

MINUTES OF MEETING  
WILFORD PRESERVE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

The meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Wilford Preserve Community Development District was held on Monday, March 5, 2018 at 1:30 p.m. at the Plantation Oaks Amenity Center, 845 Oakleaf Plantation Parkway, Orange Park, Florida 32065.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

Batey McGraw	Chairman
Greg Murell	Supervisor
Khaled Oweis	Supervisor

Also present were:

Jim Perry	District Manager
Wes Haber	District Counsel
Daniel Laughlin	GMS
Glynn Taylor	Taylor & White
Patrick Metcalf	Dream Finders Homes
Rhonda Mossing	MBS Capital Markets
Nick Powell	Dream Finders Homes
Misty Taylor	Bryant Miller & Olive

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Call to Order**

Mr. Perry called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Public Comment**

There being none, the next item followed.

**THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Affidavit of Publication**

A copy of the affidavit was enclosed in the agenda packet.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Organizational Matters**

**A. Acceptance of Resignations from Robert White and Nick Powell**

On MOTION by Mr. Oweis seconded by Mr. Murrell with all in favor the resignations of Robert White and Nick Powell were accepted.

**B. Oath of Office for Newly Elected Supervisors**

Mr. Perry administered the oaths of office.

**C. Resolution 2018-01, Canvassing and Certifying the Results of the Landowners Election**

Mr. Perry stated just prior to this meeting we held the landowners' meeting. There was a proxy and ballots were cast and the results of that were Batey McGraw 150 votes, Khaled Oweis 200, Greg Murrell 200, Bois Farrar 150 and Lynda Richardson 150. We will certify those under resolution 2018-01.

On MOTION by Mr. McGraw seconded by Mr. Murrell with all in favor Resolution 2018-01 was approved.

**D. Resolution 2018-02, Election of Officers**

Mr. Perry stated resolution 2018-02 is election of officers. I would ask that the board consider naming myself as the Secretary, Mr. Oliver of my office as the Treasurer, myself as Assistant Treasurer and James Oliver and Daniel Laughlin as Assistant Secretaries. We would ask you to name a Chairman and Vice Chair and then the other board members would be Assistant Secretaries.

Mr. McGraw stated I will appoint myself as Chair and Greg would be Vice Chair.

On MOTION by Mr. McGraw seconded by Mr. Oweis with all in favor Resolution 2018-02 was approved.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Financing Matters**

**A. Consideration of Engineer's Report**

Mr. Taylor stated I have two pages that I want to change out, table one and table three.

Mr. Haber stated just by way of background, we're going to kick off the process to levy assessments that will ultimately secure any bonds the district issues. In order to do that the board needs to approve an Engineer's report describing improvements that you may fund, as well as a methodology that describes how the assessments will be allocated. You have in front of you a copy of the Engineer's report. Glynn, if you could just run through it quickly with respect to the line items of types of improvements that are included, the estimated costs and just state for the record that the estimated costs are reasonable.

Mr. Taylor stated the report includes all of the roadways, the pump station, amenity areas, stormwater ponds, and earthwork. It does not include anything that has to do with the lots. You have to put one strip of sod adjacent to pavement, all the sidewalks, ADA ramps, the

stormwater piping, reuse line, water line, an eight-foot path, all onsite utilities and private parks.

Mr. Haber stated and the most up to date estimated costs is \$17,191,70. In your opinion those estimated costs are reasonable?

Mr. Taylor responded yes.

On MOTION by Mr. McGraw seconded by Mr. Murrell with all in favor the Engineer's report was approved.

**B. Consideration of Assessment Methodology**

Mr. Perry stated a master assessment methodology was distributed that reflects the cost of construction as just presented of \$17,191,70. With that construction MBS has done a pricing of the bonds to be approximately \$21,535,000. We've allocated that to the 445 lots that are planned for the development with a differentiation between the 50' and 60' lots based on the front footage of the lots. This master report assumes that all that construction is financed and we know that the district is going to issue something less than that in the future in regards to the bonds but this gives you flexibility as to the issuance of those bonds going forward.

On MOTION by Mr. McGraw seconded by Mr. Oweis with all in favor the Engineer's report was approved.

**C. Consideration of Resolution 2018-03, Declaring Special Assessments**

Mr. Perry stated there needs to be some changes to the numbers in the one that's included in your agenda package in regards to the construction improvements.

Mr. Haber stated paragraph three the \$15,837,825 will be replaced with the number that Glynn just provided you, the \$17,191,70. Additionally the \$19,840,000 set forth in paragraph four will be replaced with the amount set forth in the methodology, the \$21,535,000. This resolution is the first step you'll take in levying assessments on the property to secure the bonds. It's a two-step process, today's meeting being the first step. After you consider this resolution you will consider another resolution setting a public hearing date subsequent to this meeting. We will need to mail a notice to the property owner informing them of the public hearing date and we will also need to publish a copy of this resolution as well as a separate

notice in the newspaper. Thirty plus days from now we will hold that public hearing and formally adopt the resolution, which would levy those assessments. As Jim mentioned, those are just a ceiling. It gives us the right but not the obligation to issue bonds and impose assessments that we can then collect to secure those bonds in those amounts. This resolution approves the project and approves the methodology for purposes of kicking off the process.

On MOTION by Mr. McGraw seconded by Mr. Murrell with all in favor Resolution 2018-03 was approved.

**D. Consideration of Resolution 2018-04, Setting a Public Hearing Date**

Mr. Perry stated this just dovetails the previous resolution setting a public hearing. We do have some proposed dates coming up for the board to approve for the rest of the year. Rhonda, I don't know which date you were targeting for the hearing?

Ms. Mossing responded I was targeting April 12<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. McGraw asked and that was based on the timeline that you gave us a week ago?

Ms. Mossing responded that would be the soonest you could hold the meeting because you need 30 days notice. If you push it out that's going to delay the issuance.

Mr. McGraw stated I think the twelfth is great.

Mr. Perry stated so April 12<sup>th</sup> at 1:00 at this location.

On MOTION by Mr. McGraw seconded by Mr. Oweis with all in favor Resolution 2018-04 was approved.

**E. Consideration of Resolution 2018-05, Bond Authorization**

Ms. Taylor stated this is what we consider the master bond resolution that lays out a not-to-exceed amount of \$22,000,000. This is not an obligation to issue that amount of bonds, we just want to give this outside amount so we can use that amount to file a validation complaint. The District is required to validate bonds that have a term of more than five years so this resolution authorizes us to file that action in the circuit court. That's a process we will have to complete before we can issue the first series of bonds with a term longer than five years. This resolution doesn't approve any particular series. We will come back to the board with a

supplemental bond resolution that will contain the terms and the structure of the particular bond issue that we're looking at that time.

Mr. Haber asked Misty you mentioned we would have to complete that process before the first issuance. Are we contemplating an issuance before the completion of validation?

Ms. Mossing responded we are contemplating B Bonds with a term less than five years.

Mr. Haber asked so because in all likelihood we will get to the ability to issue those before the validation is complete because we're subject to the judge's calendar it's sometimes a longer process but because the board is considering issuance of the B Bonds you only need to validate bonds that are going to have a term in excess of five years and I think we're thinking about having a term of less than five years.

Mr. McGraw asked are they all going to be less than five with the staged funding?

Ms. Mossing responded what you would be funding this year, even if it was just the first part of the B Bonds, would still be less than five years and then what you fund next year if we don't fund all of the B Bonds this year and you want to do a B Bond tranche next year, when you do your A Bonds then the A Bonds would be thirty years but both of those would be after your validation so you could do your B Bonds eight years if you wanted to.

Mr. McGraw asked so that second tranche could be longer if need be?

Ms. Mossing responded you have some flexibility there. You could tie it to your build out schedule.

Mr. McGraw asked just this first tranche can be no longer than five years?

Ms. Mossing responded right.

Mr. McGraw asked the limit, is that in the perpetuity?

Mr. Haber responded you could validate more. You would have to identify more improvements so the limit is based on the 17 million dollars worth of improvements to get to the 22 million for cost issuance fees and stuff like that but if you had to issue more bonds you would have to identify more improvements that you would fund with those bonds and then go back through the validation process.

Mr. McGraw stated I'm thinking of expansions to the community features and amenities. You could go back and validate more after the fact?

Mr. Perry responded correct.

On MOTION by Mr. McGraw seconded by Mr. Murrell with all in favor Resolution 2018-05 was approved.

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**                      **Consideration of Matters Related to Project Construction**

**A. Resolution 2018-08, Authorizing RFP for Infrastructure Construction Project**

Mr. Haber stated this resolution is to allow the district to issue a request for proposals for certain infrastructure construction. The way it works is the district is required to publicly notice in a newspaper the project. That notice needs to give 30 days for a proposer to submit and prepare their proposal to the board for review. The resolution has two documents that it's approving in substantial form, the first of which is a copy of the notice that would ultimately end up in the newspaper. There are a number of blanks that we would fill in once we know the details and secondly, the evaluation criteria that the board would use to review and choose the winning proposer. The request for proposals gives the board the opportunity to review the qualifications of the proposers and it's not exclusively based on price, so if somebody comes in at the lowest price but they're not necessarily qualified you don't have to award the contract to them. The ultimate contract cannot be awarded and signed until we close on the bonds and the district has funds in its account to pay for the project that is going to be subject to the contract. Either funds in an account or some other source of payment. Sometimes districts will have funding agreements with the developer. If the contract we enter into either is entered into prior to the bonds being closed on, or if the contract we enter into is in excess of the amount of funds that we have. This resolution is really to give your chair, together with staff, the ability to be able to move forward and get an RFP in the newspaper and prepared so we can have it to you to review in connection with your issuance of the bonds.

Mr. McGraw asked what other action is required to name the evaluation committee?

Mr. Haber responded you don't need to have an evaluation committee. The board can do it. If you want an evaluation committee it would be up to you to appoint that committee. If you do that, the committee is subject to the Sunshine Law and public records so they would have to publicly notice their meetings. The way an evaluation committee would work is they would not make the decision for you; they would merely review, score them, and make a recommendation to you so this board would still need to meet and review the recommendation. You don't have to accept that recommendation but if you wanted to it could streamline this

board's process if you have a recommendation from the committee that says here's our rankings, we recommend you go with contractor X. If you have lots of trust in your committee you could just say motion to approve the committee's recommendation. Alternatively, you don't need a committee. You will be provided the package and then you will need to go through that evaluation criteria and score the packages and you can get input from your engineer on that process.

Mr. McGraw stated I think we will forgo a committee.

On MOTION by Mr. McGraw seconded by Mr. Oweis with all in favor Resolution 2018-08 was approved.

Mr. Oweis asked how quickly does that now go to the paper?

Mr. Haber responded if you look at the notice there are some blanks that we need to fill in so as quickly as we can get the information.

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Resolution 2018-06,  
Designating a Regular Meeting Schedule**

Mr. Perry stated the meetings that would be scheduled would be April 12<sup>th</sup>, which would be the public hearing that we just discussed earlier, May 17<sup>th</sup>, June 21<sup>st</sup>, July 19<sup>th</sup>, August 16<sup>th</sup> and September 20<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. McGraw asked what time?

Mr. Perry responded 1:30. Keep in mind, other than the April 12<sup>th</sup> meeting that we've already talked about, the other ones if we have items that we need to meet for we will meet or we can change dates going forward. We just wanted to put a schedule together on a calendar basis. It sounds like for the next three or four months with the bonds we will probably be meeting every one of those months I would expect.

Mr. McGraw stated I can't do the 17<sup>th</sup>. I can do the 16<sup>th</sup>. We can do the 17<sup>th</sup> if it were 10:00.

On MOTION by Mr. McGraw seconded by Mr. Oweis with all in favor the meeting schedule was approved as revised.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Resolution 2018-07, Amending Resolution 2017-15 to Re-Schedule and Notice the Public Hearings on the FY 2017 and 2018 Budgets**

Mr. Haber stated looking back at the meeting schedule I think the best option would be the meeting on May 17<sup>th</sup>.

On MOTION by Mr. McGraw seconded by Mr. Murrell with all in favor Resolution 2018-07 was approved.

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of Minutes**

- A. **April 14, 2017 Organizational Meeting**
- B. **June 16, 2017 Meeting**
- C. **September 1, 2017 Meeting**

Mr. Perry stated copies of the minutes are included in your agenda package.

On MOTION by Mr. McGraw seconded by Mr. Murrell with all in favor the minutes of the April 14, 2017 organizational meeting, June 16, 2017 meeting, and September 1, 2017 meeting were approved.

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Acceptance of the minutes of the September 1, 2017 Audit Committee Meeting**

On MOTION by Mr. McGraw seconded by Mr. Murrell with all in favor the minutes of the September 1, 2017 audit committee meeting were accepted.

**ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Selection of Audit Committee and Authorization for Staff to Issue an RFP**

This item was tabled.

**TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of RFQ for Engineering Services**

Mr. McGraw asked can Taylor & White qualify to be the district engineer?

Mr. Haber responded yes. They're presently the engineer on an interim basis so in order to sign an ongoing contract with them you need to go through this public procurement process.

Mr. McGraw asked do we have the ability to modify these selection criteria?



Mr. Haber responded it's pretty standard. You have the right to modify the points assigned but the actual criteria are established by statute.

On MOTION by Mr. McGraw seconded by Mr. Oweis with all in favor the RFQ for engineering services was approved.

**THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS      Staff Reports**

**A. District Counsel**

There being none, the next item followed.

**B. Interim Engineer**

Mr. Taylor stated as of now Clay County has approved the engineering plans. On the way here I dropped off the last drawing that CCUA should need. We submitted them in January but they couldn't find them so we had to resubmit and that should take care of CCUA and we can get the DEP permits for water and sewer. Two weeks ago we submitted the last engineering stuff that the water management district needed so that should be issued in about two weeks and then it goes before a board so you should have the permit in about a week and a half.

**C. District Manager**

Mr. Perry stated a lot of these public notices are expensive so we need to make sure we have the funding. I'll get with Patrick on that.

**FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS      Consideration of Funding Request No. 2**

Mr. Perry stated this funding request goes back from May of last year. The only thing to note on this is the insurance payment is for this whole fiscal year; we don't do that in installments.

Mr. McGraw asked is there a fixed amount with the management fees invoices?

Mr. Perry responded most of the variation is copies or printing.

Mr. McGraw asked why was April higher?

Mr. Perry responded that is our normal fee because of the organizational meeting and then we reduced it because you were kind of in a hold pattern at that time.

Mr. McGraw asked Wes, any explanation for December?

Mr. Haber responded mine are invoices that detail so probably the best way to figure it out is to look at the invoice.

On MOTION by Mr. McGraw seconded by Mr. Oweis with all in favor funding request number two was approved.

**FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS      Supervisors' Requests and Audience Comments**

Mr. McGraw asked who is going to complete the RFP document?

Mr. Haber responded I'll work with Glynn and then we will send it to the district manager who will make arrangements to have it published.

Mr. Perry asked do you want the district engineer, after he receives all of the proposals, to rank them based upon that criteria?

Mr. McGraw responded no I think we will rank them ourselves. Do we need to potentially work on a funding agreement as well? We're going to bid the whole set of drawings which includes work outside of the assessments.

Mr. Haber asked are you going to want the district to enter into a contract that will include both work that can be paid for by the district and work that would be paid by the developer?

Mr. McGraw responded I guess that's one option. The second part is the funding versus the non-funded work that is included in the engineer's report. The district can't sign a contract that includes work that is not in the engineer report?

Mr. Haber responded the District can enter into a contract that includes work that is not in the engineer's report; however, the District will need to enter into a funding agreement with the developer before doing so.

Mr. Taylor stated I've got it set up that the lots are separate prices so you will get a price that shows the clearing of the lots and it will be a lump sum price for that, filling of the lots, any unsuitables removed, those are separate line items so you will know which costs go to the CDD and which ones don't.

Mr. Haber asked do you want the flexibility to award to multiple contractors?

Mr. Oweis responded we don't want to do that but the reason for that is I want the landowner to be able to pave the road clearly so if we enter into an impact fee agreement the landowner can get the credit for those impact fees instead of the CDD.

Mr. McGraw stated we will pay for the lot improvements and probably the Chestwick improvements.

Mr. Taylor stated Basham & Lucas' tree plan and landscaping – before we bid we did not include that. Do we want to include that as an option because that can be included in the CDD.

Mr. Oweis stated we can have it announced when we contract with them but it doesn't have to be part of the contract.

Mr. Haber stated you can leave yourself the option to add it.

Mr. McGraw stated we will solicit to it and then we will probably bid it outside to compare.

Mr. Taylor stated I will break it up to Phase 1 trees and Phase 2 and all of the landscaping related to that.

Mr. Haber stated if that landscape work exceeds \$350,000 then you would need to go through this process for only that work. If you choose not to award it to one of the contractors as one of the alternatives and it exceeds \$350,000, then the district is going to have to do a public RFP.

Mr. McGraw stated if we don't include it we will pay for it. A lot of it is on Chestwick so that is going to be something we pay for anyway since it's part of the dedicated improvements so you're going to have to break out Chestwick landscaping, Phase 1 landscaping, and Phase 2 landscaping and then we will decide how to do it.

**SIXTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Next Scheduled Meeting – April 12, 2018 at  
1:00 pm. at the Plantation Oaks Amenity  
Center**

Mr. Perry stated our next meeting is going to be on April 12<sup>th</sup> at 1:00 and we will also have the audit committee meeting at that time.

**SEVENTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS    Adjournment**

On MOTION by Mr. McGraw seconded by Mr. Oweis with all in favor the meeting was adjourned.
--

March 5, 2018

Wilford Preserve CDD

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary/Assistant Secretary

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman/Vice Chairman