

MINUTES OF MEETING

BRIGHTON LAKES COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

A special meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Brighton Lakes Community Development District was held Thursday, October 23, 2008, at 6:00 p.m. at Club Habitat, 4250 Brighton Lakes Boulevard, Kissimmee, Florida.

Present were:

Jennifer Palmer	Chairman
John McGrath	Vice Chairman
Michelle Incandela	Supervisor
Tom Mihalic	Supervisor
Dolores Pieters	Supervisor

Also present were:

Gary Moyer	District Manager
Jennifer O'Brian (by phone)	District Attorney
Brenda (Wright) Burgess	Moyer Management Group
Maria Fuentes	Severn Trent Services
Nestor Olmo	HOA President
Brian Smith	Severn Trent Services
Residents and members of the public	

This represents the context and summary of the meeting.

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. Moyer called the roll, indicating a quorum was present for the meeting. Ms. Incandela was not present at roll call.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. McGrath led the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Bids Received for Landscape Maintenance Services and Award of Contract

Mr. Moyer stated the primary purpose of this meeting is to consider the results of the rebid that we went through for landscape maintenance services. You were provided with that information and results of that bid process. I will enter for the record the order of respondents based upon price; Weber was lowest, Vila & Son was 2nd, Servello & Son was 3rd, Luke Brothers was 4th, The Budd Group was 5th, AmeriScape was 6th, OneSource was 7th, and Florida Cut was 8th.

Mr. Smith stated I distributed the references that we called. They are scored 1 to 5.

Mr. Moyer stated the record will reflect that Ms. Incandela has joined the meeting.

Mr. Smith stated most of the companies received 3s or 4s or all 5s. They all received fairly good references, nothing below a 3.

Mr. Crumbaker asked did Mr. Smith score them for purposes of a recommendation?

Mr. Smith stated we called their references and asked the companies they worked for about their quality of service and responsiveness. The score was based on their references scoring them from 1 to 5. They were all fairly responsive. Some companies did not provide financial statements, but as part of the package, they did provide their annual sales figures.

Ms. Palmer asked what are the rules on what we can discuss and what we cannot ask?

Mr. Crumbaker asked of the vendors or staff?

Ms. Palmer stated both.

Mr. Crumbaker stated the only thing you can do with respect to the vendor is ask for clarification on any issue but you cannot take into consideration any supplemental information they provide that may supplement what they provided within the bid package. You have to consider what was included in their proposal.

Mr. Smith stated in the proposals, on page 21 of the contractor qualification statement, for item 8 for financial information for the past three years, a majority of them added that on their qualification statement.

Mr. Crumbaker stated there was no requirement for them to provide financial statements because it is exempt pursuant to Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, for purposes of public records. A couple things we look at include insurance and the amount of work they have done over the past three years to see their financial capability to handle a project of this size.

Ms. Palmer asked can we ask for Mr. Frawley's input, even though he is not a Board member, since he works so closely with the vendors?

Mr. Crumbaker stated he is technically staff.

Mr. Frawley stated some of these did not answer what the scope of services asked for. There are different mowings and different service intervals than what we asked. That is something you should consider.

Mr. Smith stated we provided a worksheet in order for them to provide their prices. There is a scope of services that identifies quantities of service, but that does not have anything to do with their final bid. They have to go by the scope of services. They will be obligated to those quantities identified in the scope of services. I reviewed the worksheets

and only one identified them perfectly and others had differences. We do not take bids from the worksheet but from the bid proposal form. We will ask them if they are going to honor the scope of services or will they go by the numbers in the worksheet.

Mr. McGrath asked in the proposal, did we ask for 42 mowings and were we specific in that?

Mr. Smith stated on page 52 of the RFP, you will see the scope of services with the narrative.

Mr. McGrath asked why would some of the respondents plan to mow a different number of times than 42?

Mr. Smith stated the scope is for 40 mowings as shown on page 53. The scope provides all the quantities. We merely provided the worksheet and it was blank.

Mr. McGrath stated everyone bid at least the minimum but some did more.

Mr. Moyer stated some worksheets had a different approach to accomplish the same goal. When you say they all bid more, that is not necessarily the case. The condition of the District signing a contract to award this to a company and if their worksheet does not correspond to the scope of services, we will get clarification that they will perform our scope of services for the bid price that was in the bid package. If they say no, they will not do that, then we go to the next bidder.

Mr. Smith stated page 12 of the RFP is the actual bid form. Page 14 is the worksheet and it is blank. They have to go through the scope of services and as they read that scope, they fill that in and provide their numbers. But that is not the proposal form.

Mr. McGrath stated thank you for clarifying. When I reviewed the information, I saw one company was doing 42 mowings and others were doing 40 mowings.

Mr. Moyer stated 40 was in bid specifications. How that factors into the scoring is, if there is a question on their worksheet, that will lead to a question related to the understanding of the scope of work. Technically you can give a lower score on the criteria worksheet if they had a lower number on the worksheet than specified. At the end of the day the one you select as the firm to do this work, we will make sure they understand they are bidding our scope and not their scope.

Ms. Palmer asked which of these companies has Mr. Smith worked with?

Mr. Smith stated I have worked with Vila, Servello, and OneSource. I am familiar with Weber, Budd Group, Luke Brothers, and AmeriScape. The only one I am not familiar with is Florida Cut. The others have worked on projects adjacent to or within the

communities that we manage. I am familiar with essentially all of them and they are all excellent companies. I was thrilled when I saw the companies who responded. They all had good references. The companies we called for references are reputable companies.

Mr. Moyer asked on personnel, in terms of scoring, are they all qualified? Are there significant differences in the qualifications they had?

Mr. Smith stated no. Oftentimes it is the supervisor on site who makes the difference and the support he gets from the company. They all have that potential and I know some of them have employees who go back and forth. It is us doing our best to have that company put the best supervisor on site that we can get, which is someone who cares. Mr. Frawley sees that and we will meet on site with them. If we have a good supervisor, everything looks great.

Ms. Palmer stated it is a volatile business. Does any one company have more consistency in staffing?

Mr. Smith stated of the four low bidders, I currently work on two projects with Servello and they are responsive. I am familiar with Weber. It is very hard because it is comparing apples to apples on all these companies.

Mr. McGrath asked our task is to complete the worksheet for all these companies, asking questions if we need to?

Mr. Moyer stated yes.

Mr. McGrath stated for personnel, it sounds like we give them all 25 points.

Mr. Mihalic stated rather than each individual scoring, I would like to have a score as a Board. That is what we did last time.

Mr. Moyer stated that is fine.

Ms. Palmer stated if Mr. Smith says all are pretty much on par with each other, then let us only look at the top four that provided the lowest prices. It is not because of qualifications, but the main reason we started this process is for budgetary purposes to put extra money in reserves that we are currently not able to do without significantly raising assessments, which we did not want to do for this current fiscal year. If they are all at the same level, then I will not pay \$110,000 more for the top company. In my opinion, there are four under \$200,000, so we look at those four. The other four we do not consider

Mr. McGrath stated I agree. Price is one third of the total score.

Mr. Mihalic stated I agree.

Ms. Incandela stated we need to make sure they understand that they are bound to the price for our scope and we submit that to them before they sign. Can we make sure everyone understands before we select one? They all understand that is the price they are bound to pursuant to our scope, regardless of what was submitted. I would rather get clarification on that now if we can.

Mr. Crumbaker stated when the District issued the RFP, you adopted scoring criteria. We are adhering to a process that is set out under State law and the District's rules of procedure. There is not a lot of latitude in terms of deviating from that course. When we talk about scoring proposals, you score all of them to the extent they are responsive to the RFP, meaning there are no material defects in the proposal resulting in that proposal not being scored. The only proposal I can see that appears to be non-responsive, unless a representative is there to demonstrate otherwise, is Florida Cut. The proposal was submitted by Florida Cut, but when we went to the Department of State's website, there were many Florida Cut entities, and we could not identify an existing company according to the Department of State named Florida Cut Landscape Services. As a threshold issue, that is a material defect because you cannot enter into a contract with an entity that is not in existence. With the remaining seven proposal, I know we are looking to save money and a portion of the scoring criteria is related to price, but the Board needs to look through each of the proposals and score each category on the evaluation criteria sheet in order to come up with a reasonable and sound decision under the basis of Florida law in order to award the highest-ranked proposer as it relates to this procurement.

Mr. McGrath stated I suggest we go ahead and under personnel we grant 25 to all the proposers with the exception of Florida Cut.

Mr. Smith stated you are also looking at location for scoring points. Weber is out of Winter Haven.

Mr. McGrath stated they have a branch off Michigan.

A Representative from Weber Environmental stated we are off Michigan and Osceola Parkway.

Mr. Smith stated I am going by their main office. if the contractor is here, can we ask them what location they are working out of? Servello is off Taft Vineland and Orange Blossom Trail. Vila is from Winter Garden.

Mr. Crumbaker stated staying within the parameters of the bid package regarding location or any other information, the contractor can confirm information if they are at the meeting but they cannot supplement the information that was in their proposal.

Mr. Smith stated Luke Brothers is on Silverstar Road in Orlando. Budd Group is on Goldenrod Road in Orlando. OneSource is based out of Celebration. AmeriScape is on Hand Avenue in Orlando. Florida Cut is on Harmony Lane in Kissimmee.

Mr. Mihalic stated we are considering staff plus location.

Ms. Incandela stated I think all of them are able to manage this property from their location.

Mr. McGrath asked score 25 all of them?

Ms. Palmer stated all of them have the location to be able to do it.

Mr. Mihalic stated give 25 to Weber because they are the closest.

Ms. Incandela stated for personnel and experience, I see everyone pretty even. There may be an issue with the scope of work where some are more tailored than others, and certainly price will be a huge difference, but on the first two categories, they are very close.

Ms. Pieters stated I agree.

Mr. McGrath asked do we want to score 25 on personnel for everyone?

Ms. Incandela stated I do not see anyone who does not have the experience who could not handle our task on experience.

Mr. McGrath asked do we score all of them 30 points for experience?

Ms. Palmer asked where do references come into play?

Mr. Moyer stated on this category.

Ms. Palmer stated if someone receives 5s, then I think they receive full points for this category. Some received 3 points and they should not receive as many points.

Mr. Smith stated Weber received 5 and 5. Vila received 4.5 and 5. Servello received 5 and 5+. Luke received three 4s. Budd Group received 5 and 5. OneSource received 5 and 3. AmeriScape is 5 and 4. Florida Cut received 4 and 3.5.

Ms. Palmer stated anyone with a 5 receives full points. If you received 4.5, I would give them full points. If they got a 3, they do not get full points. We have to base it on a legitimate factor.

Mr. McGrath stated 30 points for two 5s and 25 points for 4s. For the three 4s, give them 20.

Mr. Mihalic stated for 4.5 and 5, give them 25 points.

Ms. Incandela stated I do not want to count 4 the same as 4.5. They should be in relation to their numbers, so it is a proportion.

Mr. McGrath stated for 5 and 3, score them 20.

Mr. Mihalic stated 4 and 5 would be 25 points, and 4 and 3 would be 15.

Ms. Palmer stated understanding scope of work, I defer to Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith stated all of them had differences in worksheets except for Luke Brothers. They had all the scope on the worksheet that corresponded to our scope of services.

Ms. Palmer asked does that mean the other ones did not include it or broke it up differently?

Mr. Smith stated Weber had 42 mowings instead of 40. For prunings they had 12 rather than 18 because we are on a cycle where they are pruned every three weeks. Servello had 18 prunings but made a mistake on the irrigation quantities on their worksheet. All of them had differences in worksheets.

Mr. McGrath asked do you think it is more of a paperwork issue than the ability to understand what Brighton Lakes needs for landscaping?

Mr. Smith stated it is not fully reading the scope.

Ms. Palmer stated then Luke gets full points for that and the rest do not. Some of the discrepancies were not in our favor.

Mr. Smith stated the discrepancies are pretty equal.

Mr. McGrath asked 15 for Luke and 12 for the rest?

Ms. Palmer stated 10 or 12 but to make it easy to add, use 10.

Mr. Mihalic asked if they added something but shorted something else, how do you score that?

Ms. Palmer stated the scoring sheet asks "Does the proposal demonstrate an understanding of the District's needs for the services requested?" If they did not answer it correctly, then the one who did gets full points and the others do not.

Mr. McGrath stated I agree.

Ms. Palmer stated for price, Weber receives 15 because they are the lowest.

Mr. Crumbaker stated I calculated the points for price based upon the most points going to the lowest bid: 15 for Weber, 12.75 for Vila, 11.85 for Servello, 10.39 for Luke Brothers, 9.45 for Budd Group, 7.44 for OneSource, and 7.43 for AmeriScape.

Mr. Mihalic stated I calculated the totals to be Weber 80, Vila 72.75, Servello 76.85, Luke Brothers 75.39, Budd Group 74.45, OneSource 62.44, and AmeriScape 67.43.

Mr. Crumbaker stated those totals do not include the additional 15 points under price. There are 15 additional points based on reasonableness of unit price and increase in annual premium.

Mr. Moyer stated that is if someone came in exceptionally low or high. Florida Cut was exceptionally high.

Mr. Mihalic stated if you look at the low bid versus second bid, it is a difference \$25,000 per year, or 20%.

Ms. Palmer stated they are all reasonable.

Ms. Incandela stated I think some are better than others but they are all reasonable.

Mr. McGrath asked does everyone get 10 points for reasonableness?

Ms. Palmer stated no.

Mr. Mihalic stated I would give the first two 10, the second two 8, and the remainder 5 points.

Mr. McGrath stated I agree.

Ms. Palmer stated it is not going to make a difference at this point but the first four are all reasonable. Low does not always mean reasonable.

Mr. McGrath stated I agree. Reasonable is the issue we are looking at.

Ms. Palmer stated I would give 10 to the first four.

Mr. Mihalic stated I am willing to score them that way.

Mr. McGrath stated regarding the proposed increase in total annual price, Weber gets the full 5 points.

Mr. Mihalic stated they did not adjust every year.

Mr. Moyer stated Servello also did not change their price, so they would also get the full 5 points.

Mr. McGrath stated Weber and Servello get 5 points.

Mr. Mihalic stated Vila should get 4 because they kept the first two years the same and then increased after that.

Mr. Moyer stated then give the rest 3 points.

Mr. Mihalic stated yes. The grand totals are Weber 95, Vila 84.75, Servello 91.85, Luke Brothers 89.39, Budd Group 82.45, OneSource 70.44, and AmeriScape 75.43.

Mr. Crumbaker stated I will ask for a motion approving the rankings as calculated and awarding a contract to Weber Environmental.

Ms. Palmer moved to approve the rankings as read into the record and to award a contract to Weber Environmental for landscape maintenance services.
Mr. Mihalic seconded the motion.

Mr. Mihalic stated since there were some slips in scope, I want to make sure they understand they are performing our scope of services.

Mr. Moyer asked is it appropriate for the Board to award the contract to Weber with the condition that they acknowledge the scope. If that does not happen, is it appropriate for the Board to authorize staff to award a contract to the number 2 firm?

Mr. Crumbaker stated yes.

Ms. Palmer amended the motion to approve the rankings as read into the record and to award a contract to Weber Environmental for landscape maintenance services. If an agreement cannot be reached with Weber Environmental for the full scope of work, staff is authorized to negotiate with Servello & Son as the second-ranked firm.
Mr. Mihalic seconded the amended motion.

On VOICE VOTE, with all in favor, approval was given to the above-stated motion.

Ms. Palmer stated I would like to thank everyone for attending and participating in this process.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Analysis of Gates and Related Security Issues

Ms. Incandela stated I am not sure how this item ended up on the agenda for this meeting. I thought we had this special meeting for the purposes of the landscaping bid. I requested a workshop for Board members prior to a meeting where we can receive public feedback so we can discuss how to make sure our residents are informed of the special security meeting. I do not know how we added it to the agenda or if it is even appropriate.

Mr. McGrath stated I asked staff to do something. One thing we did at our last meeting was review the security contract and I said we should stop on the basis that if we

are going to make a change, I did not want someone to plan for a whole year ahead. I wanted to have this at our meeting for that discussion.

Ms. Incandela stated the issues are rather pressing and we should be addressing them. When you have a special meeting designated for a limited purpose, we need to keep to the scope of that. I do not think the security issues were properly added for this special meeting. In the near future, we need to have a workshop. I think there are a lot of issues the Board needs to resolve that do not necessarily need to involve public comment, to make sure when we have a meeting designated for security issues that the residents know what we are doing and what issues we are considering. I do not want anyone left out when it comes to a point for us to make a decision. We may make a decision that will be a big change.

Ms. Palmer stated security is the hottest topic of any we have. I want to know what our community thinks. Perhaps that means, before we have a workshop, sending a survey and asking for their comments. It can be available on the website and we mail it out to everyone so everyone can provide their feedback. When we have our meeting regarding security, then we will have the viewpoints of the community. What we as Board members think may not be what the community as a whole thinks.

Mr. Smith stated I understood from the last meeting that I was to provide some numbers for you to consider as part of your analysis. This was provided for you to consider and when we have the workshop, you will have the analysis.

Ms. Incandela stated you are correct that we asked for that at the next meeting. This information should be for the regular meeting. I did not want residents to be under the impression that we are here at tonight's meeting to discuss and make security changes. I would carry this over to the next regular meeting agenda.

Ms. Palmer stated in between we need something that goes out. Only 10 homes are being represented at this meeting tonight and we cannot make a decision based on that number.

Ms. Incandela asked how much notice do we need for a workshop?

Mr. Moyer stated it is seven days in advance of the meeting for the newspaper notice plus several days to get it to the newspaper before their publication deadline.

Ms. Incandela stated I would like the letter that we send out to be inclusive so that we do it the correct way so people do not have any questions when they read the letter. I think more input is required for that. That is why I wanted the workshop to decide on that

letter and what we are going to do and how we are going to inform our residents. Then we can decide what to do with security issues after that.

Ms. Palmer stated I would like to have input of the home owners when we are trying to put together what we present to them. We can put together what we think everyone wants to hear about but it might not be what the rest of the community cares about. Ms. Incandela and Mr. Crumbaker are good putting things into words, and I would be fine with you and Mr. Crumbaker drafting a letter to send out and then have a workshop after we receive the information. Based on the results from the community, then we can make a decision.

Ms. Incandela stated you want to get input from the community for what our agenda should be in the future.

Mr. Mihalic stated we should give them several examples of what we are looking at so they can make a choice.

Ms. Incandela stated I do not know what I am looking at until we have the workshop.

Mr. Mihalic stated I disagree with using the website, because we have no way of knowing if one person sends in multiple comments. They can mail it in but I do not want one person to enter multiple times.

Ms. Incandela stated we can accept email responses, as long as there is an email address. I think we should allow them the opportunity to provide comments on these issues if we are asking for feedback. They are not necessarily voting but they are offering comments and it is presented to the Board. We can do it through both the website and by mail to cover all options.

Mr. Mihalic stated I calculated it would cost about \$300 to mail it to everyone.

Ms. Incandela stated I think we definitely mail it, and the website will help because it will reach people. Computer people will respond if they can email a response.

Mr. McGrath stated we added this item on our agenda for tonight. Can we have the workshop for the Board now since it was advertised?

Ms. Incandela stated Ms. Palmer suggested that we get feedback first. My suggestion is, if we draft and mail the letter before the workshop, we can have more feedback to discuss at the workshop.

Mr. McGrath stated that sounds like logical approach. The concern I have is, the security contractor should not worry about what is going on with us.

Ms. Palmer stated they realize that we are happy with them now, compared with every other company, and other companies face the same situation of not knowing. I hope he understands we want feedback from home owners and we can accept feedback from the guards who are here and what they see are the pros and cons and what are the biggest issues of what they see and any solutions they might have. I think their feedback as the people at the gate is very vital to what we are going to do. We can set a timeframe for the letter to go out in a week, give them 10 days to respond via website or in the mail. That gives time to get information from the guards who work here also.

Ms. Incandela asked if we have a formal workshop, can we have the security company present at that meeting?

Mr. Crumbaker stated workshops are public meetings and anyone can come. You can have the vendor there and ask them questions and have dialogue with them.

Mr. Moyer stated for whoever drafts the letter, if you ask someone if they want 24 hours of security versus 6 hours, that is somewhat misleading. You have to indicate what that means in terms of price.

Ms. Palmer stated we can include those numbers in the letter.

Mr. Mihalic stated that is the reason for the analysis.

Ms. Incandela stated I do not know if we can draft a letter that will be able to get their overall opinions. I would like them to tell us what they are having issues with and say the Board is evaluating our security procedures at this time. If anyone has an opinion and would like to express it to the Board, knowing that the Board may undertake major changes to the security system with respect to gates, officers, and anything specific, then please give us your feedback. Give them an opportunity to voice whatever their opinions are, as opposed to being able to pick from a list of choices. I do not think the letter needs to be complicated. I want to be sure that they understand that we are going to evaluate these issues and that they have the opportunity to give their opinions with respect to gate operations and security before the Board makes those decisions. This is their chance to speak up so no one feels they were not notified or did not have the opportunity to voice their opinion. I am having a difficult time getting a feel for how the community feels about the gates. I am hearing a 50-50 split and I do not want to impose my personal opinions if that is against the majority, but I need to get a better feel for the majority.

Ms. Palmer stated maybe we start with a blank slate. We can ask them to go online to submit their comments. If one person sends in their comments 12 times, you will be able

to tell. Ask them to bring proposals that we present to the community and we discuss those proposals before we make a decision.

Mr. Mihalic stated it should be home owners and not renters. What if the majority of people say they want 24-hour security by the sheriff's department and we know we cannot afford that?

Ms. Incandela stated that is something you take into consideration as you make your decision as a Supervisor. If you know that even though there is a public opinion on this matter but you know realistically and logically that we do not have the funds to do it or other reasons, you use your intelligence and experience to make the best decision that you can, but you will know if someone said that, they are under a misconception about what it costs and you can address that issue with them. Perhaps their opinion will change.

Ms. Palmer stated this is something that will take more than one meeting. It is not an easy decision. It is a passionate argument and perhaps we get the input and if the consensus is 24-hour sheriff patrols, that is one option we present. At that meeting, we tell them there is a cost factor and explain how it relates to their annual assessment fee. If the overwhelming majority of residents agree to a significant increase, then we think about that and weigh that. You present the facts based on what they asked for. Find out what everyone wants, present the options from there and have a meeting to discuss that. Maybe you go back and tweak the idea before the Board makes the final recommendation and we make a decision. It cannot happen in one meeting and will be a process through the rest of the calendar year and into 2009. We ask our current company to work with us and if they want to keep the contract, I think they will do that.

Mr. Mihalic stated I think it is reasonable to extend their contract with the current security company until the end of January.

Ms. Palmer stated I have no issue with that at all.

Mr. McGrath stated this process will give people a chance to take the opportunity to participate. It is our responsibility to make the decision based on feedback we receive but perhaps not. Perhaps it is what this Board feels is the right thing to do. We are talking about what we are currently doing and one other possible change. Are there any other ideas other than police coming in? There might be other options that we have not considered.

Ms. Palmer stated one option may be that they do not want anything: no gate, no security. At that point we have to be prepared to get crime statistics from the area and

present those statistics to inform the residents what that means to our community. We are elected to represent a mass of people. I appreciate those families who are represented here in the audience, but there are 700+ other home owners, who do not attend these meetings for whatever reason. Perhaps because they do not care or they work or other reasons. We owe it to them to find out what their opinions are. We represent all of them, whether they come to all the meetings, some of the meetings or zero meetings. They all pay their fees.

Mr. McGrath stated the first thing is to find a day and time for a workshop.

Mr. Mihalic stated we discussed having the workshop before our next meeting.

Ms. Palmer stated perhaps Mr. Moyer can put this letter together with Mr. Crumbaker. I would like the letter sent out by the end of next week saying we are going to begin the process to make some changes and direct them to the website or provide a sheet for them to submit their comments, and give them until November 15 to submit their comments.

Mr. McGrath stated Mr. Moyer provided us with a draft. Maybe we should take the letter we received and provide feedback to Mr. Moyer.

Ms. Palmer stated I would like to authorize staff to compose a letter.

Ms. Incandela asked are we authorizing a general letter and are we asking for feedback prior to our next meeting? If we are, then I want to make sure we say in the letter that there will not be a general comment at that workshop. The workshop will be open to the public but closed to comments. If they want their comments to be considered by the Board, they have to submit them. I want to be sure they understand no action will be taken at the workshop and this may affect changes in the future but there will be no changes made at the current time. We are simply asking them to give us their opinions.

Ms. Palmer stated there will be an opportunity for them to voice any opinions before any decision is made.

Mr. McGrath stated we encourage any additional ideas.

Mr. Mihalic asked can the website be setup to receive their comments by then?

Ms. Burgess stated yes.

On MOTION Ms. Palmer, seconded by Mr. Mihalic, with all in favor, approval was given to authorize staff to compose a letter to home owners as discussed, to schedule a workshop prior to the November meeting, and to extend the contract with Keep Safe for an additional three months.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Other Business

There being no other business, the next order of business followed.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

On MOTION by Mr. Palmer, seconded by Ms. Mihalic, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Gary L. Moyer, Secretary

Jennifer Palmer, Chairman