Minutes of Meeting Rivers Edge Community Development District

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Rivers Edge Community Development District was held Wednesday, February 17, 2021 at 11:00 a.m. at the RiverTown Amenity Center, 156 Landing Street, St. Johns, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Randy Schaublin Chairman by telephone Mac McIntyre Vice Chairman by telephone Erick Saks Supervisor Frederick Baron Supervisor Robert Cameron Supervisor Also present were: Jim Perry District Manager Lauren Gentry District Counsel Jennifer Kilinski District Counsel by telephone Ryan Stillwell **District Engineer** Dan Fagen Vesta/Amenity Services Jason Davidson Vesta/Amenity Services Zach Davidson Vesta/Amenity Services Robert Beladi VerdeGo Ernesto Torres GMS

The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the February 17, 2021 meeting. An audio copy of the proceedings can be obtained by contacting the District Manager.

Mattamy

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS Roll Call

Mr. Perry called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. and called the roll.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Jacob O'Keefe

Audience Comments

There being none, the next item followed.

Rivers Edge CDD

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of the January 20, 2021 Meeting

On MOTION by Mr. Baron seconded by Mr. Cameron with all in favor the minutes of the January 20, 2021 meeting were approved as presented.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Update on Landscaping Areas on Longleaf Pine Parkway

Mr. Perry stated we provided to the board documents relative to the enhancements on Longleaf Pine Parkway and we have been working with VerdeGo on some of the costs related to that. You may have received in a separate email some cost sheets, but those are not accurate. We are working through that and will bring that back to you at the next meeting.

Mr. Baron stated it is a cost share between all three districts. All three districts would have to concur with the plan. If one district says no, how do you deal with that?

Mr. Perry stated if a district says I am not going to participate the other two districts could in theory absorb the cost or an individual district could absorb the cost and then it would not be cost shared.

Mr. Cameron stated it looks as though the work has already taken place.

Mr. Perry stated there is work being done.

Mr. Cameron asked why didn't anybody say anything about that at the last meeting when I asked?

Mr. O'Keefe stated I don't know how else to approach this other than to say it was a process failure in terms of looping in all the necessary parties in terms of getting a review with all the eyes on the improvements that were taking place. Mattamy was the issuing name on those improvements, we did so because we felt that it would enhance the overall community feel and the sense of arrival for the residents to not have to drive through shrubs between Publix and the front entrance of Rivertown. That is work that Mattamy has had in their purview for a long time and it took a long time to get through. It was expensive to install, but we did it to enhance the feel of the whole place for the residents. We tried to do so with maintenance costs, preservation and trying to keep that down knowing that there are sensitivities not just on the board's end but on everyone's end. I feel there was a failure on getting that in front of everybody and for that I

Rivers Edge CDD

apologize. That falls on me but I'm hoping we can work towards a solution that everyone is comfortable with in terms of incorporating that into it being maintained by all three districts.

Mr. Baron stated that is why I asked the question the way I did. I'm familiar with the CDD turnover after the builder is done at a certain point. We are inheriting something as an enhancement, but we are going to turn this over to the CDD for maintenance. This was an unusual way that this was being brought forward.

Mr. Perry stated it is my understanding that it is not going to be completed prior to the next meeting.

Ms. Gentry stated as a process and history on this, it is my understanding that these areas are already being maintained at a base level under the existing landscaping agreement. These are not new areas necessarily that are coming online, it is just additional landscaping improvements that are being installed in these areas that we are already maintaining. Your interlocal cost share agreement contemplates a process to do that sort of thing and it is just getting the necessary signoff from Jim and Ryan and the districts that all these costs are appropriate, they benefit all the communities and that sort of thing. We have collaborated with Mattamy, shared the forms with them and I think everyone is on the same page now as to what it takes to bring these online. We will be looking to get those in front of you as soon as possible.

Mr. Cameron stated I would like to see them come in front of us before the process because part of what is in this plan, I think we paid for it, when we did the replacement of the grass to the south.

Mr. O'Keefe stated that was existing St. Augustine, it was already irrigated and landscaped. It was basically replacing what was already there. Mattamy paid all the costs for the improvements, that was not borne by the district.

Mr. Stillwell stated the entire road is shown in the plans, but only in certain areas was there work done. Most of those areas are places that either had trees that were dying, trees that were dead or they had areas of sod that were not irrigated.

Mr. O'Keefe stated the goal going forward is prior to plans being finalized, definitely before a shovel goes into the ground there is purview on everyone's aspect and insight that all the boards can share and all before the plans being finalized. You asked the question, but no one knew at the time. We weren't running in sync with each other, and I think we are there now.

Mr. Baron stated to put closure on this, we will ask that you put on the next agenda your cost share proposal and how you came up with the percentage against each CDD.

Mr. Perry stated that has been established. I think CDD II is about 30%, CDD I is 33% and the balance is in CDD III.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Discussion on Additional Trails

Mr. Perry stated included in your agenda package is a trail map and we wanted to bring this to the board in discussions with Jacob. These are proposed enhancements and so forth.

Mr. O'Keefe stated I think we are now out in front of this. Mattamy owns the majority of the land in which these trails are going through. There are a couple areas in which these trails cross that are over Rivers Edge I's property. Probably the most significant area is the area adjacent to the dog park and then a couple more towards Longleaf Pine entrance, there is another area the district owns and those are essentially what we are targeting to be trailheads as a launching point to get back into the tail system. Those will be hardscaped and landscaped improvements on district property. Mattamy would like to put in place as a natural amenity for the community to get back into the trail systems that were put throughout the balance of Mattamy owned land behind there, which will eventually be transferred to the appropriate CDD ownership at some point for maintenance. I'm looking for feedback from you and get a handle on what questions you may have in order for us to be able to put that amenity in the ground for the residents.

Mr. Baron stated I noticed the two locations for the trailhead specifically have parking near them. One is with the dog park and has a parking area. It appears that trailhead no. 2 has proposed parking to be at the trailhead. Is that correct?

Mr. Stillwell stated that is correct. We are proposing to put golf cart parking at trailheads.

Mr. Baron asked at the play park why would that not be a trailhead as a location?

Mr. O'Keefe stated there are a lot of different areas where we could draw trailheads. It has a little bit to do with looping systems that we wanted to put in place for the residents to be able to experience different portions of the community without having to get too far out in terms of length and having to travel to get to there. A portion of it is cost management with limiting the amount of trail that we are putting in and trying to get space between them where there are two different points of arrival and departure without them being right next to each other.

Rivers Edge CDD

Mr. Stillwell stated part of that involves being able to have golf cart parking at the trailhead. We don't have parking at the north end, and we don't want to encourage golf carts being driven over there because they should not be at that play park.

Mr. Baron asked is there any lighting system that will be provided for the safety and security of the community?

Mr. O'Keefe stated not within the trails themselves. One reason is the cost, another is if I have a home on a preserve neighborhood and all of sudden there were lights in my backyard, and the goal is to have that be a natural trail system where it is being traversed in daylight hours and at night it returns to an unused area.

Mr. Baron stated my concern is safety and as you do the trails similar to the waterfront area where the trails are, they are very open, very visible. I don't know about deep into the woods area here whether that safety and concern is there. As you build that out consider that a key factor.

Mr. O'Keefe stated that is not the goal. The goal is not to clear cut a bunch of woods back there, it is to make you feel like you are in nature not like you are in a manufactured version of nature. The goal is to go back there with a bobcat and whatever the width of the shovel is on the front of the bobcat would be the width of the trail and do as little disturbance to that natural area as possible.

Mr. Baron stated you are asking the board members to fund the maintenance of that where if it is not cleared enough, I'm constantly back in there cutting back overgrowth each year. It is a trade on how much am I going to be funding for maintenance on a yearly basis after it is developed versus what can I do upfront in the planning stage to make that maintenance cost go down.

Mr. O'Keefe stated I get it and our design has maintenance in mind. The attempt is to make that natural surface for the most part with the only hardscape coming in the form of monumentation at points of historical significance or perhaps natural view corridors that are nice such as a view of the pond and we may put in a couple benches but the trails themselves other than where they require a boardwalk to get over a wetland, which is minimal in the grand scheme of this project, the surfaces themselves will be hardpacked covered with pine needles.

Mr. Stillwell stated it is an unpaved path, they are not intended to be paved.

Mr. Cameron asked do you have a way to keep the carts out?

5

Rivers Edge CDD

Mr. Stillwell stated the goal is to set up a trailhead at the dog park with bollards to prevent carts from the going on the trails. Most of these trails are about 6 feet but golf carts are not allowed in these areas.

Mr. Cameron asked what about crosswalks?

Mr. O'Keefe stated as a portion of the management of these trails we were hoping that we would be able to also install a crosswalk for access in a more defined manner to get to the dog park as well as widening of the path for golf carts to now be able to access the welcome center and splash pad area.

I'm looking to get on the frontend of the conversation with you to make sure that we have your approval for the improvements on Rivers Edge I property and making sure you have an understanding of the scope in general.

Mr. Cameron asked will St. Johns County want access?

Mr. O'Keefe stated that will be district property at some point. Will it be public? Since Rivers Edge I is a public entity, it can be accessed by the public.

Mr. Perry stated some boards have adopted policies in regard to ID cards so the facilities even though they are public facilities, we do have a non-member rate that you can join to be a member, but that would require members of the public to join and pay the \$3,000 or \$3,500 a year fee. The question then gets to how you monitor it and most people don't wear their ID tags or carry it in their wallet. It gets to be a problematic issue down the road, but that is one way to solve that issue to a certain extent.

Ms. Gentry stated when we talk about those people, both the residents who pay your annual CDD assessments and the outsiders who have the option to pay that annual fee and have access to the amenities, we call those "Patrons," so if we install signage, we can say Patrons only.

Mr. O'Keefe stated the point of the conversation was to make sure that we could get the ball rolling and continue with the design and we will have to come back with final plans in terms of what the trailhead will look like and will probably put that in front of you. If you have more question you can post those to the team here.

Mr. Saks asked what is the timeline?

Mr. O'Keefe stated hopefully, it will be totally complete by early summer. It has been surveyed and the design should be finalized by the end of this month and we could break ground shortly thereafter.

6

Rivers Edge CDD

Mr. Saks asked are there any low points in this or areas that could wash away?

Mr. Stillwell responded there are two areas that we have identified because we have walked the trails and that is marked on the map. These trails are intended to be natural so it may be that as we start construction, there may be a desire to leave one of them and it be closed during periods of rain. When you create natural trails, you go out and walk the area and maybe go around a tree rather than right through it. Our goal is not to take down any trees with this other than saplings, it is to be a natural trail.

Mr. Cameron asked can you give us an estimate of how many feet of trail is in CDD I and CDD II.

Mr. Stillwell stated the distances are shown on the map and overall, it is a little under 5 miles of trails. Just to make sure we did this right from a process standpoint; do we need to formally make a submittal from a plan perspective for all three boards to approve or is it more of a presentation?

Ms. Gentry stated at this stage I don't believe we are far enough in the process yet to have the cost-share maintenance amounts. This is helpful from a looking forward standpoint and once we have those maintenance costs, we will get the forms before the boards.

Mr. O'Keefe stated the hardscape improvements that are right around the corner at the trailheads are something that will be done on district property. Do we have to do anything for that?

Ms. Gentry stated yes, I was going to get with you offline about that. There may be something we want to bring back at the next meeting, but I will talk with you both offline.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Discussion on Conservation Easement Obstruction

Mr. Perry stated we have a number of households that have constructed on easement areas fencing and other types of structures and staff is evaluating whether some of those structures should remain depending on how they have been built and where they are built. Once we identify all of these and the issues related to them, we are going to bring back a suggestion on a policy that the board can undertake, hopefully in the future, and the policy would entail that anybody who is looking to construct something on district lands, it has to go through the HOA for their permit process but would also need to come before the CDD so we can make sure there are no encroachments on our properties. There will probably be a fee associated with such efforts whether

Rivers Edge CDD

it is new construction or even allowing the current items that are on there to remain in place because a lot of these items take a lot of staff time and a lot of our staff is on an hourly basis, we want to make sure the district isn't footing the bill for certain residents that want or have already constructed enhancements.

Mr. Schaublin asked what is the purpose, we have an architectural review board?

Ms. Gentry stated to provide a little bit of context about the process, you have private lots and on your private lot along many of the edges are reserved to the district an easement that says the district can access this property for purposes of drainage access, etc.. The problem is when residents install a fence or landscaping or a pool that cuts into that easement area it interferes with the district's rights that we need to be able to maintain our improvements and for our stormwater system to function properly. When residents go before the architectural review board, they are getting approval on one side from the HOA that says this is or is not the type of thing you can install on your property but what some residents don't realize is that the district has a property right in that easement area. The process we would put into place would be a process where they come to us, tell us what their proposed encroachment is, and Ryan's team would evaluate whether that is permissible or not based on what we need the easement for. There are different types of easements, so the analysis is different in each case. If it was something that was acceptable, we would have them sign an agreement that acknowledges they have permission to install this but if the District needs to use this easement area for its intended purpose, they may have to move it and they are not allowed to install other things beyond what they have gotten approval for in this area. It is really to protect the District and our ability to use the easements.

Mr. Schaublin asked why isn't it a part of the ARB request? Are you saying we are going to add another step to the process? Why have this process when we already have a review process?

Ms. Gentry stated ideally there would be some communication if the HOA sees an application that obviously encroaches on the CDD easement they would forward it to our staff. Ultimately, you want the burden to be on the homeowner because the homeowner has their lot, they have a survey that shows everything on their lot when they buy their property, and they are the ones applying for the permission. For instance, we can grant permission from the CDD side but there may be additional approvals from the county or the water management district that they need to obtain, and it is not our place to tell them what approvals they need from the county or other entities.

Rivers Edge CDD

Mr. Schaublin stated when I put in my screened patio in the backyard I went through this process with the ARB and they guided me through the whole step, where I had to drive my lot zones and encouraged us to go through the county, the builder to work with the county on permits. I'm confused as to why it is so fractured. It seemed to work well when I put in my screened in patio.

Mr. Perry stated I think part of the process, and I'm not positive of this, but it appears that once it has been approved the actual construction might be a little different than what has been approved and there is not a review of the ARB out there to determine if the fence should have been put 10-feet south of the easement area or not.

Mr. Cameron stated there is a big difference with the easements and everything else. I have a 10-foot easement in the back of my lawn because it is for access. I have built on the 10foot easement, I put in a patio, it came quite a ways from it, I added a bed in the rear and I asked for the bed because it is a major landscape change and I asked for that and I was told I was fine, but if I encroached on the easement I would be responsible for replacing anything that was in that easement. That is what the HOA did for the \$50 I paid. My next-door neighbor had the same 10foot on his property. When he bought the house, he bought it with the fence put in, a 6-foot vinyl fence put right on the property line, the easement was not in any way adjusted. That was done by the homeowner. The salesperson when I first moved in one of my neighbors had asked if he could go across my property because he was bringing in sod and I said fine, then he had 40-yard dumpster of palmettos taken out of his backyard. Maybe it was in the easement, I don't know, then he put in four pallets of sod. I asked him what are you doing, because I didn't have anything I needed to take out of my backyard and he said Mattamy when they sold me the house told me they were going to clear the palmettos, I got tired of waiting so I'm doing it myself. I know it was an expense for him but I'm sure that is one of the easements you are talking about. We do not control the HOA until 90% of the three CDDs have sold. To me it is Mattamy's problem because that way they can argue the salesperson told them something and Mattamy can live by it. I understand it is an easement that is included in our CDD, but it is really a convoluted situation. I feel it should be policed by the HOA not by the CDD board because they are the ones. What is the \$50 for, to rubber stamp whatever comes before them?

Rivers Edge CDD

Ms. Gentry stated I can't speak to the HOA process, but I agree it would be beneficial if there were some collaboration and once we get our policy in place we can talk to the HOA about how they refer applications to us.

Mr. Saks asked is it typical for a CDD to have a separate process for this?

Ms. Gentry stated the HOA does not have the authority to grant permission on behalf of the CDD; that can only come from the CDD. It would be great if the HOA would cooperate and route to us any applications that seem to encroach on an easement. I would say it is much better for the resident to identify I'm going into an easement area I need to get permission from the CDD just as I want to put in an improvement, I need to get my permission from the HOA. There can be some cooperation in that process, we can ask the ARB if they are willing to put some language on their forms that says, also if you are within a CDD easement area here is the person to contact to get your permission from the CDD to make sure there is no confusion.

Mr. O'Keefe stated I have an architectural approval letter here and it says, it is your responsibility to obtain any easement, permits, license or approvals, which may be necessary to improve the property in accordance with approved plans. That is what the HOA is putting out when you get an approval.

Ms. Gentry stated that is great, all we are doing now is adding that step for how they go to the CDD to get that approval because it has been handled on a case-by-case basis. As we get more residents it is coming up more and more. It is helpful to have a process.

Mr. Saks asked, we are really talking about pools and fences, right?

Mr. Perry stated no, it can be enhanced landscaping because we have one right now that they want to enhance their landscaping and it is on an easement where there is a pipe and there is a fence that shouldn't be there. These things are starting to pop up more and more. A lot of districts do adopt a policy with a fee so that the district can review that and make a determination if it is reasonable to allow it. We can also do what you are suggesting, basically just say nothing is allowed in those areas at all; we are not going to make any exceptions.

Mr. Cameron stated you have someone who wants to go over a pipe. How did you find out?

Mr. Perry stated they made a request and we reviewed it with the engineer.

Mr. Cameron asked should the HOA be reviewing it? Should we put that on the HOA to review it?

Rivers Edge CDD

Mr. Perry stated it is on our property.

Mr. Schaublin stated they need to come to the CDD board, it is not a development issue it is a CDD issue. In the case you mentioned Fred, if your neighbor didn't come to us and did it anyway and we had to go through and tear up their yard to do some pipe work, we are not accountable for anything we tear up on our property. They take accountability for that.

Ms. Kilinski stated we are not bringing this policy up for fun, we are bringing this policy up because in the course of the last two or three months staff has received five or six or more requests by homeowners to impact CDD easement areas, including conservation areas where we don't have a whole lot of choice. A conservation easement that says there cannot be impacts made, and if a homeowner makes impacts the Army Corps or the water management district, whoever is the underlying deed holder is going to enforce a fine against the District. They don't care who did the impact. We have been responsible for going after the homeowners and Randy is right, the point is they are going to come to us and ask for these requests. That is happening, that is the good news the HOA is pointing them in our direction and saying part of this is not our authority. The question for us is do you want to hear these at every board meeting, or do you want to have a policy in place and you give staff direction to make decisions between board meetings and not having two or three of these on your work schedule every other month or more. We have gotten a lot of them in the last few months. That is where this is coming from, it is not trying to create a new policy or trying to make things more onerous. We try to keep it from being a board level decision that people have to wait to get direction and process this between meetings.

Mr. Schaublin stated before we can say let's turn it over to staff to make the decision, let's figure out the guidelines on what the staff is using. It is a little unfair we don't know how people are being chosen yes or no unless it would be no out of the gate. I say for the next couple of board meetings bring them to us and we can see what the requests are, understand what people are asking for and the impact is and based on that we will get comfortable enough to turn it over to staff to take on going forward because we better understand what these things are and how they are being handled. At least for a couple months bring them to the board so we understand what they are and what we are dealing with before we turn it over to staff.

Ms. Kilinski stated we will bring back a package to you as well at the board meetings. This is not an infrequent situation in other districts so we do have policies in place that have worked

fairly well over a number of years in other Districts that we can provide to you for some consideration.

Ms. Gentry stated the plan was to bring them at your next meeting, we sent a draft to staff and got feedback about what we may want to do differently here given the parameters of this District.

Mr. Schaublin stated put all the documents in the package between this meeting and the next meeting, so we are prepared.

Mr. Perry stated we have the draft already so we can circulate it after this meeting.

Ms. Gentry stated as a part of that policy you have the option to set a fee to offset some of the staff costs or not it is up to the board whether you want to do that. We will ask you about that at your next meeting as well.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Ratification of E-Verify Memorandum of Understanding

Ms. Gentry stated effective January 1st there was a change in Florida Statutes that went into effect that requires government entities like the CDD as well as the contractors that they enter into contracts with to be enrolled in the federal E-Verify System to verify work authorization status of any employees. We have circulated some advice to your district manager about language that we are going to be including in your contracts going forward to make sure your contractors are aware of that requirement, and we have recommended that district managers enroll their districts in this E-Verify System to keep us compliant. Jim's office has worked behind the scenes to get the District enrolled in that system. What you see in the agenda package is the standard MOU that the federal government requires to get enrolled in this system. It has been completed and we are asking you to ratify it.

Mr. Schaublin asked are we looking to extend this towards our vendors?

Ms. Gentry stated our contract language that we will be including going forward informs contractors that they are required to be enrolled in this system and the way the statute is worded if we have a good faith belief that they are not complying with the requirements of that statute, we would terminate that contract. If they have been terminated in that manner they would not be eligible for more government work for a certain period of time. We are including that contract language, so they are contractually bound to be enrolled in that system.

On MOTION by Mr. Schaublin seconded by Mr. Baron with all in favor execution of the memorandum of understanding for the E-Verify System was ratified.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Consideration of Proposals from VerdeGo

Mr. Perry stated this is a cost share request for landscaping for the Kendall Crossing area. There are two components, one is the Rivers Edge portion, the total was \$9,493.31, and also the cost share report for that additional area that resides in Rivers Edge III Kendall Crossing was for \$24,423.63. These are cost shared between all three districts and I do have the form here that did have the amounts and I think those have been sent to you by separate email. Rivers Edge portion of \$24,423.63 is \$8,177.03.

Mr. Schaublin asked were these budgeted or not budgeted?

Mr. Perry stated these were considered in the budgets.

On MOTION by Mr. Saks seconded by Mr. Baron with all in favor the proposal from VerdeGo in the annual amount of \$3,178.36 for Rivers Edge and for the Kendall Crossing proposal of \$24,423.63 with Rivers Edge portion of \$8,177.03 was approved.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Staff Reports

A. Attorney

There being none, the next item followed.

B. Engineer

Mr. Stillwell stated I have been working with Zach on a drainage inlet on Waterfront Drive in the Lakes area where there has been erosion behind this curb inlet. I believe it is the underdrain behind the back of curb is failing. My main concern is that someone could step in the hole that is filled in with St. Augustine. I need to get a proposal from Burnham and I would like authorization for a not to exceed amount and I will try to make it significantly less than this. They need to excavate that area, dig down on the underdrain and I think they can do that for under \$3,000 but I wanted to get permission from the board, if possible to move forward with that and get a proposal for less than that.

On MOTION by Mr. Saks seconded by Mr. Cameron with all in favor staff was authorized to contract for inlet leak repairs on Waterfront Drive in an amount not to exceed \$3,000.

Mr. Stillwell stated just to get it on the record at every meeting, those paths are not intended for golf cart traffic. People in golf carts are going around the water, the sod is soaking wet, they are putting ruts in the sod and those paths are not intended for golf carts.

C. Manager

There being none, the next item followed.

D. General Manager

1. Report

Mr. Jason Davidson gave an overview of the general manager's report, copy of which was included in the agenda package. Mr. Davidson described planned events, including a 5k race planned with the race vendor who has facilitated previous races at the District. Ms. Gentry asked if this race would be handled in the same manner as others under a license agreement. Mr. Davidson responded it would.

On MOTION by Mr. Baron seconded by Mr. Saks with all in favor the 5K run was approved and District Counsel was authorized to prepare a license agreement for this event.

2. Proposal for Sandblasting Signage at North Lake Play Park

On MOTION by Mr. Baron seconded by Mr. Cameron with all in favor the proposal from B&S Signs, Inc. to sandblast signage at North Lake Play Park in an amount not to exceed \$2,400 was approved and staff will verify that the letters can be replaced.

3. Proposal for Waterfall Light Replacement at Longleaf Entrance

On MOTION by Mr. Saks seconded by Mr. Baron with all in favor the proposal from KAD Electric Company to demo existing lights and replace with new LED top mounted light fixtures in the amount of \$17,890 was approved and District Counsel was authorized to prepare and agreement for this work.

E. Landscape - Report

Mr. Baron stated we have worked hard on this for the past month and irrigation is one of my pet peeves on this board, driving down the cost of what we were projecting. Rob has made great efforts and he has reduced all the pressure heads and all the irrigation under this CDD. You also integrated the IQ Rainbird Systems on eight meters, and we have seen the values in this last month go down and that is positive. You have eight done now. How many more are you going to do?

Mr. Beladi stated I just talked to my tech before this. We have 36 clocks total, we have eight online and he said some are not compatible with the IQ system, but he did say those are 20 zones or less, not a very significant area.

Mr. Baron stated Rob and I have gone out and done a verification on meters with the JEA and I am drafting a letter I would like to send to Lauren to send to JEA. We are finding a number of issues with the meters. We are finding meters that are dead that are not reading but we are getting a bill. We find meters that are incorrect on the meter number that does not correspond to the location per the JEA website. We are finding meters that have come down and we are hunting meters and not finding where they are located. There are meters that have inconsistencies that JEA has to fix, meters are on a recall list that need to be recalled. I don't feel that we are being billed appropriately and I'm working with Jim to see the actual bill so that I have hard facts in the letter to send to JEA. I have another list of meters that we have trouble finding. All of this is driving down to a cost number with the usage of the IQ system and the access of being turned on and off to make sure those meters that have the highest usage we gain the maximum benefit from. Over the last month we saved about \$22,000 and we expect to see that number continue to decrease through this ability. The investment we made is paying dividends and I encourage the board to

Rivers Edge CDD

get a proposal from Rob to put another seven meters on the IQ system. It will not come out of the budget because we recouped savings last month that can be used to pay for the IQ system in the cards and turn on fee. Eventually we should see a significant budget reduction in reclaimed water.

Ms. Gentry stated if I could revisit your letter, it sounds like you have done a lot of legwork investigating these irrigation issues and pinpointing what they are. We typically recommend that until there is a legal dispute, District Counsel is likely not the best one to send a letter. The board can authorize you to communicate something on behalf of the District or management could collaborate with you on the letter.

Mr. Baron stated I don't mind signing the letter, I just want to route it through legal for a second set of eyes.

Ms. Gentry stated we are happy to do that.

Mr. Baron asked is there any issue with me sending a letter to JEA? Do I have to route it through the members?

Mr. Perry stated I can work with you and it should probably come from me.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Supervisors' Requests and Audience Comments

Mr. Baron stated last meeting we talked about the checks that were part of the overdraft. How does that get back in?

Mr. Perry stated it should be net of the GMS bill.

Mr. Baron stated in the meeting minutes it talks about a solar light system being installed on 13. Do we ever bill the insurance company for something for damage to CDD property from an accident that occurs if we know the cause of that? I never see anything in the minutes that we reclaimed some of the costs that we are authorizing for the repairs from the insurance company or the person who caused the damage.

Mr. Perry stated all the claims are filed and we do process the receipt of those funds that are netted against the repair and replacement account.

Mr. Baron asked is that addressed in any of the meeting minutes?

Mr. Perry responded that is just a standard practice.

Mr. Baron stated if we could occasionally put that on the record for the general population to recognize that we do receive funds back. I assume those funds go back into the fund line that can be used for expenditures.

Mr. Perry stated yes, and we work extensively with Jason and Zach and the insurance company and we try to identify the parties. A lot of time they are not identified.

Mr. Baron asked is it possible to put an amendment on the table to purchase additional trash receptacles for the community that the board can approve and be placed in certain spots?

Mr. Perry responded I would bring that up as an agenda item at the next meeting because it is not only the capital cost of the items you are asking for, but additional staff time.

Mr. O'Keefe stated I continue to hear the golf cart stuff come up and it seems that whatever we are doing is not working in terms of where they should and should not take their carts. I'm proposing to put stencils on the paths themselves to identify pathways where they shouldn't have carts on them. It will be a circle with a line through it to indicate there shouldn't be carts so when folks are approaching that area, they know they shouldn't there. Perhaps that is something that will be more effective. I propose to the board that I get that process going. Can I work with one of the folks from CDD 1 and CDD 2?

Mr. Perry stated that is not a problem.

Mr. Saks stated I can be the main point of contact in terms of driving it forward with Prosser and then they can loop in whoever on the board wants to take over from there.

Mr. Cameron stated I will do that.

Mr. Stillwell stated we will put together a map that shows where you want to have these then get them distributed to the different boards.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Other Business

There being none, the next item followed.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Financial Reports

A. Balance Sheet & Income Statement

A copy of the balance sheet and income statement were included in the agenda package.

B. Assessment Receipt Schedule

A copy of the assessment receipt schedule was included in the agenda package.

C. Approval of Check Register

On MOTION by Mr. Baron seconded by Mr. Saks with all in favor the check register net GMS bill of \$500 for NSF charges was approved.

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Scheduled Meeting – Wednesday, March 17, 2021 @ 11:00 a.m. at the RiverTown Amenity Center

Mr. Perry stated the next scheduled meeting is March 17, 2021 at 11:00 a.m.

On MOTION by Mr. Saks seconded by Mr. Cameron with all in favor the meeting adjourned at 12:53 p.m.

DocuSigned by: Ernesto Torres 3FE774DC69854A7....

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

DocuSigned by: CED1EE447

Chairman/Vice Chairman