

MINUTES OF MEETING  
CHAMPIONSGATE  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

A meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the ChampionsGate Community Development District was held Monday, September 17, 2019 at 11:30 a.m. at the offices of RIDA Development, 8390 ChampionsGate Boulevard, Suite 104, ChampionsGate, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Phillip Montalvo	Chairman
Darin Tennyson	Vice Chairman
Jordan Rockefeller	Assistant Secretary
Lee Dawson	Assistant Secretary by telephone
Elizabeth Allen	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

George Flint	District Manager
Scott Clark	District Counsel
Mark Vincutonis	Hanson Walter
Yvonne Shouey	RIDA Development
Marc Reicher	RIDA Development
Lanice Lawrence	Resident

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

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

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comment Period**

Ms. Lawrence asked are you still considering speed bumps on Legends?

Mr. Montalvo stated we are going to be talking about that today.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of the Minutes of the August 12,  
2019 Meeting**

On MOTION by Mr. Montalvo seconded by Mr. Tennyson with all in favor the minutes of the August 12, 2019 meeting were approved as presented.
---

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Discussion Items****A. Monument Signage Remediation**

Mr. Reicher stated we have made significant progress with Poblocki and with Gary, who visited with Phil and I and he made the presentation that is in front of you. There is a spec and they will redo all the stonework, changing some of the bases out. They are also changing some of the inset panels to be slip panels. In other words, there will be a 1 ¼" raised area where they slip the signs in. It will look like the new sign that Poblocki just built in ChampionsGate for a private party not for the District. They are squaring off the bottom, recaulking, resealing and redoing all the faux stone, finishing painting and changing the cabinets.

Ms. Allen asked is this the original contractor?

Mr. Reicher stated this is the original contractor, the account representative is different. We were having struggles with one individual, which was a surprise to us because he was a long-term account rep to us. When we informed the company in Raleigh, N.C. what was going on they said what can we do to make this right. They brought in a more senior designer who spent time on this and provided us a spec sign by sign. They are thinking the work is a duration of nine weeks and I feel they will do all this work as remedial work for the balance that is due.

Mr. Dawson joined the meeting by phone at this time.

Mr. Reicher stated there are a couple outstanding things, but my level of confidence has gone up significantly. They not only value ChampionsGate as a client but they are a large account with the developer throughout the country, they do a lot of our way finding signs at hotels. They were embarrassed and this is a very appropriate response for us to be able to move ahead. I feel much more comfortable that this work will be done correctly and in a timely fashion and it is the manager's recommendation to go the nine weeks with this guy and put it in place. The sign I'm not so sure we are 100% on and needs a little more work would be the major sign out here at the corner, sign 6. He is showing it all closed in underneath now. There was a question whether or not he did the EIFS draw on the bottom but looks now like he is going to do that.

Mr. Flint stated it doesn't appear they are consistent on how they are doing the base. A lot of them extends all across the bottom.

Mr. Reicher stated the flat ones are extended but on the curved one the material was too rigid. It was never our intent to do stone on the bottom.

Mr. Montalvo stated they will bring it all the way down and landscape in front of it.

Mr. Reicher stated correct. We would have to pick different landscaping, but he is bringing it all the way down. I think this is a much better design. He keeps referencing the sign he just installed, which is outside, which is appropriate and adequate in terms of how the casing would work and the fact that he squared off the bases and got rid of some of the EIFS flares, we have a much more consistent sign package. Right now it has stone that is not fastened correctly and a single coat of paint.

Mr. Rockefeller joined the meeting at this time.

Mr. Reicher stated the installer is putting an aluminum cap on top of the stone to break instead of the rolled EIFS piece, which is consistent with our new sign package. They are also putting it on with fasteners as needed and the teal EIFS surfaces will receive a second coat of paint to ensure color consistency. Sign 2, the first major sign we see at the corner, instead of leaving the panels in up against where it looks rough and unfinished he is creating a separate cabinet that will sit on top that sticks out a little bit but it has removable side panels for ease of access. Most important this type of rigging will prevent the signs from cracking and bowing, because it holds them in there better. Sign 3 is the one by Watson and the same process, he is squaring off that bottom and giving it the aluminum leg, a much cleaner more finished look. On the flat ones he is able to run the stone all the way along the bottom. He is detailing how he is going to clad in the second color with paint inconsistency. This is a much more complete spec than we had the first time. I feel good about this. Sign 5 is the same process, the aluminum base instead of the rolled area, the base is solid and looks like it is part of it and the sign looks like part of it and we are going to clean up all the paint and the same fasteners for the faux stone and the casing is solving a lot of our issues. Sign 6 is a little special but in this drawing it looks like he is covering over the bottom, which is good with an EIFS, which wasn't done. He cannot get rid of the rolled stone there because it is actual stone it is not EIFS so this one is slightly different but it will be fastening the stone the same way and it will be using the same control cabinet for the signs. This is by White Shark, the one nice thing he did was he centered the IDs opposed to them being passed to the left, they are using the entire sign bed and created a little more balance and symmetry on the sign. You can see the aluminum caps on the bottom and the stone. Also, they will paint the inside of that stone, that teal green will go on the inside of the base on that

stone so it won't be that exposed foam we see now. That might require caulking but that will be in a finished condition and painted green so it will look more complete.

He is saying a nine-week period of time once we reinstate the contract should be an adequate amount of time for him to manufacture and install. I think he will beat that, but we asked him, given the history to make sure he is comfortable on what he was committing to so he can over deliver. That is the proposal from Poblocki to do the remedial and we are presenting it to the Board to give it some consideration.

Mr. Montalvo stated we had a very productive meeting with them and they were contrite and understood the problem. What happens in the nine-week period? No signs at all?

Mr. Reicher stated I think he will be putting in a temporary banner. The more he can do in the shop the better quality you are going to get so he wants to try to do as much as he can in the shop. I think he is going to put A temporary banner over the sign areas so we are not without identification and way finding.

Mr. Montalvo stated we don't have a contract right now.

Mr. Reicher stated we will be reinstating that.

Mr. Montalvo stated we are going to reinstate the contract. Are they going to complete the work for the contract price?

Mr. Reicher stated that is my understanding. We haven't had that discussion so I think that was the original request and they haven't pushed back on that. I'm assuming your assumption is correct. We haven't said, you are doing this for the same price, right and he hasn't said right. I think we are 99.9% sure that is the plan if he gets reinstated.

Mr. Montalvo stated a question that was asked me directly after everybody vacated the room is, what remedies will you be seeking basically beyond the contract and I said I can't address that at this point in time. We tap danced around it. I don't feel that we should be paying more than we have contracted for. In terms of what action we take today I leave to the Board as to what they think. I am not inclined to leave the door open for further charges.

Mr. Flint stated I think the District has spent enough money on attorneys and everybody else on this issue that for them to ask for more money to get to where we are at would probably be unreasonable.

Mr. Reicher stated if you are inclined to reinstate we will write them a letter saying you are reinstated with this modified spec under the same terms and conditions with a completion date to be no later than the 9 weeks they pledged.

Mr. Clark stated we will do an amendment with reinstatement, substitute the spec, address the timeframe and they get paid upon final acceptance. They get paid the balance of the contract price.

Mr. Reicher stated I believe that is our expectation.

Mr. Flint stated I think the Board should authorize District Counsel to draft an agreement based on the specs provided and the original financial terms and if they accept it, Phil can execute it if not then we have to come back.

Ms. Allen asked do we give them a timeline to respond?

Mr. Reicher stated he will respond quickly. They have been highly responsive.

On MOTION by Mr. Montalvo seconded by Ms. Allen with all in favor District Counsel was authorized to draft the documents needed to reinstate the contract with Poblocki based on the specs provided, completion within nine weeks and the original financial terms.

#### **B. Masters Boulevard Overlay Project**

Mr. Vincutonis stated I have been talking the superintendent who is handling this job and he was trying to schedule the rolling straightedge test. The owner of the company seems to be resistant to doing the rolling straightedge test, saying it was not appropriate for this type of road because you have medians, speed humps, crosswalks, intersections. I'm not sure what he is basing that on. It doesn't sound like they want to do a rolling straightedge. Maybe we need to go out and look at the locations I have identified on the map and repair those to our satisfaction. I did a little more homework on the rolling straightedge and they do not see an issue with the type of road on why you couldn't do the rolling straightedge. The cost to do it is between \$2,000 and \$4,000 depending on how many lanes we want to do. Ideally, we would do the wheel path of every lane. Do we want to do all four, just do the outside land and inside lane? We have to decide how we are going to go back to them and try to force the issue of doing a rolling straightedge, offering to do it ourselves and back charging them for it or having them try to make the repairs as we noted the areas that appear rough. When I talked to them I said you may want to do it because some of the areas I have noted may be in tolerance then you are potentially

fixing areas that don't need to be fixed and follow the 3/16 variation. He understood that but I think he is getting pressure from the owner they want to get paid.

Mr. Montalvo asked how much have we paid?

Mr. Flint stated nothing.

Mr. Reicher asked what are they offering to do?

Mr. Vincutonis stated meeting with me and looking at the map and trying to fix these areas; if they passed the rolling straightedge you wouldn't need to fix them and when you do make patches you are going to have to mill the area and put a new patch in so you are going to end up with patches. The road is new and I don't think you are going to see the coloration difference as much but you are still introducing another joint and that is going to have a little bit of a feel and if it is a big enough area you will still have undulations whether it is going to be better or worse it is hard to tell.

Mr. Montalvo asked did anybody come up with why this happened?

Mr. Vincutonis responded no. Some of the jolts you feel are the joints, where they stopped and started and you are going to have that where you have the two seams. They milled it and they seemed to do a consistent mill job and putting the asphalt down and they are lining up with the curb so the thickness coming out of the paver is fairly consistent.

Mr. Montalvo asked with you going out there with them is this a negotiation?

Mr. Vincutonis stated they haven't challenged my map saying they don't think one or several of them need to be fixed so they haven't made that plan.

Mr. Montalvo stated if we say fix all the ones that you have identified and get it done, we are going to end up there anyway.

Mr. Vincutonis stated at the end of the day that is the spot you want to get to, a smoother road.

Mr. Flint stated the patches have to be a minimum size.

Mr. Reicher stated you may have 66 separate joint lines. What would that look like? Would it look like a patch?

Mr. Vincutonis stated they would go from curb to curb all the way across and it would be a joint.

Mr. Reicher asked how do they meet the tolerances so that it is not wavy in a different way after they do that?

Ms. Allen asked would the rolling straightedge test give us the data to show just how far out they are and then we can decide that they are so far out of tolerance it is not acceptable or it is slightly out and maybe we are making too much out of it?

Mr. Reicher stated 3/16 is going to be tolerance.

Mr. Clark stated Mark called me earlier today and we talked about this a little bit. I think we need to understand from him what is the standard test and measurement and document it because if we do some patch job stuff without doing that then that doesn't work then we are going to get into a squabble where they say, we told you it was alright. Then we are going to be stuck with something without any objective test having been done.

Mr. Vincutonis stated the rolling straightedge is the only test I know and it is between \$2,000 and \$4,000.

Mr. Montalvo asked why don't we do it?

Mr. Reicher stated if it shows up within tolerance then we have spent the money.

Mr. Flint stated what he is saying is you can't back charge them if it is in tolerance.

Mr. Montalvo stated we need a baseline.

Ms. Allen stated we might as well do it upfront.

Ms. Shouey stated we should do it quickly.

Mr. Clark stated we should present to them the Board's decision that this is how it is going to be done and you will do it or we will do it if you refuse but this is what is going to happen.

Ms. Allen asked who does the test, do they?

Mr. Flint responded a geotechnical engineer.

Ms. Allen stated a third-party company, good. Who contacts the third-party company to do the testing?

Mr. Vincutonis stated we can certainly get a price from them and hire them to do it and if the contractor were to hire them to do it under their umbrella it would be the same thing.

Ms. Allen stated I didn't know if it would move it along faster if we contacted the third-party versus waiting for them if they are resistant.

Mr. Montalvo stated they said they are not going to do it. I say we do it and see what it shows. If we pay \$4,000 to prove he didn't do it right then we are not going to pay for that at the end and that will be a discussion point.



Mr. Reicher asked does the whole thing need a rolling straightedge or just a concentration they may have missed?

Mr. Vincutonis stated they are kind of spaced out.

Ms. Allen stated if we do it ourselves we are in control of the timing.

Ms. Shouey asked do you write the letter, Scott?

Mr. Clark stated I think this goes with the letter saying the Board is going to do this test, we are going to determine objectively the conditions on the site and then we will expect you to remedy any deficiencies that are revealed and we will expect you to pay for the test. Then we need to address are we going to release money to them.

Mr. Montalvo stated I think in all fairness we need to release some money. They have done some work. I don't want to release so much money that we find ourselves on the short end later, but if we paid 50% we would still have \$180,000. I'm willing to pay half and defer the other half.

Mr. Rockefeller asked if they patch it are they going to make it worse than it was?

Mr. Flint stated we won't know until we get the test results.

Mr. Rockefeller asked if we find a lot of undulations could they be held responsible?

Mr. Flint stated that is the purpose of the test.

Mr. Reicher asked what do the specs say?

Mr. Vincutonis stated DOT specs is 3/16".

Mr. Flint asked what is the spec in the contract?

Mr. Vincutonis stated we didn't really say they had to do a rolling straightedge. I don't know if there is fine print in the contract language.

Mr. Clark stated I thought there was an FDOT spec type of thing in the contract.

Mr. Reicher stated if there is a DOT reference in there we might want to remind them as we go back and tell them we think you would be well invested to do it before we spend our money but if the DOT spec is there you might want to remind them of the spec.

Mr. Montalvo stated back to the issue of releasing funds, something has to be done. We can do the test and find out if they pass it then we have to pay all of it.

Ms. Allen asked what is your gut telling you when you go out and look at this?

Mr. Vincutonis stated there are a few you can feel but if you weren't looking for it, you may not really feel it. The county just had a contractor do a lot of roads in Celebration and the



speed limit is lower at 25 mph, but you feel things when you are driving. It isn't that uncommon to have a little bit of undulation. Sure, you would like it nice and flat like a roller skating rink.

Mr. Montalvo stated we never had a problem with ChampionsGate Boulevard.

Mr. Vincutonis stated it was the same kind of work.

Mr. Flint stated it was a different contractor.

Ms. Allen stated we need to get the data back and then we will know what the next steps are.

Mr. Montalvo stated we all agree we need to do the test and we are going to do the test. The question is in the meantime we will not have a meeting scheduled until December and I think it would be unfair to hold this money back totally.

Mr. Flint asked how quickly do you think we can get the rolling straightedge test done?

Mr. Vincutonis stated within a few weeks.

Mr. Flint stated one way to handle it is the Board could delegate authority to the chairman once the results of the rolling straightedge test are received that you can release up to X percent of the funds for payment. If the rolling test says the whole thing is a nightmare at that point you could probably feel better about the other 50% is appropriate or 70% or what the number is. The Board could set the ceiling up to 70%.

Mr. Montalvo stated I can in consultation with Mark get an idea of what it would cost to alleviate whatever comes back. We will get a ballpark figure and back in the percent to give us a cushion.

Ms. Allen stated I would be comfortable releasing up to 50% based on the results of the rolling test. As soon as we get that data in give Phil the authority to release up to 50%.

Mr. Reicher stated if it indicates 0.

Mr. Montalvo stated then we pay them, except for the work that is not done.

Mr. Clark stated to Marc's question, if the test says it is alright and we have said up to 50% then we are stuck to the next meeting. If the test comes back okay then we should disburse based on the original contract.

Mr. Montalvo stated yes.

Ms. Shouey stated they still have work to do.

Mr. Vincutonis stated the items that are incomplete are fairly low dollar items with the exception of the striping, the speed humps and raising the valve cans. Striping was \$30,000 and a total of \$3,000 for all four speed humps.

Mr. Flint stated the motion would be to authorize the District Engineer to initiate the rolling straightedge test with a third party, direct District Counsel to draft a letter indicating this is going to be the standard we use and in the event it fails they would be responsible for reimbursement out of the remaining funds, that as a result of the rolling straightedge study the District will make a determination as to the amount of funds being released based on the percent completion or defects found. I'm sure Scott can draft it appropriately.

Mr. Reicher stated it would be great if the contract said FDOT standards then we would have these set tolerances.

Mr. Clark stated I will check that first and if the county adopts that it becomes the implied standard.

On MOTION by Mr. Montalvo seconded by Mr. Tennyson with all in favor the District Engineer was authorized to initiate the rolling straightedge test with a third party, District Counsel was directed to draft a letter indicating this is going to be the standard we use and in the event it fails they would be responsible for reimbursement out of the remaining funds, upon the result of the rolling straightedge study the District will make a determination as to the amount of funds being released based on the percent completion or defects found.

Mr. Vincutonis asked should I reach out to Matt or let the letter be the start of the next communication? I may reach out to him and if he understands that is what the Board is wanting to do is to hire the third party.

Mr. Reicher stated I would at least draft the letter and we can figure out how strong our case is.

Mr. Clark stated I will get the letter drafted tomorrow.

Mr. Reicher stated once we have the draft I think we should tell him we are sending the letter and this is why.

**C. Speed Hump Replacement Project**

**D. Speed Study**

Mr. Flint stated I think C and D are related to Legends.

Mr. Montalvo stated we talked at the last meeting about repurposing the ones we had and install them in Legends. Is that what we are talking about here?

Mr. Flint stated there was some discussion of that, but I don't know that the Board ever came to a conclusion.

Mr. Montalvo asked can those be reused?

Mr. Vincutonis stated they can be if they are in good shape. You will probably need new hardware to attach them, but the rubber pieces should be reusable.

Mr. Montalvo stated they are going to have to take them out to do their work. Where will those be physically stored?

Mr. Reicher stated right now they would be considered waste unless we made a request to keep and reuse them.

Mr. Montalvo stated we need to decide where they are stored. We need to tell them once they are removed that they are to drop them where?

Mr. Flint asked do you have a place to store them?

Ms. Shouey stated yes and then the guys can pick them up.

Mr. Flint asked were you going to submit a work authorization to come up with proposed locations? We probably want the engineer signing off on the locations.

Mr. Vincutonis stated it depends on how many you want to do; do you want one northbound and one southbound; I think you do where the opposing left turns begin, where you are now putting the speed bump across the turn lane. It is kind of in the middle of that northerly section, it makes sense to put it there. If you are going to do multiple in each direction then we may look at the spacing a little differently, but that seems to make the most sense on that north section south where the parking lot comes out. There is a decent stretch between there and Laura Lane. Do you want to put one in that area basically where the wetlands are?

Mr. Reicher stated we are doing this without any engineering.

Mr. Flint stated you have to put in the striping and signage that are standard. There is no study that would go along with it.

Mr. Montalvo stated let's get them removed and stored.

Mr. Flint stated then if you want we can get a proposal from Fausnight for the striping and signage.

Mr. Vincutonis stated I think they are the ones who put them in the first time.

Mr. Reicher asked can the County say remove them if we haven't done a traffic study?

Ms. Shouey stated they can come back and say remove them.

Ms. Allen stated we had this exact discussion at the last meeting and it says if you are worried about the speed bumps I would go to the same guy at the County that let me do the right hand turn. Then it goes on to say you would put your feelers out and see if there was any objection.

Mr. Montalvo stated we had that discussion, we know they are going to be removed. Let's remove them and store them and we will meet in December.

Ms. Shouey stated I thought you didn't want me to talk to him because we weren't going to ask permission to do it, so you said don't ask him.

Mr. Montalvo stated I think we need to defer any further discussion on this until after we have removed them, stored them and then we will decide how to proceed. It would be premature to decide now.

Mr. Tennyson stated in the meantime we get a bid for striping and installation.

Ms. Shouey asked from Fausnight? It's kind of early.

Ms. Allen stated if we call for a quote mid-November it will be here for our December meeting if it is a go. That way we can at least make a decision in December.

#### **E. Painting of Light Posts**

Mr. Flint stated we added two items to the agenda. We have painting of the light posts that we have discussed in the past and subsequent to the last meeting another proposal was ascertained.

Mr. Montalvo stated we had agreed in principal to do the \$74,000 but we did not take action. One is \$75,000 and one is \$35,000. What is wrong with this picture?

Mr. Reicher stated we had the same questions and we had the guy in this morning and they specialize in this, they are a \$35 million company and they have been in business for 20 years. This is a new territory for them they have field offices in Tampa, they are expanding this way and there is a warranty of one year, the paint spec is the same, they are using the same undercoating, the same top coating. They have been here to study it, they talked about how they would use a lift to get out and do the poles and mast arms. They thought about the transportation element.

Ms. Allen stated after we went back to Heritage and said we want a better product used that is when their price doubled and we were shocked. The new one may very well be in line with where he should have been.

Mr. Flint stated I think we had another quote that was in line with Heritage.

Ms. Shouey stated it was way above it, it was \$45,000 for just the mast arms. This company is only commercial and if you read about them and go on the Better Business Bureau they have an A+ rating.

Mr. Reicher stated the source of this reference is from the Sherwin Williams guy so it is not my uncle's friend. We met the vendor this morning and it raised my confidence level.

Mr. Flint stated they do a lot of hotel painting and most of their references are out of Central Florida.

Mr. Montalvo asked what is the timeline to get this done if we say go?

Mr. Reicher stated I don't think we asked for the duration in the quotes.

Ms. Shouey stated I told him there would be one in there. He was going to check with his office when he went back.

Mr. Montalvo stated if the money is right then as soon as possible. If \$35,000 is acceptable, we have heard a good recommendation from you so unless anyone has a different point of view I would say we accept the \$35,000. As far as timeline I would say start as soon as possible.

Mr. Clark stated the motion would be to approve with a start time and job time as recommended by the onsite manager. Did we vote to award the contract to Heritage?

Ms. Allen stated my recollection is that we left it up to Phil to make a decision in an amount not to exceed after other quotes came in.

Mr. Montalvo stated that is correct and I never took action on that.

On MOTION by Mr. Montalvo seconded by Mr. Tennyson with all in favor the contract for painting the lights posts from Renovia in the amount of \$35,000 was approved with a start and finish time to be inserted into the contract.

Mr. Clark stated I'm looking at the minutes, let's rescind the action from August 12<sup>th</sup>.

On MOTION by Mr. Montalvo seconded by Mr. Rockefeller with all in favor the action taken at the August 12, 2019 meeting authorizing the Chair to enter into a contract with Heritage was rescinded.

**F. Status of Laura Lane Sidewalk Installation Project**

Mr. Reicher stated they came out and they are in the process of putting together a bid but they are about a week behind this meeting. Within the next ten days we will have a complete price for the entire sidewalk plus the dock area.

Mr. Montalvo stated that will be for the December meeting. Is there any progress on the easement issue?

Ms. Shouey stated I didn't go any further with the guy since he said no.

Mr. Clark stated I didn't either since we were kind of going with a different approach.

Mr. Montalvo stated my thinking is we will keep that in abeyance for the time being. We know what his position is.

Mr. Clark stated when we see the number we might need to go back to him.

Mr. Reicher stated I know the signs saying please use the sidewalks on ChampionsGate Boulevard aren't the most popular, but should we install a couple small reminder signs and way finding signs that say, sidewalk that way. If this is all about the liability and not accommodating people who walk there, should we be doing something in the interim?

Mr. Clark stated safety and liability and practically speaking it will give you a bargaining chip when you are sitting at mediation for the personal injury claim.

Ms. Allen stated not everybody knows the names of the streets if they are visiting so if you put an arrow I think it helps even more.

Mr. Reicher stated a way finding directional because we could be going around with this for quite a while.

Mr. Clark stated it would be, no pedestrian access and a direction to go this way. That makes good sense.

Ms. Shouey stated since it is temporary I will use galvanized poles.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Agreement with Grau & Associates to Provide Auditing Services for Fiscal Year 2019**

On MOTION by Mr. Montalvo seconded by Ms. Allen with all in favor the engagement letter with Grau & Associates in the amount of \$4,000 to perform the Fiscal Year 2019 audit was approved.

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Amendment to Water Management Program Agreement with The Lake Doctors, Inc.**

Mr. Flint stated they are asking to go from \$464 per month to \$470 per month for the next fiscal year.

On MOTION by Mr. Montalvo seconded by Mr. Tennyson with all in favor the amendment to the water management program agreement with The Lake Doctors was approved.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Staff Reports**

**A. Attorney**

There being none, the next item followed.

**B. Engineer**

There being none, the next item followed.

**C. Manager**

**i. Approval of Check Register**

Mr. Flint presented the check register from August 1, 2019 through September 10, 2019 in the amount of \$98,998.10.

On MOTION by Mr. Tennyson seconded by Mr. Rockefeller with all in favor the check register was approved.

**ii. Balance Sheet and Income Statement**

A copy of the financials was included in the agenda package.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Other Business**

There being none, the next item followed.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**


**Supervisor's Requests**



There being none,

On MOTION by Mr. Tennyson seconded by Ms. Allen with all in favor  
the meeting adjourned at 12:36 p.m.

  
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

  
Chairman/Vice Chairman