#### **MINUTES OF MEETING** POINCIANA WEST **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Poinciana West Community Development District was held on Wednesday, March 20, 2024, at 9:00 a.m. via Zoom Communication Media Technology and in the Starlite Ballroom, 384 Village Drive, Poinciana, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Peggy Gregory Roy LaRue Dr. Maneck Master Ed Smith Greg Hindahl

Chair Vice Chairman Assistant Secretary Assistant Secretary Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Tricia Adams	District Manager
Scott Clark via Zoom	District Counsel
Kathy Leo	District Engineer
Joel Blanco	GMS Field Staff
Cherrief Jackson	Clarke Midge Control
Residents	-

The following is a summary of the discussions and actions taken at the March 20, 2024 Poinciana West Community Development District's Board of Supervisors Meeting.

#### FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. Adams called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. and called the roll. A quorum was present.

#### SECOND ORDER OF BUSNESS

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**Pledge of Allegiance** 

## **Roll Call**

#### **THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Public Comment Period on Agenda Items**

Ms. Adams opened the public comment period.

Resident Hedy Lowenheim (340 Monterey Street) noted that there was confusion about which ponds were being treated and who to contact when there were issues, as her pond was not being treated regularly.

Resident Louise Patterson (1324 Bonita Canyon Drive) asked if they were paying the same amount that others were paying to have their ponds treated, as her pond, Pond 22, was not being treated on a regular basis. Ms. Adams stated that field staff was taking notes and would answer these questions under staff reports. There being no further comments, Ms. Adams closed the public comment period.

#### FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

# Approval of Minutes of the January 17, 2024 Meeting

Ms. Adams presented the minutes of the January 17, 2024 meeting, which were reviewed by District Counsel, District management, and the Board prior to the meeting.

Dr. Master MOVED to approve the Minutes of the January 17 2024 Meeting as presented and Mr. Hindahl seconded the motion.

Ms. Gregory asked if there was an update on the acquisition of Ponds 19A and 19B from Taylor Morrison, whether there was a closing, whether it was paid in full and the documents were recorded. Ms. Adams stated that District Counsel would provide an update under attorney's report. Ms. Gregory requested that GMS address ethics training that Board Members were required to go through and whether it would affect the insurance policy that the District paid every year. Ms. Adams advised that District Counsel prepared a Memorandum for the Board on the ethics training requirement and was not aware of any impacts to the District's insurance policy. Mr. Clark indicated he was not aware of any insurance company providing a discount. Before the Board delved into the budget, Ms. Gregory requested that these issues be discussed and questioned the Request for Proposals (RFP) process. Mr. Clark confirmed that there was no RFP process for insurance, as they typically reached out to insurance companies for their prices. Ms. Gregory wanted to go through this process now, wanted to know the coverages, what was available, for responses to be provided in a reasonable amount of time, to be discussed by the

Board. In addition, she wanted to discuss with Mr. Clark about how the insurance increased from \$3,400 to \$5,000, as they were required to take specific coverage, which in her opinion was fraudulent.

Mr. Hindahl pointed out that he did ethics training as part of his job for every year for 20 years and questioned whether prior training would meet the requirement. Ms. Adams stated that some Boards were having workshops to complete the ethics training. Florida's Commission on Ethics website offered links ethics training at no charge. Mr. Clark provided the website in the Memorandum. She would obtain proposals for insurance and provide them to the Board when the Proposed Budget was discussed. Ms. Gregory asked if the Board could have a workshop without spending money to notice the workshop to the public, if it was for ethics training and there would be no discussion on CDD business. Mr. Clark explained that every meeting must be published in the newspaper; however, there were some changes in the law, to have a website publication, but the counties must establish a website and were slow to react.

On VOICE VOTE with all in favor the Minutes of the January 17, 2024 Meeting as presented were approved.

#### FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

### Consideration of Non-Ad Valorem Agreement with Polk County

Ms. Adams presented a Non-Ad Valorem Agreement between the District and the Polk County Property Appraiser, in order for the District to utilize the Polk County Tax Roll for Fiscal Year 2025, for the collection of CDD fees. Staff recommended approval. Mr. Hindahl asked if it was a yearly agreement. Ms. Adams confirmed that it was an annual agreement and the only change was in the date.

On MOTION by Dr. Master seconded by Ms. Gregory with all in favor the Non-Ad Valorem Agreement with Polk County was approved.

#### SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

#### Consideration of Resolution 2024-03 Relating to General Election and Notice

Ms. Adams presented Resolution 2024-04, memorializing three seats in the November General Election; Seat 3, currently held by Mr. Ed Smith, Seat 4, currently held by Mr. Hindahl and Seat 5, currently held by Dr. Master, which were for four-year terms. The District was required to announce the qualifying period on the record, which was from Noon on June 10, 2024 to Noon on June 14, 2024 in the Polk County Elections Office. Mr. LaRue asked what happened if more than one candidate qualified for the seat. Ms. Adams explained if more than one candidate for a particular seat, the seat would be placed on the General Election Ballot. Dr. Master asked if an interested candidate must identify the seat when qualifying. Ms. Adams reiterated Polk Elections Office facilitates the process, but her understanding is when someone qualified, they must identify the seat.

On MOTION by Mr. LaRue seconded by Mr. Ed Smith with all in favor Resolution 2024-03 Relating to General Election and Notice was adopted.

#### SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSI2NESS

### Consideration of Resolution 2024-04 Setting a Public Hearing to Adopt User Fees for Applications to Install Drainage Devices

Ms. Adams recalled at the January meeting, the Board discussed several situations relating to the installation of residential drain lines that terminate on CDD property and directed staff bring back a resolution to set a public hearing. Resolution 2024-04, which was included in the agenda package, set the public hearing for July 17, 2024 at 9:00 a.m., to adopt user fees for applications to install drainage devices on CDD property. However, they were required to include a maximum fee in the advertisement for the public hearing and the amount that they were working with was \$100, which would offset the legal expenses for recording the document. Attached to the resolution, was a draft sample application, which was similar to what the Poinciana CDD used. The form of the License Agreement was provided by District Counsel and was a sample, but if an application was approved, the District would enter into the License Agreement with the owner, the agreement would be recorded and would stay with the parcel. An exhibit to the resolution, was an engineer's sketch used by the Poinciana CDD, showing the

#### Poinciana West CDD

locations for installation as well as the drain type. Dr. Master pointed out that the sketch showed water coming down from a down spout and asked if there could be other drainage locations. Ms. Leo confirmed that there could be any drainage location. Mr. Clark recommended holding the public hearing at the same time as the budget public hearing, to save the cost of having multiple publications and it was up to the Board whether or not \$100 was the correct amount, but it could be decreased at the public hearing, but could not be increased. Ms. Gregory asked if applicants obtained the documents from Ms. Adams. Ms. Adams recalled with the Poinciana CDD, when the policy was approved, the documents were provided to the HOA. The HOA then forwarded them to the ARC to be used if a resident approached the ARC for a drainage improvement that terminated on CDD property.

Ms. Gregory questioned the documents that were recorded. Ms. Adams stated the only document that was recorded was the License Agreement. Typically, the resident wanting to do the drainage improvement, would approach the HOA for permission. They would then receive the CDD application packet, the application was submitted to the CDD, it was forwarded to field management staff and District Engineer for review, they would provide a recommendation and the application would be placed on the next meeting agenda for Board consideration. Once the Board approved the application, the work would commence. Ms. Gregory recalled that the Board discussed at the last meeting, including an informative paragraph in *The Reflections*, as the majority of residents did not understand the process or know what a French drain was and recommended including a step-by-step explanation, from beginning to end, in order for residents to complete it properly. In addition, Ms. Gregory requested a timeframe for the HOA to provide the application to the resident, for the resident to submit it to the ARC and a limit on the amount of documentation. Mr. Clark recommended the \$100 cover the staff time and there be an additional cost for recording fees. Dr. Master questioned the number of people that created this problem in Poinciana and went through this process. Ms. Leo explained that the developer of the majority of property in Poinciana, installed French drains as part of the home installation, but over time, the pipes were crushed or submerged. As a result, residents on the Poinciana side, installed pipes into the pond, making it difficult for the slopes to be maintained. The intent of this process was for better control by the District. Dr. Master preferred to have a better understanding of what they were trying to do, so they did not confuse homeowners.

#### Poinciana West CDD

Mr. LaRue pointed out that the District did not create this problem and questioned why the CDD should suffer in order to correct it. The homeowner was suffering, which was why they needed the drainage and if they were going to do it, it should be installed properly. Dr. Master questioned why, as the CDD had not suffered any major loss and the problem occurred because the builder, as part of the building process, installed pipes without the proper installation and the builder needed to fix it. Mr. Ed Smith understood residents needing to have good drainage and doing things that the CDD did not know about and felt that there was a communications issue and suggested sending out an e-blast, but questioned why the CDD was charging a fee, as there was no fee to submit to ARC. Ms. Adams explained that the fee was established by the Poinciana CDD Board, to cover recording costs and any professional fees that were incurred as a result of the application review. Dr. Master questioned what the \$100 covered, if it did not cover the recording. Mr. Clark explained that the \$100 would cover most of the recording fees, which would go directly to the Clerk of Court to record the document. Ms. Leo pointed out according to the Polk County website, the cost was \$10 to record the first page and \$10 for each additional page. Ms. Adams indicated that the purpose of the \$100 fee, was to cover professional engineering and legal services along with the recording fee. Ms. Adams estimated eight to ten pages of documentation to be recorded, which equated to \$80. Mr. LaRue requested that the application reflect that the recording be paid by the owner. Dr. Master noted three options: charging \$100 for review of the application and a separate charge for the recording, charging \$100 and nothing else or charging a registration fee. Mr. Ed Smith was in favor of charging \$100 for the cost of recording and questioned what the professional fee covered. Mr. LaRue pointed out it was for billable hours that were charged for Ms. Leo to go out and look at the installation, which was realistic, to ensure that the work was completed correctly. Dr. Master questioned why an engineer needed to verify whether the work was performed to standards, as anyone could check to see whether it was a 4-inch pipe and it worked well and believed that there were two options, for the resident to pay billable hours for an engineer to perform a custom installation or to standardize it.

Ms. Adams confirmed that field staff performed a pre-inspection to document the conditions, take photographs and provide any information to the District Engineer. The District Engineer would review the application and if there were any concerns, would bring those to the Board's attention. Dr. Master recommended setting up another committee of the CDD, instead of

#### Poinciana West CDD

creating additional costs that the homeowner must pay. Mr. LaRue preferred setting \$100 for the recording fee. Mr. Ed Smith was not comfortable with the resident paying \$100. Ms. Leo pointed out that most of the inspection was performed by GMS staff. Ms. Adams stated that District management and field staff performed the majority of the work, but District Counsel and the District Engineer performed oversight. Mr. Ed Smith questioned the rationale for the Poinciana CDD approving the \$100 fee, as they did not know what the billable hours were and if the \$100 would cover it. Ms. Adams pointed out that it was a fair approximation of the expenses to handle the application and recording costs and all the resolution did, was to set the public hearing and noticed the \$100 application fee, which could be reduced. Mr. LaRue reiterated his request that application reflect that the recording fees would be paid by the owner and not the CDD. There was Board consensus for staff to amend the application to reflect that the recording fees would be paid by the owner.

On MOTION by Mr. LaRue seconded by Ms. Gregory with all in favor the adoption of Resolution 2024-04 Setting a Public Hearing for July 17, 2024 at 9:00 a.m. at this location to adopt User Fees for Applications to Install Drainage Devices and staff to amend the application to reflect that the recording fees would be paid by the owner was approved.

#### **EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **Consideration of Drainage Improvement Application – 676 San Raphael Street**

Ms. Adams recalled in response to a drain line being installed on CDD property without the CDD's permission, at the last meeting, the Board directed staff to communicate with the property owner, to secure an application that the Board could consider, allowing the drain line to terminate on CDD property. A copy of the letter that was sent to the owner of 675 San Raphael Street, which they promptly responded to and an application for the drainage improvement, were included in the agenda package. The application was provided to GMS' field services team to perform a site inspection and they confirmed that the property owners had changed how the drain terminated, to include a pop-up emitter to diffuse the water, in order to deter erosion at the pond bank. The Field Manager noted no concerns or impediments to the Board approving this application. Mr. Ed Smith asked if it terminated on CDD property. Ms. Adams confirmed that it terminated on CDD property and the property owners paid \$100 for the application fee, which

she was holding until there was direction from the Board to accept it or return to the owner. Dr. Master noted that the picture did not show how deep the drain line was trenched. Ms. Adams pointed out that the pictures were of the field conditions and did not include the depth. She requested that any Board approval be subject to final approval by the District Engineer.

Dr. Master asked if the application for 675 San Raphael Street would be recorded. Ms. Adams confirmed that a form of License Agreement was provided by District Counsel, which the Board approved at the last meeting. It would be updated with all pertinent information and demographics from this application. Mr. LaRue asked if the draining was effective. Ms. Leo explained that staff would look at the slope, but each lot was different.

On MOTION by Dr. Master seconded by Mr. Hindahl with all in favor the drainage application for 676 San Raphael Street was approved, subject to final approval by the District Engineer.

There was Board consensus for Ms. Adams to process the \$100 application fee from the owner of 676 San Raphael Street. Dr. Master noted there were other ways to drain as he was aware of people who had drainage issues, due to a perforated pipe that was buried on their property. Ms. Adams indicated that the only reason that the District became involved, was if the drain terminated on District property. If the drain was on private property, the CDD had no legal interest.

### NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Staff Reports

### A. Attorney

Regarding the ethics training, Mr. Clark reported that a course was sponsored by the Florida Association of Special Districts, as well as a local one sponsored by Florida State University (FSU), which was tailored to Special Districts. He took the course a couple of weeks ago and it was excellent. The cost was \$79, it was online and could be broken out into segments over several days. Instead of the workshop approach, Mr. Clark recommended that the Board Members take this course individually. Dr. Master requested the link to the Florida Association of Special Districts ethics training. The District Manager's office would provide the link. Dr. Master asked if there was an account that Board Members could use to pay for the course. Ms. Adams recalled that the Board adopted a resolution approving reimbursement for the fees. The

#### Poinciana West CDD

CDD did not have an account but would check into prepaying tuition with a credit card. Regarding the acquisition of stormwater Ponds 19A and 19B from Taylor Morrison, Mr. Clark reported that the closing was completed and all of the documents were modified at his request, which were signed by the Chair on behalf of the District, they were recorded and the permit transfer was filed. The District received a full reimbursement of staff costs that were expended. All that was left to do, was for the District Engineer to finalize the map and complete any follow up items with the Water Management District. Mr. Clark was informed yesterday, that the developer had additional requests for some of the conservation areas. There would be a future application in the future, to look at some additional areas that they wanted to transfer, which they would deal with at that time. Mr. LaRue questioned the precedence on taking conservation areas, as they needed to maintain the ponds. Mr. Clark was skeptical about the conservation areas, unless there were Water Management District permits, where the maintenance was assigned to the District, as a great deal of expense was associated with conservation areas, to deal with nuisance vegetation. They would deal with it when it comes. Mr. LaRue questioned when the documents were transferred. Mr. Clark would find out and provide the Board with a copy of the recorded deed. Dr. Master requested clarification of the Pond Ownership Map, particularly the yellow areas, which were the Avatar owned wetlands, as someone could put a pipe into the wetland without encroaching onto CDD property. Ms. Leo confirmed that drainage could not go directly into a wetland. Ms. Gregory had no interest in acquiring any wetland and felt that Taylor Morrison or Avatar had no right to walk away from the community with no responsibilities.

#### B. Engineer

#### i. Review of Updated Pond Ownership Map

Ms. Leo presented an updated Pond Ownership Map, which was included in the agenda package. A PDF version of the map would be provided by Ms. Adams, as the purpose was to memorialize the acceptance of Ponds 19A and 19B and would post the map on the CDD website. Ms. Gregory could not read the pond numbers and requested that they be identified in a large bold font.

#### C. District Manager

Ms. Adams confirmed that the District had public officials' liability insurance, as well as a general liability policy; however, the District did not own any assets, as generally, ponds and

9

#### Poinciana West CDD

outfall structures were not insured. The frustration was when proposals were received, it included coverages for auto liability and other coverages that the Board wanted to exclude. Ms. Gregory confirmed that the automobile coverage was not needed, as well as the coverage for cybersecurity, but the underwriter stated if they renewed the insurance, they must take the entire insurance package, including the coverage that they did not need. Ms. Adams pointed out that the proposals that were received were for apples-to-apples coverage, with the auto liability, as well as cyber insurance, which were part of the standard packages for special purpose governments. There are three insurance providers in the State of Florida, who cover government insurance. One was FMIT, which writes for municipalities and counties; however, at this time, they were not writing for CDDs. Proposals would be provided to the Board for consideration at the next meeting. Ms. Gregory recalled that the State of Florida was having some issues with the HOAs and asked if any CDDs were sued in the State of Florida. Mr. Clark noted instances where this occurred, but most CDD lawsuits, were for trips and falls on sidewalks owned by the CDD, but there were not many liability cases. Ms. Adams pointed out that the District had public officials' liability insurance, which covered Board Members and liability insurance. Ms. Adams recalled the Board discussing property damage caused by feral hogs and reported that the HOA tasked the Wildlife Committee with studying the situation and making a recommendation to the HOA. The Wildlife Committee was making a presentation to the Poinciana CDD Board regarding the feral hog situation and asked if the Poinciana West CDD wanted the same presentation. Ms. Gregory preferred to address the matter when there was an issue.

#### i. February 2024 Financials

Ms. Adams presented the Unaudited Financials through the end of February 2024, which was included in the agenda package. Mr. Ed Smith questioned the \$600 for *Engineering* – *Property Conveyance* and \$2,480 for *Attorney* – *Property Conveyance* and whether Taylor Morrison was paying those costs. Ms. Adams confirmed that Taylor Morrison paid a deposit and any fees that were part of the deposit, were collected at closing, which was transmitted to the District and deposited on March 5<sup>th</sup>. Dr. Master questioned what the telephone line item covered. Ms. Adams explained that it was for telephone conference services. She recommended leaving it in the budget in case it was needed. The Board did a great job of controlling expenses, as it was

over \$11,000 under budget for administration of the District and over \$22,000 under budget for the field expenses.

## ii. Consideration of Certificate of Deposit Investment Maturing April 2024

Ms. Adams presented an Investment Summary of all current investments, which was included in the agenda package. There was a Florida Prime Account with the State Board of Administration (SBA), which was earning 5.6% interest, a 6-month Certificate of Deposit (CD) with Bank United that matured on April 25<sup>th</sup>, earning 5.25%, a 12-month CD that earned 5.5% and a money market account earning 5.15%. Ms. Adams questioned how the Board wanted to direct staff regarding the CD that was maturing. US Bank, could not quote what the interest rate would be on April 25. The shortest term that they were currently offering was a 9-month CD earning 5.25% interest. The 12-month interest rate with Bank United was 4.75%. Dr. Master asked if they must stay with Bank United. Ms. Adams stated they were not required to, but Bank United previously offered the best terms. Dr. Master proposed extending it for nine months. Ms. Adams would confer with the Chair closer to the maturity date and select either a 9 or 12-month CD. There was currently \$252,000 in surplus funds that could be invested in a money market earning 5.15% and then transferred out incrementally as needed, to cover operating expenses. Or, funds could be transferred into the SBA. Ms. Gregory proposed purchasing another 12-month CD and putting half of the \$250,000 into a money market and half into the SBA to earn a higher rate, until the election. There was Board consensus to transfer \$200,000 into a money market with Bank United and using other surplus to increase the 6-month CD that was maturing to \$200,000 and purchasing a 9-month or 12-month CD, based on the interest rate.

#### iii. Approval of Check Register

Ms. Adams presented the Check Register for January 1, 2024 through February 29, 2024 totaling \$1,051,942.54, which included the General Fund, money market account and payroll as well as the detailed invoices and Check Run Summary. There were large transmittals, as the Polk County Tax Collector transmits all CDD fees to the General Fund and the portion to pay back the bond and to make interest and principal payments, was transmitted to the Trustee.

On MOTION by Dr. Master seconded by Mr. LaRue with all in favor the Check Register as stated above was approved.

#### D. Field Manager's Report

#### i. Field Manager's Report

#### ii. Pond Maintenance Report

Mr. Blanco presented the Field Manager Report, which was included in the agenda package, along with the Pond Maintenance Report from SOLitude. Yesterday, he sent the District Engineer a photograph of the drain line at 676 San Rafael Street and where it was located on the CDD tract. Staff was continuously reviewing the ponds throughout the District and performed an aquatics and midge management maintenance review. Most of the ponds were free from algae blooms, as they were being treated by the aquatics vendor. GMS responded to residents that reported algae blooms, and the information was forwarded to SOLitude for treatment. There were some pond grasses that were growing further into the pond on P16, which were identified and would be sprayed by the aquatics vendor. During the pond reviews, anytime that there was midge activity, Mr. Blanco reached out to Clarke to schedule a treatment for that pond, to be proactive. Mr. LaRue asked if midge issues were recorded on the spreadsheet. Mr. Blanco indicated that the report was from the aquatics vendor but could include it on the complaint log. Mr. Ed Smith requested that Mr. Blanco have a separate spreadsheet for midge activity.

Dr. Master asked Mr. Blanco to address the concerns from residents about ponds not being treated. Mr. Blanco indicated that he spoke with Mr. Clayton Smith and Ms. Cherrief Jackson of Clarke for clarification and would speak to Ms. Lowenheim and Ms. Patterson after the meeting regarding the treatment of their ponds. Mr. LaRue heard of two instances where residents were told that their pond was being treated for midges but was actually being treated for algae and grasses and felt that it was unacceptable and requested that Ms. Iman Sakalla of GMS be educated on what the ponds were being treated for, so she could inform the residents. Mr. Blanco indicated that he was speaking to residents but would work with office staff closely. Ms. Adams pointed out that Ms. Sakalla was simply passing on information from the caller to the Field Manager and the Field Manager was the one who would be communicating with residents. Ms. Gregory requested that a midge spreadsheet be provided to the Board, showing the date that the pond was serviced by either Clarke on Solitude and not just state that a resident called about

a midge problem. Mr. LaRue stated they had 24 ponds and were currently spending \$26,511 for midge treatment on four ponds and if all of the ponds were treated, it would cost \$159,072. The four ponds being treated were close to conservation areas and consistently had midge issues. They did not want to treat all of the ponds, because most of the time, they could be treated with one or two treatments. Ms. Gregory recalled at one time, they paid for fish to eat the larvae, which was successful and requested that the residents be patient, as they conquered the midge problems.

At the request of the Board, Ms. Adams opened the floor to public comments. Mr. LaRue questioned why Ms. Lowenheim did not complain to staff and waited three years to say something. Ms. Lowenheim stated that she did not know who complain to and requested that an email be sent to residents on how to deal with midge issues, as no one knew what to do. Mr. LaRue recalled that Mr. Blanco's contact information was posted on the website. Dr. Master referred Ms. Lowenheim to Mr. Rudy Bautista, the HOA Community Manager, who could inform her whether it was an HOA or CDD problem and who to call. Ms. Gregory suggested residents look at their Master Declarations. Ms. Lowenheim pointed out she never received a return call from Mr. Bautista. Mr. LaRue questioned how many midge issues Ms. Patterson had. Ms. Patterson stated that she could not go onto her lanai, due to the midges and had bites all over her arms. Ms. LaRue pointed out that midges do not bite and assumed that she was being bitten by mosquitos. Dr. Master recommended that Ms. Patterson contact a pest control person to treat the outside perimeter of her house. Resident Janet Martin (678 Barcelona Drive) was the neighborhood Captain of Valencia South and noted that residents that lived on ponds, could not take their dogs for walks because of the midges. Ms. Gregory understood, but no one contacted them from Valencia and unless staff knows about these issues, they could not do anything about it. Mr. Blanco stated if they were contacted, they would resolve the issue as soon as they could. Ms. Martin spoke to Mr. Bautista and Mr. Clayton Smith, as well as Ms. Adams staff and got nowhere. Ms. Gregory noted that there was an administrative office downtown, which had a concierge. Ms. Martin would speak to the administrative office. Dr. Master strongly urged Ms. Martin to utilize the website but felt that it was all homeowners responsibility to know what they purchased and review their documents, so there was no misinformation. Ms. Adams requested that residents provide any concerns about midges or nuisance vegetation on their pond, to Mr. Blanco. There being no further comments, Ms. Adams closed the floor to public comments.

#### Poinciana West CDD

#### \**Mr. LaRue left the meeting at this time.*

Mr. Blanco reported that GMS staff continued to review all CDD landscaping areas. The overall quality remained satisfactory, with all of the pond banks being trimmed by Floralawn. The District Engineer advised that allowing the edge grasses to grow, was a method of erosion prevention. Ms. Gregory pointed out when the grasses grow halfway across both edges, the vendor comes out to spray. Mr. Blanco stated that he was monitoring the grasses and if they go into the pond, he notified the aquatic vendor, so they could spray, but they were allowing the bank edges to grow, as a method of erosion prevention, to keep the integrity of the pond. Mr. Ed Smith noted that Pond P3, the dry pond, was mowed halfway and looked incomplete. Mr. Blanco would review it the next time that he was onsite. Dr. Master recalled that the landscaper used a mower with bush hog to mow the ponds, but they no longer used it and only mowed half of the dry pond. Ms. Gregory requested that Mr. Blanco inform her of any issues and she would contact Floralawn, since she contacted them before about throwing grass in their swimming pool. Ms. Adams asked Board Members to contact Mr. Blanco if there was a deficiency in a CDD area. Mr. Blanco pointed out that he performed an internal review but was holding the vendors accountable for what was in the contract. They could look at the Treatment Reports and was asking for an updated Treatment Report, due to some discrepancies in the report.

#### iii. Midge Management Report

#### iv. Customer Complaint Log

Mr. Blanco presented the Midge Management Report from Clarke and Customer Complaint Log, which were included in the agenda package.

#### Poinciana West CDD

#### **TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

#### **Supervisor's Requests**

There being no comments, the next item followed.

#### ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS General Audience Comments

Ms. Adams opened the general audience comments period. Hedy Lowenheim (340 Monterey Street) agreed with Ms. Gregory on treating the ponds with fish and requested that the Board look into supplying the ponds with Gambusia Fish. Ms. Adams stated that obtaining proposals for Gambusia Fish could be considered at a future meeting. Ms. Gregory pointed out that if complaints were made, the ponds would be treated. It was a process and they would not just spend an exorbitant amount of money for fish. Ms. Lowenheim felt that there was a disconnect, as she had in writing that her pond was being treated on a regular basis, but when she spoke to Mr. Bautista, he referred her to the CDD Board for approval. She was working with Mr. Blanco on a bad odor coming from her pond. Ms. Gregory explained that when the vendor sprayed at night, there was a smell. Ms. Lowenheim indicated that the smell was primarily during the day. There being no further comments, Ms. Adams closed the general audience comments period.

#### TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS Other Business

Dr. Master voiced concern about communication to residents, as they did not receive any contact information when they closed on their home and asked if there was some way that they could have better communication. For example, there was a resignation in the Poinciana CDD, recently, an email blast was sent out to everyone in the community, but no one in the Poinciana West side could apply for that position because it was on the Poinciana side. Ms. Adams explained that notification for Poinciana West CDD Board meetings go through the email blast system and to neighborhood captains. In the future, they could include information with a link to the website, with a statement that the Poinciana West CDD maintained ponds, provides services for landscaping around the ponds, midge management and aquatic treatment. Dr. Master felt that was reasonable. Mr. Ed Smith pointed out that some people don't read emails. Ms. Gregory believed that there should have been information in the new homeowner packets from the builder. Ms. Gregory felt it was unnecessary to spend \$9,000 per month on Reflections, as it was a sales tool, instead of having actual messages about the structure of this community that

benefited residents. Ms. Adams understood the direction of the Board and would provide additional context for the next CDD meeting notice.

#### **THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS** Next Meeting Date - May 15, 2024

Ms. Adams stated the next meeting was May 15, 2024 at 9:00 a.m.

#### Adjournment FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

On MOTION by Ms. Gregory seconded by Dr. Master with all in favor the meeting was adjourned.

DocuSigned by:

tricia adams

Secretary / Assistant Secretary

DocuSigned by:

'LARY GREADRY

Chairman / Vice Chairman

Poinciana West CDD