10-20-2018
9/21/2018	CK 1004	Class of 1968 - Sandra Earley	\$ 500.00	DD Deposit - High School Reunion 10/27/2018
9/21/2018	cash	Cash	\$ 425.00	Damages Event 6/23/2018
TOTAL			\$ 1,925.00	

ENTRANCE GATE OPENERS

DATE	DESCRIPTION	NAME	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
9/12/2018	662	Kimberly Greene	\$ 37.00	Main Entrance Gate Opener
TOTAL			\$ 37.00	

SECURITY

DATE	DESCRIPTION	NAME	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
9/4/2018	658	Nivia Guitard	\$ 250.00	Security Fee for Wedding on 10-6-2018
9/21/2018		Tonya Boatwright	\$ 175.00	DD & Security Fee for Wells/Martin Wedding on 10-20-2018
9/21/2018	CK 1005	Class of 1968 - Sandra Earley	\$ 125.00	Security Fee - High School Reunion 10/27/2018
TOTAL			\$ 550.00	

TOTAL CASH RECEIPTS - SEPTEMBER 2018	\$ 13,704.46
---	---------------------

LAKE ASHTON CDD
SEPTEMBER 2018 CASH RECEIPTS

SUMMARY		
ENTERTAINMENT	\$	1,880.00
ENTERTAINMENT-DEFERRED	\$	1,500.00
ROOM RENTALS	\$	1,200.00
ROOM RENTALS-DEFERRED	\$	583.00
NEWSLETTER	\$	175.00
NEWSLETTER-DEFERRED	\$	5,196.46
CLERICAL	\$	108.00
COFFEE	\$	100.00
COFFEE-DEFERRED	\$	450.00
DEPOSITS	\$	1,925.00
DEPOSIT-RESTAURANT	\$	-
ENTRANCE GATE OPENER	\$	37.00
RESTAURANT/SALES TAXES	\$	-
SECURITY	\$	-
SECURITY-DEFERRED	\$	550.00
MISCELLANEOUS	\$	-
TOTAL	\$	13,704.46

Lake Ashton CDD
Special Assessment Receipts
Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 2018

Date Received	Collection Period	O&M Receipts	Debt Svc Receipts	O&M Discounts/ Penalties	Debt Discounts/ Penalties	Commissions Paid	Net Amount Received	\$1,690,408.25 .36300.10100 General Fund 100.00%	\$456,180.85 2015-1 Debt Svc Fund 89.403%	\$54,072.40 2015-2 Debt Svc Fund 10.597%	\$510,253.25 Debt Total 100%
11/15/2017	10/1/17-10/31/17	\$ 8,572.05	\$ 3,275.20	\$ 342.89	\$ 131.00	\$ 227.46	\$ 11,145.90	\$ 8,054.44	\$ 2,763.85	\$ 327.61	\$ 3,091.46
11/17/2017	11/1/17-11/5/17	\$ 97,721.37	\$ 19,998.90	\$ 3,909.04	\$ 799.93	\$ 2,260.23	\$ 110,751.07	\$ 92,076.17	\$ 16,695.89	\$ 1,979.01	\$ 18,674.91
11/22/2017	6/1/17-10/31/17	\$ 25,975.57	\$ 8,283.96	\$ 1,347.60	\$ 422.59	\$ 649.79	\$ 31,839.55	\$ 24,128.85	\$ 6,893.59	\$ 817.12	\$ 7,710.71
12/5/2017	11/06/17-11/12/17	\$ 219,444.48	\$ 57,363.12	\$ 8,778.13	\$ 2,294.47	\$ 5,314.70	\$ 260,420.30	\$ 206,583.94	\$ 48,131.23	\$ 5,705.13	\$ 53,836.36
12/13/2017	11/13/17-11/22/17	\$ 500,607.72	\$ 140,899.37	\$ 20,025.12	\$ 5,635.81	\$ 12,316.92	\$ 603,529.24	\$ 471,121.52	\$ 118,376.24	\$ 14,031.47	\$ 132,407.71
12/20/2017	11/23/17-11/30/17	\$ 627,474.06	\$ 202,907.63	\$ 25,099.99	\$ 8,116.01	\$ 15,943.31	\$ 781,222.38	\$ 590,127.43	\$ 170,844.29	\$ 20,250.65	\$ 191,094.95
1/16/2018	12/01/17-12/31/17	\$ 78,946.69	\$ 25,853.31	\$ 2,372.64	\$ 783.21	\$ 2,032.88	\$ 99,611.27	\$ 75,012.52	\$ 21,991.98	\$ 2,606.77	\$ 24,598.75
1/31/2018	INTEREST	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,123.84	\$ 868.57	\$ 228.22	\$ 27.05	\$ 255.27
2/14/2018	01/01/18-01/31/18	\$ 20,572.92	\$ 5,595.58	\$ 411.48	\$ 111.93	\$ 512.90	\$ 25,132.19	\$ 19,767.46	\$ 4,796.22	\$ 568.51	\$ 5,364.73
3/15/2018	02/01/18-02/28/18	\$ 7,714.02	\$ 2,801.97	\$ 68.57	\$ 26.12	\$ 208.43	\$ 10,212.87	\$ 7,485.35	\$ 2,438.48	\$ 289.04	\$ 2,727.52
4/13/2018	03/01/18-03/31/18	\$ 48,087.83	\$ 20,469.50	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,371.15	\$ 67,186.18	\$ 47,034.60	\$ 18,016.08	\$ 2,135.50	\$ 20,151.58
4/26/2018	INTEREST	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 68.08	\$ 49.38	\$ 16.72	\$ 1.98	\$ 18.70
5/15/2018	04/01/18-04/30/18	\$ 3,428.82	\$ 765.82	\$ (51.43)	\$ (22.97)	\$ 85.39	\$ 4,183.65	\$ 3,414.66	\$ 687.50	\$ 81.49	\$ 768.99
6/15/2018	05/01/18-05/31/18	\$ 2,144.84	\$ -	\$ (64.35)	\$ -	\$ 44.18	\$ 2,165.01	\$ 2,165.01	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6/20/2018	06/01/18-06/01/18	\$ 36,908.07	\$ 16,189.90	\$ (1,660.88)	\$ (728.53)	\$ 1,109.75	\$ 54,377.63	\$ 37,716.51	\$ 14,895.51	\$ 1,765.61	\$ 16,661.12
7/30/2018	INTEREST	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 75.59	\$ 54.47	\$ 18.88	\$ 2.24	\$ 21.12
8/8/2018	INV#4651605	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (21,985.90)	\$ (16,904.08)	\$ (4,543.29)	\$ (538.53)	\$ (5,081.82)
8/14/2018	07/01/18-07/31/18	\$ 6,803.40	\$ 3,151.67	\$ (530.47)	\$ (245.74)	\$ 214.63	\$ 10,516.65	\$ 7,169.01	\$ 2,992.89	\$ 354.76	\$ 3,347.65
9/14/2018	08/01/18-08/31/18	\$ 6,006.41	\$ 2,697.33	\$ (540.86)	\$ (242.94)	\$ 189.76	\$ 9,297.78	\$ 6,401.51	\$ 2,589.35	\$ 306.92	\$ 2,896.27
10/31/2018	EXCESS FEES	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (3,922.90)	\$ 3,922.90	\$ 3,013.32	\$ 813.19	\$ 96.39	\$ 909.58
BALANCE REMAINING		\$ 1,690,408.25	\$ 510,253.26	\$ 59,507.47	\$ 17,080.89	\$ 38,558.57	\$ 2,064,796.19	\$ 1,585,340.63	\$ 428,646.84	\$ 50,808.72	\$ 479,455.56
		\$0.00	(\$0.01)								

Gross Percent Collected	100.00%
Balance Due	(\$0.01)

LAKE ASHTON
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT
COMBINED BALANCE SHEET
September 30, 2018

	Major Funds			Total
	General	Debt Service	Capital Reserve	Governmental Funds
ASSETS:				
Cash-Wells Fargo	\$99,298	---	\$992	\$100,290
Assessments Receivable	\$3,013	\$910	---	\$3,923
Accounts Receivable	---	---	\$2,370	\$2,370
Due from Other Funds	\$1,482	---	---	\$1,482
Investment - State Board	\$301,933	---	---	\$301,933
Investment - State Board Capital Reserve	---	---	\$407,785	\$407,785
Investments:				
Series 2015				
Reserve A	---	\$235,063	---	\$235,063
Interest A	---	\$2	---	\$2
Revenue A	---	\$134,263	---	\$134,263
Prepayment A-1	---	\$36,218	---	\$36,218
Prepayment A-2	---	\$9,220	---	\$9,220
Prepaid Expenses	\$51,404	---	---	\$51,404
TOTAL ASSETS	\$457,130	\$415,675	\$411,146	\$1,283,951
LIABILITIES:				
Accounts Payable	\$61,907	---	\$21,820	\$83,726
Due to Other Funds	---	\$1,482	---	\$1,482
Deposits-Restaurant	\$6,000	---	---	\$6,000
Deposits-Room Rentals	\$6,250	---	---	\$6,250
Deferred Revenue	\$31,374	---	---	\$31,374
TOTAL LIABILITIES	\$105,531	\$1,482	\$21,820	\$128,832
FUND BALANCES:				
Nonspendable:				
Deposits and prepaid items	\$51,404	---	---	\$51,404
Restricted:				
Debt Service	---	\$414,194	---	\$414,194
Assigned:				
Capital Reserve	---	---	\$389,326	\$389,326
Unassigned	\$300,195	---	---	\$300,195
TOTAL FUND BALANCES	\$351,599	\$414,194	\$389,326	\$1,155,119
TOTAL LIABILITIES & FUND BALANCES	\$457,130	\$415,675	\$411,146	\$1,283,951

LAKE ASHTON

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT GENERAL FUND

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance
For The Period Ending September 30, 2018

AMENDED BUDGET	PRORATED BUDGET THRU 9/30/18	ACTUAL THRU 9/30/18	VARIANCE
-------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------	----------

REVENUES:

Special Assessments - Levy	\$1,572,079	\$1,572,079	\$1,585,341	\$13,261
Rental Income	\$56,675	\$56,675	\$61,425	\$4,750
Entertainment Fees	\$144,406	\$144,406	\$157,411	\$13,005
Newsletter Ad Revenue	\$92,804	\$92,804	\$97,750	\$4,946
Interest Income	\$6,413	\$6,413	\$8,199	\$1,786
Miscellaneous Income	\$16,427	\$16,427	\$18,305	\$1,878
Restaurant Lease	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$5,484	(\$6,516)
Insurance Proceeds	\$192,846	\$192,846	\$192,846	\$0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$2,093,650	\$2,093,650	\$2,126,760	\$33,111

EXPENDITURES:

ADMINISTRATIVE:

Supervisor Fees	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,100	(\$100)
FICA Expense	\$230	\$230	\$237	(\$8)
Engineering	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$28,993	(\$8,993)
Arbitrage	\$1,200	\$1,200	\$600	\$600
Dissemination	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,450	(\$450)
Attorney	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$32,660	(\$12,660)
Annual Audit	\$4,123	\$4,123	\$4,123	\$0
Trustee Fees	\$4,310	\$4,310	\$4,310	\$0
Management Fees	\$58,482	\$58,482	\$58,482	\$0
Computer Time	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$0
Travel & Per Diem	\$0	\$0	\$100	(\$100)
Postage	\$2,500	\$2,500	\$3,008	(\$508)
Printing & Binding	\$1,600	\$1,600	\$1,420	\$181
Newsletter Printing	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$38,862	(\$6,862)
Rentals & Leases	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,421	(\$421)
Insurance	\$34,278	\$34,278	\$36,737	(\$2,459)
Legal Advertising	\$500	\$500	\$977	(\$477)
Other Current Charges	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$13,412	(\$12,162)
Property Taxes	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$12,408	(\$408)
Office Supplies	\$100	\$100	\$71	\$29
Dues, Licenses & Subscriptions	\$175	\$175	\$175	\$0
TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE	\$202,748	\$202,748	\$247,545	(\$44,798)

LAKE ASHTON

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT GENERAL FUND

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance For The Period Ending September 30, 2018

	AMENDED BUDGET	PRORATED BUDGET THRU 9/30/18	ACTUAL THRU 9/30/18	VARIANCE
Field:				
Field Management Services	\$322,330	\$322,330	\$292,407	\$29,923
Gate Attendants	\$209,457	\$209,457	\$213,017	(\$3,560)
Pool Attendants	\$12,495	\$12,495	\$6,614	\$5,881
Pest Control	\$1,750	\$1,750	\$2,276	(\$526)
Security/Fire Alarm/Gate Repairs	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$9,057	(\$4,057)
Telephone/Internet	\$13,600	\$13,600	\$11,827	\$1,773
Electric	\$216,000	\$216,000	\$206,990	\$9,010
Water	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$11,726	\$274
Gas	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$25,926	(\$10,926)
Refuse	\$10,500	\$10,500	\$8,674	\$1,826
Clubhouse Maintenance	\$105,000	\$105,000	\$122,108	(\$17,108)
Pool and Fountain Maintenance	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,148	(\$148)
Landscape Maintenance	\$176,007	\$176,007	\$175,580	\$427
Plant Replacement	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$4,234	\$2,766
Irrigation Repairs	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$1,398	\$6,102
Lake Maintenance	\$18,540	\$18,540	\$18,540	\$0
Wetland Mitigation and Maintenance	\$34,800	\$34,800	\$37,750	(\$2,950)
Permits/Inspections	\$2,160	\$2,160	\$1,580	\$580
Office Supplies/Printing/Binding	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$5,714	(\$1,714)
Operating Supplies	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$32,249	(\$7,249)
Credit Card Processing Fees	\$3,500	\$3,500	\$3,813	(\$313)
Dues & Subscriptions	\$8,500	\$8,500	\$11,534	(\$3,034)
Decorations	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$628	\$1,373
Special Events	\$130,000	\$130,000	\$149,679	(\$19,679)
Storm Damage	\$303,316	\$303,316	\$314,316	(\$11,000)
Traffic Accident Damage	\$0	\$0	\$4,716	(\$4,716)
TOTAL FIELD	\$1,665,455	\$1,665,455	\$1,692,499	(\$27,044)
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$1,868,202	\$1,868,202	\$1,940,044	(\$71,842)
OTHER SOURCES AND USES				
Capital Reserve-Transfer Out	(\$260,194)	(\$260,194)	(\$260,194)	\$0
TOTAL OTHER SOURCES AND USES	(\$260,194)	(\$260,194)	(\$260,194)	\$0
EXCESS REVENUES (EXPENDITURES)	(\$34,746)		(\$73,477)	
FUND BALANCE - Beginning	\$34,746		\$425,077	
FUND BALANCE - Ending	\$0		\$351,599	

(1) Assessments are shown net of Discounts and Collection Fees.

LAKE ASHTON
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT
Capital Projects Reserve Fund
Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance
For The Period Ending September 30, 2018

	ADOPTED BUDGET	PRORATED BUDGET THRU 9/30/18	ACTUAL THRU 9/30/18	VARIANCE
REVENUES:				
Interest Income	\$100	\$100	\$6,909	\$6,809
Capital Reserve-Transfer In FY 18	\$260,194	\$260,194	\$260,194	\$0
TOTAL REVENUES	\$260,294	\$260,294	\$267,103	\$6,809
EXPENDITURES:				
Capital Projects:				
Restaurant Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$5,344	(\$5,344)
Ballroom Window Replacement	\$66,000	\$66,000	\$35,042	\$30,958
Bowling Alley Equipment & Scoreboards	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$19,050	\$5,950
Computer Allowance	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$550	\$4,450
Pool Fence Panel Refurbishment	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$0	\$16,000
Fitness Equipment	\$19,000	\$19,000	\$13,968	\$5,032
Fitness Center Restroom Refurbishment	\$0	\$0	\$3,260	(\$3,260)
HVAC Replacement	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$12,990	\$7,010
Landscape Refurbishment	\$10,100	\$10,100	\$8,528	\$1,572
Pavement Management-Parking lot Resurfacing/Striping	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$0	\$70,000
Pavement Management-2993 LF Gullane, Dornoch, Robellini	\$165,000	\$165,000	\$300	\$164,700
Pool Equipment	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$5,844	\$4,156
Restaurant Equipment Allowance	\$15,000	\$15,000	\$21,171	(\$6,171)
Stormwater System and Curb Repairs	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$31,680	(\$6,680)
Ticketing Software	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000
Traffic Calming Speed Humps (2)	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$0	\$7,500
Other Current Charges	\$650	\$650	\$476	\$174
Capital Reserves	\$71,920	\$71,920	\$0	\$71,920
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$536,170	\$536,170	\$158,202	\$377,968
EXCESS REVENUES (EXPENDITURES)	(\$275,876)		\$108,901	
FUND BALANCE - Beginning	\$275,876		\$280,425	
FUND BALANCE - Ending	\$0		\$389,326	

LAKE ASHTON
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

SERIES 2015
DEBT SERVICE FUND

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance
For The Period Ending September 30, 2018

AMENDED BUDGET	PRORATED THRU 9/30/18	ACTUAL THRU 9/30/18	VARIANCE
-------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	----------

REVENUES:

Interest Income	\$0	\$0	\$1,087	\$1,087
Assessments - Levy	\$477,921	\$477,921	\$479,456	\$1,535
Assessments - Prepayments A-1	\$0	\$0	\$31,795	\$31,795
Assessments - Prepayments A-2	\$0	\$0	\$4,746	\$4,746

TOTAL REVENUES	\$477,921	\$477,921	\$517,084	\$39,163
-----------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	-----------------

EXPENDITURES:

Series 2015A-1

Interest - 11/01	\$111,625	\$111,625	\$111,625	\$0
Interest - 5/01	\$111,625	\$111,625	\$110,250	\$1,375
Principal - 5/01	\$205,000	\$205,000	\$200,000	\$5,000
Special Call - 11/01	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$55,000	(\$30,000)
Special Call - 05/01	\$0	\$0	\$20,000	(\$20,000)

Series 2015A-2

Interest - 11/01	\$15,125	\$15,125	\$15,125	\$0
Interest - 5/01	\$15,125	\$15,125	\$15,000	\$125
Principal - 5/01	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0
Special Call - 11/01	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	(\$5,000)

TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$503,500	\$503,500	\$552,000	(\$48,500)
---------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	-------------------

EXCESS REVENUES (EXPENDITURES)	(\$25,579)	(\$34,916)
---------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------

FUND BALANCE - Beginning	\$165,434	\$449,110
---------------------------------	------------------	------------------

FUND BALANCE - Ending	\$139,855	\$414,194
------------------------------	------------------	------------------

**LAKE ASHTON
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT
Long Term Debt Report
FY 2018**

<i>Series 2015-1, Special Assessment Bonds</i>		
Interest Rate:	5.000%	
Maturity Date:	5/1/2025	\$1,965,000.00
Interest Rate:	5.000%	
Maturity Date:	5/1/2032	\$2,500,000.00
Reserve Requirement:	50% Maximum Annual Debt Service	
Bonds outstanding - 9/30/2017		\$4,465,000.00
	November 1, 2017 (Special Call)	(\$55,000.00)
	May 1, 2018 (Mandatory)	(\$200,000.00)
	May 1, 2018 (Special Call)	(\$20,000.00)
Current Bonds Outstanding		\$4,190,000.00

<i>Series 2015-2, Special Assessment Bonds</i>		
Interest Rate:	5.000%	
Maturity Date:	5/1/2025	\$170,000.00
Interest Rate:	5.000%	
Maturity Date:	5/1/2037	\$435,000.00
Reserve Requirement:	50% Maximum Annual Debt Service	
Bonds outstanding - 9/30/2017		\$605,000.00
	November 1, 2017 (Special Call)	(\$5,000.00)
	May 1, 2018 (Mandatory)	(\$20,000.00)
Current Bonds Outstanding		\$580,000.00

Total Current Bonds Outstanding		\$4,770,000.00
--	--	-----------------------

**Lake Ashton
Community Development District**

General Fund
Statement of Revenues and Expenditures (Month by Month)
FY 2018

	OCT 2017	NOV 2017	DEC 2017	JAN 2018	FEB 2018	MAR 2018	APR 2018	MAY 2018	JUN 2018	JUL 2018	AUG 2018	SEP 2018	TOTAL
Revenues													
Maintenance Assessments	\$0	\$1,392,092	\$75,013	\$20,636	\$7,485	\$47,035	\$3,464	\$39,882	\$0	\$7,223	(\$16,904)	\$9,415	\$1,585,341
Rental Income	\$5,450	\$3,475	\$6,750	\$7,000	\$5,400	\$3,900	\$14,100	\$3,950	\$2,800	\$4,600	\$2,800	\$1,200	\$61,425
Entertainment Fees	\$96,050	\$14,974	\$10,991	\$9,342	\$3,998	\$1,753	\$3,138	\$2,130	\$1,205	\$825	\$11,125	\$1,880	\$157,411
Newsletter Ad Revenue	\$23,057	\$9,770	\$5,299	\$17,571	\$7,847	\$8,808	\$5,917	\$5,420	\$4,461	\$4,655	\$4,771	\$175	\$97,750
Interest Income	\$342	\$188	\$180	\$200	\$1,208	\$1,166	\$744	\$768	\$775	\$842	\$834	\$952	\$8,199
Miscellaneous Income	\$1,911	\$870	\$4,981	\$1,126	\$1,130	\$1,446	\$1,129	\$1,141	\$910	\$1,784	\$1,633	\$245	\$18,305
Restaurant Lease	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$484	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,484
Insurance Proceeds	\$0	\$4,716	\$0	\$0	\$182,946	\$5,183	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$192,846
Total Revenues	\$127,809	\$1,427,084	\$104,213	\$56,875	\$211,014	\$69,775	\$28,492	\$53,291	\$10,151	\$19,930	\$4,259	\$13,867	\$2,126,760
ADMINISTRATIVE:													
Supervisor Fees	\$250	\$250	\$200	\$250	\$250	\$250	\$250	\$500	\$200	\$250	\$250	\$200	\$3,100
FICA Expense	\$19	\$19	\$15	\$19	\$19	\$19	\$19	\$38	\$15	\$19	\$19	\$15	\$237
Engineering	\$900	\$1,350	\$1,575	\$1,725	\$2,715	\$2,363	\$1,875	\$6,318	\$4,953	\$2,925	\$2,115	\$180	\$28,993
Arbitrage	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$600
Dissemination	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$433	\$183	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$1,450
Attorney	\$1,714	\$2,156	\$1,405	\$2,717	\$2,528	\$3,373	\$3,424	\$1,951	\$1,734	\$2,219	\$5,393	\$4,047	\$32,660
Consulting Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Annual Audit	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$23	\$0	\$0	\$500	\$1,500	\$2,100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,123
Trustee Fees	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,310	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,310
Management Fees	\$4,874	\$4,874	\$4,874	\$4,874	\$4,874	\$4,874	\$4,874	\$4,874	\$4,874	\$4,874	\$4,874	\$4,874	\$58,482
Computer Time	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$83	\$1,000
Travel & Per Diem	\$0	\$100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100
Postage	\$341	\$672	\$464	\$199	\$199	\$207	\$156	\$145	\$222	\$176	\$90	\$137	\$3,008
Printing & Binding	\$115	\$111	\$138	\$0	\$103	\$118	\$157	\$182	\$93	\$156	\$121	\$125	\$1,420
Newsletter Printing	\$3,200	\$3,571	\$3,321	\$3,439	\$3,557	\$3,131	\$3,288	\$3,284	\$3,289	\$2,976	\$2,852	\$2,955	\$38,862
Rentals & Leases	\$709	\$187	\$320	\$998	\$187	\$224	\$997	\$187	\$187	\$1,022	\$187	\$216	\$5,421
Insurance	\$36,737	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$36,737
Legal Advertising	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$59	\$0	\$33	\$29	\$165	\$0	\$188	\$333	\$171	\$977
Other Current Charges	\$81	\$186	\$66	\$8	\$111	\$59	\$44	\$2,531	\$209	\$10,005	\$21	\$92	\$13,412
Property Taxes	\$0	\$12,408	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,408
Office Supplies	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$58	\$5	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4	\$3	\$71
Dues, Licenses & Subscriptions	\$175	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$175
Total Administrative	\$49,281	\$26,050	\$12,544	\$14,536	\$14,714	\$15,167	\$20,791	\$21,840	\$18,041	\$24,976	\$16,424	\$13,182	\$247,545

Lake Ashton
Community Development District
 General Fund
 Statement of Revenues and Expenditures (Month by Month)
 FY 2018

	OCT 2017	NOV 2017	DEC 2017	JAN 2018	FEB 2018	MAR 2018	APR 2018	MAY 2018	JUN 2018	JUL 2018	AUG 2018	SEP 2018	TOTAL
<i>Field:</i>													
Field Management Services	\$28,939	\$25,690	\$37,338	\$26,264	\$20,288	\$21,010	\$21,785	\$18,802	\$29,297	\$19,965	\$21,438	\$21,592	\$292,407
Gate Attendants	\$17,756	\$17,290	\$17,739	\$18,363	\$16,876	\$18,738	\$17,010	\$17,561	\$17,924	\$37,626	\$0	\$16,133	\$213,017
Pool Attendants	\$0	\$0	\$257	\$2,278	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,486	\$1,593	\$0	\$0	\$6,614
Pest Control	\$120	\$120	\$120	\$120	\$295	\$305	\$120	\$245	\$240	\$120	\$123	\$348	\$2,276
Security/Fire Alarm/Gate Repairs	\$1,153	\$1,079	\$168	\$130	\$715	\$526	\$476	\$258	\$1,390	\$1,365	\$1,045	\$752	\$9,057
Telephone/Internet	\$948	\$1,002	\$1,764	\$898	\$898	\$1,060	\$119	\$999	\$1,097	\$1,045	\$999	\$999	\$11,827
Electric	\$18,266	\$17,551	\$18,278	\$18,251	\$17,845	\$17,176	\$16,357	\$15,759	\$16,160	\$16,964	\$17,318	\$17,065	\$206,990
Water	\$814	\$976	\$970	\$1,004	\$962	\$964	\$953	\$1,119	\$1,023	\$1,136	\$957	\$849	\$11,726
Gas	\$4,522	\$2,478	\$3,116	\$5,552	\$2,973	\$1,167	\$1,597	\$3,447	\$0	\$701	\$374	\$0	\$25,926
Refuse	\$379	\$851	\$851	\$1,070	\$379	\$1,066	\$379	\$722	\$722	\$722	\$767	\$767	\$8,674
Clubhouse Maintenance	\$8,551	\$5,706	\$15,519	\$11,537	\$7,831	\$9,436	\$12,358	\$11,055	\$10,884	\$16,309	\$7,588	\$5,334	\$122,108
Pool and Fountain Maintenance	\$1,528	\$2,765	\$1,965	\$1,365	\$1,565	\$1,565	\$1,565	\$1,720	\$1,565	\$1,565	\$1,490	\$1,490	\$20,148
Landscape Maintenance	\$14,240	\$14,667	\$14,667	\$14,667	\$14,667	\$14,667	\$14,667	\$14,667	\$14,667	\$14,667	\$14,667	\$14,667	\$175,580
Plant Replacement	\$0	\$765	\$0	\$2,844	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$625	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,234
Irrigation Repairs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$470	\$0	\$338	\$590	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,398
Lake Maintenance	\$1,545	\$1,545	\$1,545	\$1,545	\$1,545	\$1,545	\$1,545	\$1,545	\$1,545	\$1,545	\$1,545	\$1,545	\$18,540
Wetland Mitigation and Maintenance	\$0	\$0	\$10,100	\$0	\$0	\$7,300	\$0	\$0	\$10,100	\$2,950	\$0	\$7,300	\$37,750
Permits/Inspections	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$312	\$550	\$0	\$90	\$420	\$0	\$0	\$208	\$1,580
Office Supplies/Printing/Binding	\$1,017	\$339	\$204	\$1,357	\$611	\$459	\$364	\$630	\$73	\$308	\$256	\$95	\$5,714
Operating Supplies	\$2,432	\$4,099	\$3,335	\$10,410	\$1,880	\$1,642	\$2,487	\$1,573	\$572	\$2,278	\$1,054	\$486	\$32,249
Credit Card Processing Fees	\$246	\$1,113	\$340	\$391	\$195	\$184	\$266	\$276	\$153	\$131	\$172	\$348	\$3,813
Dues & Subscriptions	\$219	\$234	\$198	\$1,357	\$198	\$441	\$254	\$303	\$3,152	\$809	\$4,170	\$198	\$11,534
Decorations	\$0	\$368	\$0	\$260	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$628
Special Events	\$982	\$4,665	\$9,799	\$66,788	\$31,378	\$22,722	\$872	\$3,081	\$436	\$1,380	\$2,768	\$4,807	\$149,679
Storm Damage	\$1,305	\$0	\$112,048	\$153,022	\$36,941	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,000	\$314,316
Traffic Accident Damage	\$0	\$4,716	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,716
TOTAL FIELD	\$104,961	\$108,018	\$250,321	\$339,472	\$158,823	\$122,523	\$93,513	\$94,440	\$114,533	\$123,178	\$76,730	\$105,984	\$1,692,499
OTHER SOURCES AND USES													
Capital Reserve-Transfer Out	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$260,194)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$260,194)
TOTAL OTHER SOURCES AND USES	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$260,194)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$260,194)
Subtotal Operating Expenses	\$154,242	\$134,068	\$262,865	\$614,202	\$173,537	\$137,690	\$114,304	\$116,281	\$132,574	\$148,154	\$93,155	\$119,166	\$2,200,238
Excess Revenues (Expenditures)	(\$26,433)	\$1,293,016	(\$158,652)	(\$557,327)	\$37,477	(\$67,915)	(\$85,812)	(\$62,990)	(\$122,423)	(\$128,224)	(\$88,895)	(\$105,299)	(\$73,477)