

MINUTES OF MEETING
STONEYBROOK SOUTH AT CHAMPIONSGATE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Stoneybrook South at ChampionsGate Community Development District was held Monday, May 6, 2019 at 11:30 a.m. at the Oasis Club, 1520 Oasis Club Blvd., ChampionsGate, Florida 33896.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Adam Morgan	Chairman
Lane Register	Vice Chairman
Tim Smith	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

George Flint	District Manager
Andrew d'Adesky	District Counsel
David Reid	District Engineer
Alan Scheerer	Field Manager
Michelle Barr	Lennar Homes

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. Flint called the meeting to order and called the roll.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comment Period

Mr. Flint: There are only staff and Board members present.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of Minutes of the April 1, 2019 Meeting

Mr. Flint: Does the Board have any additions, deletions, corrections on those?

On MOTION by Mr. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Register, with all in favor, the Minutes of the April 1, 2019 Meeting were approved, as presented.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Review of Proposals and Selection of a District Engineer

Mr. Flint: The Board authorized staff to terminate the agreement with your prior District Engineer. You hired Hamilton Engineering as your Interim Engineer and authorized us to go through the noticing provisions under the Consultants Competitive Negotiation Act to hire a permanent District Engineer. You approved us advertising a notice for those services, and we did that. As a result, we received two responses. One from Hamilton Engineering, which is your Interim Engineer and one from Conklin Porter & Holmes (CPH). As part of the process there are selection criteria that the Board approved to use to review the responses. You can see those behind section 4. There should be CPH and Hamilton should both be listed there and then you can see the criteria including ability and personnel. Consultants past performance, their geographic location, their willingness to meet time and budget requirements, whether they are a certified MBE, their recent/current/and projected workloads, and then their volume of previous work awarded to the District. Does the Board have any comments on the responses in regards to the criteria?

Mr. Morgan: When do we need to complete this ranking?

Mr. Flint: Ideally today.

Mr. Smith: George, do you have a staff recommendation?

Mr. Flint: No, typically the Board ranks the responses. It doesn't appear to me that either one is a Minority Business Enterprise. So, I think they probably both get zero on that. Then the Board just have to weigh the experience of I think Mr. Reid being with Hamilton Engineering and being the prior District Engineer for an extended period of time vs. Conklin Porter and Holmes' experience.

Mr. Morgan: I think Mr. Reid's internal knowledge of what's happened in the past should carry a significant amount of weight since he is already familiar with the projects history.

Mr. Register: Yes, absolutely.

Mr. Smith: I agree.

Mr. Flint: Do you want to take a stab at assigning points?

Mr. Morgan: Briefly reading through both proposals that we received, it looks that CPH certainly has the ability and adequacy of personnel, so I would say they both get 25 points on that. If either of you all disagree with me speak up, I am just going to run down the list.

Mr. Register: Absolutely, go ahead.

Mr. Morgan: Geographic location it looks like, CPH is over in Sanford?

Mr. Flint: They also have an office in downtown Orlando.

Mr. Morgan: They would both get probably similar points in that then. Consultants past performance, we don't have any history with CPH. We have a 10 year history with Mr. Reid, so I would think that would carry a significant difference on the scoring. What do you think about the scoring on that Board?

Mr. Smith: We have no experience with CPH.

Mr. Register: I think broadly we can assign them 20 points out of 25.

Mr. Morgan: Their proposal is extensive.

Mr. Register: Exactly, so I would say 20 out of 25 on that. Hamilton I would definitely give 25.

Mr. Morgan: I wasn't able to grasp anything from CPH's proposal on the willingness to meet time and budget. Although it looks like with their completed and current workload that they are operating well. We do know for sure that Mr. Reid has the ability to meet our time and budget requirements.

Mr. Flint: So, do you want to give them a 15?

Mr. Morgan: Yes. Then recent, current, and projected workloads, it would be both 5 I guess. But then the volume of work previously awarded, how is that interpreted?

Mr. Register: If that is by firm then that is zero points for CPH. If its by personnel.

Mr. Smith: I think personnel would be counted in that.

Mr. Morgan: Then we would give Hamilton 5 and CPH 0.

Mr. Register: I think that is accurate.

Mr. Smith: George, do you have numbers for all of the criteria?

Mr. Flint: It would be 85 for CPH and 95 for Hamilton. With Hamilton ranked 1 and CPH 2 based on that.

On MOTION by Mr. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Register, with all in favor, Ranking Hamilton Engineering & Surveying, Inc. as #1, was approved.

Mr. Flint: So, we will reach out to Hamilton and work on getting an agreement in place with Hamilton.

Mr. Smith: George, are you comfortable doing a notice to CPH?

Mr. Flint: Yes, we will wait until we get the agreement negotiated with Hamilton before we notify CPH. Technically, if we aren't able to enter into a new agreement with Hamilton we would move to CPH.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Resolution 2019-07 Approving the Proposed Fiscal Year 2020 Budget and Setting a Public Hearing

Mr. Flint: This approves a proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2020 and sets the date, place, and time of the public hearing. Each year the boards are required to approve what is called a proposed budget by June 15th and set the date, place, and time of the public hearing for its final adoption. We are suggesting August 5, 2019 at this location at 11:30 a.m. for your public hearing. And Exhibit A attached to the resolution is the proposed budget. It is not binding on the Board, it is really the start of the budget process. Once we get the assessment role information on or around June 1st we will be able to refine this better. What we have attempted to do on this initial draft, under administrative expenses you will see there is some increases for arbitrage, Trustees fees, Dissemination Agent, and those are all related to the fact that the District will now issue bonds and those are expenses incurred as a result of requirements of the bond issues. Most of the other administrative fees have remained flat. There are no increases in management fees or budgeted Attorney's fee or Engineer's fees. Under field we've increased property insurance as a result of some anticipated property coming online that we need to be insured. Street lighting, landscape maintenance, those are the main ones. Plus we have added lake maintenance and a contingency. I believe Alan met with the contractor and with representatives of Lennar to review areas that are anticipated to come online and review the timeframe for those to come online and then Alan got estimated costs from Down to Earth.

Mr. Morgan: For Lake maintenance?

Mr. Scheerer: I believe Down to Earth for all the Landscaping.

Mr. Morgan: So, did we review the landscaping contracts?

Mr. Scheerer: We are doing the RFP process and we've got a consultant that does nothing but the RFP process.

Mr. Morgan: Is that going to impact the Board? Who the Board hires or is that just who Lennar is hiring?

Mr. Register: It will provide a recommendation that we can choose to use.

Mr. Morgan: The lake maintenance then we are just including as a cost?

Mr. Scheerer: Based on the number of lakes that they are currently maintaining for the District and lakes that are coming online based on the maps, the plats, and everything I have received in my meetings with Tim. We just put a number in there based on their recommendation for acre price to cover the maintenance of those lakes.

Mr. Morgan: So, can we include in this proposed budget ECS's proposal? Which is around \$77,000 or so?

Mr. Flint: \$77,000?

Mr. Morgan: \$7,250 ECS. Wetland maintenance permit, annually.

Mr. Flint: So, what we will do is we will reduce the contingency by that amount and create a line item called Wetland Maintenance \$7,250. With the per unit assessments that we're anticipating once we get the assessment information, we will be able to have more detail on the revenue side.

Mr. Morgan: We should know the assessment pretty well after doing the bonds, right?

Mr. Flint: We know what the debt service is. The O&M we are going to model after the Stoneybrook South District. So, the O&M per unit amounts are similar.

Mr. Morgan: Okay.

Mr. Flint: We don't have that in here right now, but we are going to have to do a mailed notice.

Mr. Morgan: But we know what our revenue is going to be because we did that detail in the bond.

Mr. Flint: Again, this is a starting point. Treat it as a first draft to meet our legal obligations. We can change this to the extent that we need to. The assessment amounts would be based on the Stoneybrook South assessment amounts and we plan to do a mailed notice based on those. We believe that the budget can be accommodated within those parameters. Then you would have the ability to reduce them if you needed to at the Public Hearing, but you cannot increase them.

Mr. Smith: Not increase them, so it's a ceiling.

Mr. Morgan: So, street lights just on Whistling Streets is almost \$1,500 per month? Wow!

Mr. Scheerer: There is 60 of them, yes.

Mr. Morgan: I thought we were putting in solar lights?

Mr. Scheerer: They are LED. They are in the business of selling electricity I don't think they are going to go solar.

Mr. Morgan: We should put in our own lights.

Mr. Flint: If there are any questions, we can discuss it if not I ask for a motion to approve.

On MOTION by Mr. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Register, with all in favor, Resolution 2019-07 Approving the Proposed Fiscal Year 2020 Budget and Setting a Public Hearing for August 5, 2019 at 11:30 a.m. at the Oasis Club at ChampionsGate, was approved.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Proposal from Amtec to Provide Arbitrage Rebate Calculation Services

Mr. Flint: We are required as part of the regulatory requirements with the bonds to do an arbitrage calculation and make sure that we aren't earning more interest than we are paying. This proposal is for 5 years and locks in the rate of \$450 per year. That is a very competitive price and we would recommend the Board approve it.

Mr. Smith: This is required?

Mr. Morgan: Right.

On MOTION by Mr. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Smith, with all in favor, the Proposal from Amtec to Provide Arbitrage Rebate Calculation Services, was approved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney's Report

Mr. d' Adesky: Not much from me, but I did get the updated information we needed. Lane helped me out and then updated the legal description. There are some closure issues with GIS that we need to get to the County. That has all been handled so now we are on the calendar for the 20th of May for the BSEC Hearing. That's the date for the ordinance which goes into effect a day or two after that. Then following that we will actually have to go through an update of our documents, really to the bond issuance, to bring in the parcels that were expanded and bought from the District. So, there will be another minor signing after that. Just very short amendments that don't change the documents but just add the areas into the Completion Agreement, Acquisition Agreement, True Up, etc.

B. Engineer’s Report

Mr. Reid: I don’t have anything. You are working on the first requisition?

Mr. d’Adesky: Yes, we are just about done with the proof reading.

C. District Manager’s Report

1. Balance Sheet and Income Statement

Mr. Flint: You have the unaudited financial statements through March 31, 2019. If there are any questions, we can discuss those.

2. Ratification of Funding Requests #7

Mr. Flint: We also have ratification of funding request #7, which is \$16,996.12.

On MOTION by Mr. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Register, with all in favor, Funding Request #7 totaling \$16,996.12, was ratified.

3. Presentation of Number of Registered Voters - 52

Mr. Flint: Each year we are required to announce the number of registered voters within the District as of April 15th and you can see as of April 15, 2019 there were 52 registered voters. Once the District is 6 years old and we hit 250 registered voters that triggers the transition of this Board to start transitioning to general election. So, when you have 6 years and 250 registered voters the next election in an even numbered year, 2 of the seats would transition. Then in two more years two more seats and then two more years the last seat. There is not action required on registered voters.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

Mr. Flint: In regards to potentially bidding landscaping, it looks like our projected costs are under our statutory of bidding thresholds. So, theoretically the Board could take recommendations from Lennar. Any district with a projected landscaping cost in excess of \$200,000 the district actually has to go through a sealed bid process. So, we are going to have to coordinate that sealed bid process with what the HOA and the developer are also doing to make sure we are kind of all working in sync with each other. Ultimately the CDD Board will be making the decision on the contractor for the CDD. Then it is just a matter of whether they have to formally bid it, or they can take the recommendation.

Mr. d'Adesky: And even if you did have to formally bid it, you could weigh your criteria such that the familiarity with the project and the community is a factor. If they are already in the community doing HOA private stuff that's a factor you can weigh in just like with any other bid.

Mr. Smith: My understanding too in the process is we can establish criteria for the capabilities of any of the firms outside.

Mr. Flint: Price is usually about 15%.

Mr. d'Adesky: There is not a concern if we have to do a sealed bid.

Mr. Reid: He is going to eliminate Joe and Bob's landscaping with a pick-up truck and 2 mowers.

Mr. Flint: We are going to have to talk about that because he can't operate on a separate track from the CDD. I know Mark Yahn really well, he works at Reunion with us and Starky Ranch up in Pasco County and Windsor at Westside and Osceola County. We have worked with him before on bidding, but he can't eliminate stuff on behalf of the Board.

Mr. Morgan: He can eliminate on behalf of Lennar though.

Mr. Flint: Yes, he could but then if we have to go through the formal process whoever he has eliminated aren't going to be prevented from submitting a bid. So, we just to need to make sure we are working together on that.

Mr. d'Adesky: And he can give input to the criteria that he thinks that we should put in there to screen.

Mr. Flint: The Board has a lot of discretion in how you rank the responses against those criteria and price is usually only about 15% so there is a lot of other factors.

Mr. Morgan: But the Board could vote to just adopt his prequal criteria, right?

Mr. d'Adesky: As long as they are objective, and they aren't subjective.

Mr. Morgan: Just like we adopt staff's recommendations.

Mr. Flint: You can adopt his ranking criteria but if we are going to prequalify there is a separate process we are going to have to go through.

Mr. Morgan: We just couldn't accept his prequalifying?

Mr. Flint: You can accept his criteria but if you are going to eliminate anybody then you've got to actually go through your process. But the criteria pretty much handle the prequalification part of it. You don't want to get stuck with the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, and this

is not the lowest responsive and responsible bidder. This is you've got a set of criteria you are using to rank. It's not an issue for this District right now.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS


Supervisor's Request

Mr. Flint: Anything that was not on the agenda that the Board would like to discuss?

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

On MOTION by Mr. Morgan, seconded by Mr. Register, with all in favor, the meeting was adjourned.



Secretary/Assistant Secretary



Chairman/Vice Chairman