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, August 16, 2023 at 6:00 p.m. at the RiverTown Amenity Center, 156 Landing Street, St. Johns, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Mac McIntyreChairmanEric SaksVice ChairmanFrederick BaronSupervisorRobert CameronSupervisorScott MaynardSupervisor

Also present were:

Howard McGaffney District Manager
Jennifer Kilinski District Counsel
Corey Roberts District Counsel
Ryan Stillwell District Engineer
Jason Davidson General Manager
Mike Scuncio Yellowstone

11 Residents

The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the August 16, 2023 meeting.

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS Roll Call

Mr. McGaffney called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. and called the roll.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS Audience Comments

A resident stated I'm concerned about the athletic program using the soccer fields. We put a ton of wear and tear having soccer practices here as well. I want to make sure that is under consideration by the board.

A resident stated have the CDD cover the fees and not the children. I was here when the discussion about toys in the park took place and I asked you to consider putting the toys in a corner someplace. It is parents making them available for kids to play with.

A resident stated it seems that the tree and branch removal on the trails seems to be less thorough than it used to be. They cut a tree down from the trail, but they leave it, and all the roots and big limbs are left. Is it possible to keep the trails cleared a little better?

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Business Items

A. Insurance Proposal from Brown & Brown

This item was tabled.

B. Public Hearing for the Purpose of Adopting the Fiscal Year 2024 Budget

1. Executive Summery

Mr. McGaffney stated approval of the budget is the process that gets us to where we are today. We will open the public hearing; the board will hear public comments related to the budget and after that we will adopt the budget.

Only three things have changed since the approval and one of those is the cost share. The assessments last year on roll were \$2,378,000 and this year it is proposed to be \$2,402,000. The biggest revenue change is that you are receiving slightly less in the cost share because we are now projecting Rivers Edge III to start catching up and Rivers Edge II bringing on more improvements. As they pay more, their cost share dollar amounts are going down. While the overall expenditures appear to be going in a favorable direction, down, the amount of revenue coming from the cost share is going down, which is why the assessments are going up for the most part. Taking a step back, the board authorized Supervisor Baron to work with staff on the budget and we have worked on the budget extensively as well as I had some catching up to do as your new district manager. It is a pretty tight budget. The revenues for 2024 are \$3,557,000 compared to last year's \$3,637,000. Administratively we had expenditures budgeted at \$199,973 and this year is a slight increase to \$204,830. When we go through the budget process, we present our fees similar to the district engineer and district counsel. We will go through the public hearing process, I open it for the public, then after we close it you will adopt the resolution and adopt any changes to this budget.

Unless you choose to individually move to approve our fees, it will be captured in the overall budget because it is an expense line in there.

Mr. Baron stated as mentioned during the budget approval process we went over the GMS proposed fees and 6% is a very large percentage. Unlike others that are written in their agreements, for example 3% for Vesta, Yellowstone has a projected 3%, 6% in my mind is a little bit over where we should be. I continually had discussions with GMS, you have noted many times month to month on the things that I have brought to the attention of GMS. I wouldn't have a concern if it was stellar in the performance; I'm not seeing that stellar performance yet and to award 6% in my mind as a supervisor is beyond where we should be. I asked for their contract language, and they have to present at the time of budget submission. You heard me mention at that time that this was a little higher than normal. I'm okay with 3%, that is generous, but I'm not on board for the 6%. That is my viewpoint and perspective.

Mr. Baron stated going forward we can ask that this be broken out differently than just added into the budget.

Mr. Saks asked wasn't there an answer on that before that they hadn't had an increase for a certain amount of time?

Mr. McGaffney stated I thought it was helpful for the board to look at the last ten years of fees and there were multiple years in a run that the fees stayed steady for four years in a row. There were some where some of the areas went up 2% then 3% and no increase for several years in a row. You are adopting a budget, the process has historically been and it is that way in every district, that we present those fees during the budget development process, we don't hide them. I called it out in March or April when we started the budget discussions, so we were not hiding that. It has been on the record for months and the number hasn't changed. What might be helpful is you are going to adopt your budget hopefully, as is with a couple of the changes we are going to make here in a minute and I can take the information back to the owner and if he needs to come to the next meeting to discuss that or you want to authorize Supervisor Baron to talk to him and see if there is something else that can be negotiated that is fine, but to be clear I can't negotiate that because I am not a partner in the business.

Mr. McIntyre asked what are our options right now with this issue?

Mr. McGaffney stated adopt the budget as is and see if we can figure out the right process for getting somebody before the board to talk to, the person who can make those decisions.

Mr. Baron stated if I put a motion on the table for 3% and it seconded and voted on, it becomes 3%.

Mr. Baron asked is that correct, legal?

Ms. Kilinski stated you have the right to cap it, the disconnect is if the company is willing to honor that price and if you can find another district management company if they are not going to honor it. I think what Howard is saying is adopt it at the rate with the idea there will be negotiation off the record with GMS, which will come back.

Mr. Saks stated we are talking about \$3,900.

Mr. Maynard stated I support the 6% increase and have seen improvement in the last six months. I realize there are issues we can still improve. I realize there are challenges still out there. Based on the overall multi-year increases I think this is a fair request.

Mr. McGaffney stated I don't think they will disagree with pulling the agreement and putting verbiage in there that says similar to what we do with the engineer and district counsel is present a proposal. This reference is to work authorizations.

Mr. Baron stated I'm good with that if we agree with Mac's statement that we revisit the section that says that it is going to automatically slip in with the budget, and that it is a separate breakout. If they are willing to do that, I'm willing to go forward. I look forward to those discussions if the panel wants me to continue with the negotiations.

Mr. McGaffney stated why don't we handle that after the budget. We did take a pause to go into that in depth and I appreciate it. Let's go back to the budget, the administrative was at \$199,973 last year it is \$204,830 this year with the changes with GMS as well as some insurance. I will go to the items that are in red, those items are under amenity and that is amenity manager, Vesta, maintenance service Vesta and lifestyle director, Vesta. The items in red notate the changes that I previously outlined because of the cost share with Rivers Edge III coming online and needing to tweak that number. The new number for amenity manager is \$19,478, maintenance service is going to be \$78,837 and the lifestyle director \$38,136, the total difference is \$27,100 but that is the three changes that I would ask when you adopt your resolution that we do that with those changes.

- Mr. Cameron stated the maintenance service that Vesta provides is maintenance.
- Mr. McGaffney stated that is amenity maintenance.
- Mr. Cameron asked where is the maintenance of parks?

Mr. McGaffney stated the maintenance of parks is done by the landscape company and/or any other company that might be out there, but the overall operations management for field is under the grounds maintenance that last year was \$45,210 but in 2024 that number is doing down to \$37,253. Again, the cost share for Rivers Edge III coming online we have been able to stratify some of these expenses that Vesta has been sharing. Last year's total expenditures were \$3,637.354 budgeted, it is going down in expenditures to \$3,557,185. We are getting less from the cost share, which means that we need to make up revenue which means the assessments are going to increase. That will probably continue to balance itself out with actual expenditures that we are able to track over the next several years with Rivers Edge II and III as it pertains to that cost share. You can expect these numbers to change from year to year until it is fully developed and each of those boards start to get a track record of expenditures that we can count on, it will get a little easier on the budgeting.

Mr. Saks asked should we expect assessments to continually rise?

Mr. McGaffney stated it depends on how much more we are going to expend in capital funds or repairs and maintenance. It has been a tough year with a lot of irrigation repairs and new things coming online. Those things will still happen but over time it may even out.

On MOTION by Mr. McIntyre seconded by Mr. Saks with all in favor the public hearing was opened.

The following were comments/questions: Revenues from River Club go to Rivers Edge II, cost share with Rivers Edge II and III, newsletter had incorrect meeting time, meetings need more civility, great improvement with Yellowstone, Charles Aquatics.

On MOTION by Mr. McIntyre seconded by Mr. Cameron with all in favor the public hearing was closed.

2. Consideration of Resolution 2023-15 Relating to Annual Appropriations and Adopting the Budget for Fiscal Year 2024

Ms. Kilinski stated Resolution 2023-15 is the appropriation resolution, it makes certain findings regarding the process we have undertaken to get to budget approval. We will ensure that the numbers in section 2 are updated based on the changes that were made on the record today and we will send that resolution back out for your final adoption.

On MOTION by Mr. Cameron seconded by Mr. McIntyre with all in favor Resolution 2023-15 reflecting the changes made on the record was approved.

C. Public Hearing for the Purpose of Imposing Special Assessments

Mr. McGaffney stated I want to correct what I said earlier it is a 1% increase on the O&M. The best way to go over these changes is to pull one or two of the different product types and call out the assessment even though we have noticed this by mail, and we have this in the agenda, which was also meeting the requirement and putting it on the website so the numbers were there for everybody. If you have a single-family 30-39 feet lot your per unit assessment gross last year was \$1,134.97 and that increase \$10.84. If you have an 80+ foot lot last year your gross assessment was \$2,434.67 and this year the increase will be \$23.29, which is a 1% increase. When we say gross, we need to gross up the number of our assessments because you have the opportunity to pay your tax bill in November and get up to a 4% discount and tax collector has a fee to collect the assessment on roll, which is 2% so we gross up 6% as if everybody was going to take advantage of the early payment discount.

On MOTION by Mr. McIntyre seconded by Mr. Baron with all in favor the public hearing was opened.

There being no comments or questions from the public, the board took the following action.

On MOTION by Mr. McIntyre seconded by Mr. Maynard with all in favor the public hearing was closed.

1. Consideration of Resolution 2023-16 Imposing Special Assessments and Certifying an Assessment Roll for Fiscal Year 2024

Ms. Kilinski stated Resolution 2023-16 levies the assessment lien that secures the assessments that will fund the budget you just adopted. It makes certain findings regarding the processes you have undertaken. You will notice that section 2 is the actual assessment imposition and section 3 is the collection measure because we have all platted lots here all the assessments will be collected on the tax roll. We will certify the tax roll to St. Johns County after successful conclusion of these proceedings.

On MOTION by Mr. Baron seconded by Mr. McIntyre with all in favor Resolution 2023-16 was approved.

D. Public Hearing for the Purpose of Adopting Fees Related to the Community Garden

Ms. Kilinski stated you will recall where we have gone through rulemaking and rule development procedures, which means you have advertised for a ratemaking hearing tonight under Chapter 120. We will open a public hearing to discuss any comments folks may have about those rates and at the end you will make a motion to either adopt the rates as is or you can do anything less than the advertised rates. If you decide you want to do a change you just need to make it less than the maximum that we advertised.

Mr. McGaffney stated the range for the enrollment fee proposed is \$75 and a plot is \$50 to \$200.

Mr. Davidson stated in the original packet there was a \$75 fee in the beginning. I don't know that we are trying to adopt a different fee. I did find two different documents, one not including it, one including it.

Mr. Kilinski stated my recollection dating way back to when this process started is the district tried it out for a time until we started getting a lot of users, decided that there would be a fee associated with it. The district was spending some amount of expenses in having to attend to abandoned plots. One of the ideas was people tend to be more proactive and more responsible if they are actually paying for the use. I don't know if there are ongoing issues but there have been some issues with lack of maintenance in terms of responsibility on those plots. I'm recommending that you adopt some range regardless. You can always waive the fee. If you are not getting that much use we can reduce the fee, you can always come back and do that but since you have already advertised this it makes sense to adopt a range.

Mr. Cameron asked is there a way to do it if we don't have to do maintenance? As an example, if the person cleans their own plot they get a refund?

Ms. Kilinski stated yes, you are talking about you are renting the space you are putting a fee.

Mr. Cameron stated if you clean the plot where we do not have to have maintenance you get a refund, which will make the people possibly start taking care of the plot better. Otherwise, if you pay for the plot you don't have any incentive to clean it.

Mr. McIntyre asked who decides on the no payment and what that looks like? Then there is the whole thing of having administrative costs to have GMS or somebody take the time to go through a list or receive a list of who has been naughty and who has been nice, then sending out refunds. We are back to it costing us money to be helpful.

Mr. Baron stated that is what it has been for close to three years. We have had an expense on cleanup for the community gardens on abandoned plots. One of the most recent ones was \$500+ so we had a huge expense that our landscape contractor came in and cleaned it up.

Mr. Maynard stated open the public hearing. I would like to hear about the maintenance and is there an organization of gardeners.

On MOTION by Mr. McIntyre seconded by Mr. Saks with all in favor the public hearing was opened.

A resident stated I understand there was a little bit of a cost to maintain and clean up, but you did charge each one of the people that had plots, \$75 or more for each plot. I don't know how many plots there are, but I think you probably made the \$500 back plus.

Mr. Baron stated no, it was a negative loss.

A resident stated I don't object to a cost for the plot. I object to the \$75 just for the privilege of paying more money for the plot. I think of our CDD as a member of the community and I don't think you should tack that on. I love the garden I think it is beautiful, there were some people who are more attentive to their gardens than others.

Ms. Kilinski stated the other consideration was that there was a wait list.

A resident stated not all the plots were used. They need something around the edges which you could plant something with deeper roots. Maybe the Facebook page would be a good place to encourage people to be more proactive and let someone know that one is not being used.

Mr. Saks stated they are all reserved right now so some of these folks are paying for things they are just not using, but that is their choice.

Mr. McGaffney stated there is a process if one comes open, there is a list. Jason, how much time, energy and effort of yours or someone else's does it require on an annual basis? Is this a burden to you and Yellowstone to maintain? Is it just that we are getting some money back and it cost more than that?

Mr. Davidson responded I'm a gardener, so nothing burdens me on gardens. To best answer your questions during the busy season when it is warm, and the weeds are active it can be extensive on staff. In a week and a half there are weeds that are going to show themselves. We can't be there every day and Yellowstone spends time on that garden as well.

Mr. Scuncio stated this is something I work with Vesta on. We didn't charge for the onetime cleanup we go in once a week and look at it versus waiting a couple months and it turns into a big cleanup.

Mr. McGaffney stated we really don't have a tracking mechanism; it would be hard to put a number to this. The policy is related to use and responsibility of the residents to keep that up.

Ms. Kilinski stated we have a provision in our rules now that if a plot is abandoned, which means there are weeds for more than three weeks then you are done. We may go back and make sure that we are following up on that and if that takes a lot of staff time to go through the garden and anticipate how long has it been. That is another administrative cost consideration. Going back to 2017 when we first adopted this, some of the conversation was around administration, who is going to follow-up every three weeks to see if there is an abandoned plot so you can move to the next person on the list. That is a lot of staff time.

There were no additional comments on the \$75 enrollment, no comments on the \$50 to \$200 range per year,

On MOTION by Mr. Saks seconded by Mr. McIntyre with all in favor the public hearing was closed.

1. Consideration of Resolution 2023-17 Adopting Rates, Charges and Fees

Ms. Kilinski stated if there are no changes then all we need is a motion to adopt the resolution with the rates as presented.

On MOTION by Mr. Saks seconded by Mr. McIntyre with all in favor Resolution 2023-17 was approved.

E. Consideration of Designating a Regular Meeting Schedule for Fiscal Year 2024

Mr. McGaffney stated we previously talked about this, and I didn't receive any other comments.

Mr. Baron stated I sent you a comment. Where was September and November meetings and did we take those off for 2023?

Mr. McGaffney stated I took November off because of the holiday.

Mr. Saks asked what do we think about doing more evening meetings? We have two on here.

There were no comments from the audience.

On MOTION by Mr. Saks seconded by Mr. Cameron with all in favor the fiscal year 2024 meeting schedule was approved as amended with meetings in March, May, August at 5:00 p.m.

F. Consideration of Request from Florida Prime Athletic Program to Use the RiverHouse Soccer Field and Basketball Court

Mr. Davidson outlined the request from Florida Prime Athletic Program to use the RiverHouse soccer field and basketball court.

On MOTION by Mr. Maynard seconded by Mr. Saks with all in favor district counsel was authorized to prepare a license agreement with Florida Prime Athletic Program subject to verifying that it is 10% of the gross revenue share back to the district.

G. Discussion of Community Toys in Parks

Mr. McGaffney stated I came onsite and walked around and talked to residents who had concerns on both sides. We had complaints about toys being left in the playground, not being orderly, not being neat and there was concern about safety and health. The people who live around there have mixed opinions. We are continuing to allow it but are asking people to clean up after themselves. If we continue to allow the toys, do we put a large Rubbermaid shed system or box or do you not want them there?

- Mr. Cameron asked if we give permission to leave toys there, what is our liability?
- Ms. Kilinski stated the liability is pretty low and we do have coverage for that. If you decide to do that just do a posting like we do with swim at your own risk. Use these toys at your own risk.
- Mr. McIntyre stated I think our risk is low, we didn't provide the toys, we made our voice heard that we think it is an eyesore. It's a 50/50 mix so I don't think there is any blowback on that. If we install something at the Sternwheel Park, do we have to incur cost to do it elsewhere?
 - Mr. Cameron stated I don't know that we should furnish the box.
- Mr. McIntyre stated if the toys can stay corralled by the bushes that is fine, but we should not spend money on a container.
- Mr. McGaffney stated we can have a cutoff date by which they would have to remove their toys, or they have to police it themselves and if it is not orderly what happens then.

The floor was opened to public comments.

Two residents spoke in favor of leaving the toys and four spoke in opposition.

On MOTION by Mr. Baron seconded by Mr. McIntyre with three in favor and Mr. Maynard and Mr. Saks opposed the toys will be removed from the park and staff will communicate that toys cannot stay in the park

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Approval of the Consent Agenda

- A. Minutes of the July 19, 2023 Meeting
- B. Financial Statements as of June 30, 2023
- C. Check Register
- Mr. McGaffney stated there were numerous items that Mr. Baron asked staff to provide a response.
- Mr. Baron stated on page 156 irrigation repairs and the cost you responded saying we are within budget. But when I look at the budget, we budgeted \$60,000 in repair and we are over that amount. How are we adjusting irrigation costs when we exceeded the budget. How are we covering that as a board? How are you authorizing the payment?
- Mr. McGaffney asked for clarification on whether Mr. Baron was referencing the landscape reserves noting that is an item specifically for items not covered under regular landscape

maintenance contract, but then he referenced the irrigation. The irrigation budget was \$15,000 that is sitting at \$103,651, keep in mind that every expense in here is cost shared and trued up. Part of the issue is we probably need to segregate some of the expenses a little better going forward and we can do that and can potentially amend the budget we just adopted. We look at that \$100,000 number it is not just irrigation it is the other items that are in there, which was the mulch, annuals, tree removals, additional mulch, repairs to the mountain, and those total to \$100,000. When I broke out the expenses and filtered while you were discussing this, we are looking at just in irrigation repairs \$21,900. It is fair to say you need more visibility it is probably unfair to say that it is something we are not providing you. I think the solution is to segregate the budget item a little bit more so we can better track these expenses versus having one line item to capture ten different activities.

- Mr. Baron stated that is fair.
- Mr. Baron stated 171 had a receipt from 2022.
- Mr. McGaffney stated there are vendors that are very quick to get their invoices in on time but there are others we get a surprise and I have to research that to make sure we owe it.
- Ms. Kilinski stated I have some boards that have adopted policies if a vendor doesn't submit a timely invoice by a certain time it is rejected. Your concern is exactly why, it has major budget implications.
- Mr. McIntyre asked is that something we need to have on the agenda because I like that idea.
 - Mr. McGaffney stated district counsel can bring back a policy on that.

On MOTION by Mr. McIntyre seconded by Mr. Saks with all in favor the consent agenda was approved.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Landscape Maintenance - Report

Mr. Scuncio gave an overview of the process for irrigation repairs and stated we have four crews out here and we will continue to communicate with Vesta.

B. District Engineer

There being none, the next item followed.

C. District Counsel

There being none, the next item followed.

D. District Manager

There being none, the next item followed.

E. General Manager – Monthly Amenity and Field Operations Report

Mr. Davidson stated we have an inlet, and it is failing behind the inlet from the inlet to the actual sidewalk area on Rambling Water Run. I have a proposal from HEB Services in an effort to fix this they have repaired a lot of our inlet structures in the past. I would love to have gotten multiple quotes; however, this is one of the only companies that does this type of work that I was able to get one from. Being that they don't have to do any concrete repair it would be a \$5,100 repair, if concrete is needed to be repaired it would be \$6,250. I reached out to a couple other concrete repair vendors to see if I could get any savings and it was equivalent or higher. I think it is a little savings because it is all inclusive. Ryan and I went out this morning to check the inlet to get confirmation from the engineer that what they were stating was correct and it was correct. We wanted to get this in front of the board because we do need to get this repaired because it is forming a large sinkhole between that inlet and sidewalk.

Mr. McGaffney since that is under my spending authority, I could have done this but for transparency purposes and as it relates to a public comment that was made prior about an area we wanted to follow through with it. It is the recommendation of the engineer to repair it and he has reviewed this proposal and it is a cost share item.

Mr. Saks moved to approve the proposal from HEB Services to repair the area behind the inlet on Rambling Water Run in an amount not to exceed \$6,250 and Mr. McIntyre seconded the motion.

The floor was opened for public comment and there being none, the board took the following action.

On voice vote with all in favor the motion passed.

Mr. Davidson stated at the July meeting it was discuss to have staff to issue a letter of deficiency to Charles Aquatics specific to the ponds. The letter was distributed to Charles Aquatics, however their response was a bit objective towards what we identified as our concern. Since we haven't seen a lot of improvement, if anything the ponds have worsened, we did acquire proposals from Aquagenix and The Lake Doctors. Late last night I acquired another proposal from J&J Aquatics. I'm meeting with Florida Waterways at the end of the week and Solitude at the beginning of the week to obtain proposals from them as well. Being that Charles Aquatics proposal will probably not be on the table I wanted to give the board as many as I could.

Mr. McGaffney stated after the Rivers Edge II and III meeting Charles Aquatcs gave us notice.

Ms. Kilinski stated in an abundance of caution if they terminate at the end of the month we need a provider on quickly, we may need to authorize an alternative vendor. You can authorize that as long as it does not exceed the budget amount and we will bring back formal proposals at your September meeting.

Mr. Davidson stated J&J did say that if need be, they could have someone out in the next week or so.

Ms. Kilinski stated we talked a little bit this morning, I think it is worthwhile to pursue that when we get the proposals we are going to ask them for a holistic review of the lakes and determine what it will take to get the lakes back up to what we would expect them to be so when we go to Charles Aquatics that we get a sense of what that damage really is. Our intent is to get that and present that to you in September as well.

Mr. Saks asked how have the prices come in compared to Charles Aquatics?

Mr. Davidson stated they are a little bit higher.

On MOTION by Mr. McIntyre seconded by Mr. Saks with all in favor staff was authorized to issue an RFP for lake maintenance services and authorize a contingency plan to get a vendor in if necessary.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

Mr. McGaffney stated I ask that you authorize Supervisor Baron to work with GMS on the proposal or engage about the fees.

On MOTION by Mr. McIntyre seconded by Mr. Cameron with all in favor Supervisor Baron was authorized to work with GMS relative to the fees and annual process.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Supervisors' Requests

Mr. Baron stated I spoke with a couple here that are residents and in the Gardens I Phase I the alley that is going to the garage access points does not have curbing. The phase 2 in the Gardens does have curbing. They were informed that when they were the last units going in that the curbing would be installed and it has not been installed. They are requesting that curbing be installed. The question to the engineer is, is it within the specifications that were designed or is it deficient in the curbing.

Mr. McGaffney stated I will get that answer and report back to the board.

Mr. Baron stated we got approval from St. Johns County on our plan and process for pickleball. We are cleared through the building; we do not have to go back for permits for the court. They approved us on one of the future tennis courts to pursue that so we are at the point of now getting all the details to go out for an RFP to see what that cost would be and then figure out the process of how we would pay for that new amenity. Please present that to Rivers Edge II and III that we are at that point and would love their participation as part of the cost share and we might have to do a joint meeting based on this topic to evaluate the vendor of choice if they want that buy-in.

Mr. McGaffney stated we can add this to the September meeting for discussion. You are at a point where we have to get into the design concept and engage the engineer as well as have district counsel help us.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Audience Comments

A resident stated relative to Yellowstone and the toys and stuff, Friday all the sprinklers were on, and it was on all weekend and we reported it on Friday.

Mr. Scuncio stated I will get with Jason and look back at it.

A resident stated I'm interested in the schools that are going to be built. One is going to be built on Keystone and Orange Branch across from Phase 1 of the Gardens. I would love for us to require that they have a tree buffer instead of clearing the site.

Mr. McGaffney asked are you talking about CDD property?

Mr. Saks stated it is the land set aside for the school, but the district has no plans to use it currently. Mattamy designated several sites for schools. This is one they chose not to use because the school district is not doing elementaries anymore. They are doing K-8. I don't know who owns it.

Mr. Cameron stated that is part of the DRI and there is nothing we can do anything about.

Mr. McGaffney stated for anything we don't own; the best avenue is your own voice. The CDD doesn't get involved. If you give me your information, I will put you in touch with the right people.

A resident stated my concern is with safety with people going in exits when they should be going in the entrance.

Mr. McGaffney stated we do not control or enforce the county laws related to driving. I can contact the county commander of this area and tell him we have an issue.

A resident stated there is a triangle where three roads come together and it has been turned into a parking lot and that affects people who live in that area getting into their garages, kids can't play in that area because people park there, and it is not a parking space.

Mr. McGaffney stated I think I heard that comment before the meeting and I have a card for you as well. I will get in touch with you.

A resident stated we could add it to the newsletter. There are 30 homes involved in that alley area and when people go the wrong way it is a free for all.

A resident stated I wanted to thank Jason and Fred for help with the tennis courts and pickleball courts.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Next Scheduled Meeting – September 20, 2023 at 11:00 a.m. at the RiverTown Amenity Center

Mr. McGaffney stated the next meeting is scheduled for September 20, 2023 at 11:00 a.m. in the same location.

On MOTION by Mr. McIntyre seconded by Mr. Saks with all in favor the meeting adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

396ACEAA81D8491..

Secretary/Assistant Secretary

DocuSigned by:

Chairman/Vice Chairman