

Mr. Walter responded from my understanding it was done by a consensus of the Recording Secretaries. They have several Recording Secretaries who do the same function. They talked it through and it was their consensus among themselves.

Supv. Farnsworth stated I would like to point out, the only organization who uses the abbreviation Supv. is the military. They use all capitals – SUPV. If you want to use the military abbreviation with their way of abbreviating it, that is fine.

Supv. Kassel stated we do not need to. We are a CDD. They are a different organization.

Supv. Farnsworth stated if you are going to use Supv., it needs to be a four-letter acronym. It should ^{have} **be** either an *r* or a *v* after *Sup.* It does not matter which one. Otherwise, you cannot distinguish it from Superintendent.

Supv. Walls asked which would you prefer?

Supv. Farnsworth responded I do not care. Either one.

Supv. Berube stated it should be *Supr.*

Supv. Kassel stated it needs to be *v* because *Supr.* could still be Superintendent. Is that good?

Supv. Bokunic SECONDED the prior motion.

Supv. Berube stated we are not going to address any more changes regarding titles.

On MOTION by Supv. Kassel, seconded by Supv. Bokunic, with all in favor, each Supervisor will be addressed in the salutation as *Supv.* in the Minutes.

On VOICE vote with all in favor, approval was given to the Minutes of the August 31, 2017 Meeting as amended.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Developer's Report

Supv. Berube stated there are no developer people here tonight. Whether they choose to come to the meeting moving forward, we will see.

CONTEXT
Here only
the letters
"S-U-P" &
not "V" !

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Staff Reports****A. Engineer**

Mr. Boyd stated I only have a couple of updates. We are still working on the sidewalk. We had an issue which I think we resolved this week. I understand Mr. Randy Palmer, the concrete contractor, is supposed to start next week. We still have an open issue with the swale between Neighborhood F and the Lake Shore Park. We spoke to the contractor regarding repairs prior to this meeting. The hurricane came through and made everything wet again. It does need to be dry before they can repair.

Supv. Kassel asked are you talking between F and the Linear Park on Butterfly Drive because you said Lake Shore Park? You are not talking about the back side?

Mr. Boyd responded no. The north side.

Supv. Kassel is it the area between the pipeline and the back side, or are you talking about the north side?

Mr. Boyd stated I am talking about the north side of the community.



Supv. Berube stated there is a swale between the back side of the houses and behind Buck Lake.


Mr. Boyd stated it is on the north side of Lake Shore Park.


Supv. Kassel asked what about the swale on the south side of F?

Mr. Boyd responded the work has been completed over there and is operational.

Supv. Berube stated each time I look at it, it is dry. It gets wet and muddy where they cannot mow it, but I have not noticed any standing water. It drains in less than 24 hours.

Mr. Boyd stated what we are talking about now is being graded incorrectly. It has a standing puddle which never reaches the drain. They have agreed to repair it, but it needs to dry out so that they can get in there and not make a bigger mess when they try to repair it.  

 I only have one other item. Last month, we were transferring SFWMD permits to the correct operating entity. I found three more of these, which represent developer-owned facilities. The District informed me the certifications are for the pond they drain to, which is why they were not presented last month. I held them back because they are developer-owned facilities which SFWMD says because they drain to a CDD pond, they still want the transfer stating that.

 Either remove paragraph or insert speaker salutation and name to start 2nd paragraph.

Supv. Berube stated I thought we had a petty cash line item. Perhaps I am wrong.

Supv. Kassel stated I do not remember ever seeing a petty cash and we do not have it on our balance sheet now.

Supv. Berube stated perhaps we did away with it.

A. Financial Statements for August 31, 2017

B. Invoice Approval #209, Check Register and Debit Invoices

OK!

Mr. Walter reviewed the financial statements, Invoice Approval #209, check register and debit invoices, which are included in the agenda package and are available for public review in the District Office during normal business hours.

Mr. Walter stated your receipts are doing well and are at 102% of the budget. We do have an error in the financial report which speaks to the Davey contract and mulching. We will resolve that. That is not appropriate for August, but again we have some transitions going on between their invoices, and they are still hanging out there. Just to draw your attention, we did observe that issue. We have had Mr. van der Snel's review of the check register. We are good shape, so I would like to ask for acceptance of Invoice Approval #209.



Supv. Kassel asked if we look at the balance sheet, let me just get back to it. The balance sheet indicates we have a construction fund showing \$29,569. However, our statement of revenues, changes and fund balance, show \$28,977. There is a discrepancy there.

Supv. Berube asked what was the balance sheet amount?

Supv. Kassel responded it was \$29,569 and this is \$28,977. Also, we have a line item in here of *Construction in Progress* for \$34,592. I do not understand why it is called *Construction in Progress*. That was old and spent. It is construction which is complete, so why does it still appear here? Why has it not been shown as a finalized expenditure? Now we have a fund balance which should be what is remaining in that account at this point. In other words, this \$34,592 is for Blazing Star, and that happened a long time ago. Therefore, it should not appear here anymore. I do not know why it is, and then there is the problem of the fund balance.

Mr. Walter stated it is for the year. It is the year roll.

Supv. Kassel asked yes, but did we not spend it in the previous Fiscal Year?

Supv. Berube responded no I think it got paid this Fiscal Year.