

RANGER DRAINAGE DISTRICT  
 REGULAR BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETING  
 and  
 PUBLIC HEARING  
 RE: Third Amended Water Control Plan

Location: Wedgfield Golf and Country Club  
 2350 Maxim Parkway  
 Orlando, Florida

Date: Wednesday, May 6, 2009  
 Time: 6:00 o'clock p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. David Mauck, President  
 Mr. Gus Desautel, Supervisor  
 Mr. Richard McCormick, Supervisor

Mr. Jewell Davis, General Manager  
 Ms. Dawn Mullins, Office Manager  
 Mr. Terry Lewis, Esquire, Board Attorney  
 Mr. Richard Wohlfarth, Engineer

Reported by:  
 Beverly Heffelfinger

1 that it's going to go between five and 15 feet from edge  
 2 of pavement.  
 3 MR. MAUCK: Okay. Now, explain a little bit what  
 4 the sidewalks all pertain too and which side of Bancroft.  
 5 MR. DAVIS: Right now it's all going to be on the  
 6 east side of Bancroft from Starling to Nettleton, and  
 7 that is because of the proposed school. If the school  
 8 gets delayed, I'm sure the sidewalks will be delayed.  
 9 MR. MAUCK: Okay. And this is working with Orange  
 10 County Public Works?  
 11 MR. DAVIS: That is correct.  
 12 MR. MAUCK: All right.  
 13 MR. DAVIS: The other one was with the sheriff's  
 14 department. Met with the sheriff yesterday, and we had  
 15 deputies out this afternoon about the trash-dumping, the  
 16 four-wheelers and motorcycles, driving motorized vehicles  
 17 altogether down the canals and behind people's houses.  
 18 We've had some letters that have come into the  
 19 office regarding that issue, and we've had several phone  
 20 calls.  
 21 MR. MAUCK: Okay, so you had a meeting and --  
 22 MR. DAVIS: They're going to be here for a while  
 23 writing tickets.  
 24 MR. MAUCK: Okay.  
 25 MR. DAVIS: We just have to get the posted signs,

PROCEEDINGS

1 May 6, 2009 6:11 o'clock p.m.

\* \* \* \* \*

4 MR. MAUCK: We'll call this meeting to order. I  
 5 apologize for being a couple of minutes late.  
 6 We have a quorum with all board members present.  
 7 I guess we'll begin with the consent agenda, which  
 8 includes approval of disbursements, approval of driveway  
 9 applications and other applications, and lastly, approval  
 10 of the meeting minutes of February 4th and April 1st of  
 11 2009.  
 12 MR. MCCORMICK: I make a motion we accept the  
 13 consent agenda, that being the approval of disbursements;  
 14 approval of driveway applications and other applications,  
 15 and approval of meeting minutes of February 4th, as  
 16 submitted.  
 17 MR. DESAUTELS: Second the motion.  
 18 MR. MAUCK: Mr. Desautel has seconded and that's  
 19 unanimous.  
 20 Under Old Business, we have two items. First is a  
 21 report on sidewalks along Bancroft Boulevard. I think  
 22 I'll hand that over to Cecil.  
 23 MR. DAVIS: As of this afternoon, they still have  
 24 not decided where it's going to go for sure. They just  
 25 finished all the preliminary engineering, and he told me

1 "no-trespassing" signs back up where they're down, so  
 2 when they make a case, it stays.  
 3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Cecil, on the sidewalks, if  
 4 they're going to put them on the east side, will they  
 5 regrade as necessary for our right-of-way, our drainage?  
 6 MR. DAVIS: Yes, and we will get to see the  
 7 drawings and what they're proposing to do prior to any  
 8 commitment.  
 9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it's no burden to the  
 10 District?  
 11 MR. DAVIS: Correct.  
 12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, thank you.  
 13 MR. DAVIS: And where it crosses our swales, where  
 14 we have secondaries coming in, they'll meet with us for  
 15 the location and they will thicken the sidewalk at that  
 16 location, so if we drive across it, we won't break it.  
 17 MR. MAUCK: I didn't think about that. Okay, good.  
 18 Moving along under New Business, the first item is  
 19 a request from the District office for the approval to  
 20 retain RSM McGladrey -- that's R-S-M M-c-G-l-a-d-r-e-y --  
 21 to count ballots for the annual landowners' election.  
 22 Dawn or Cecil, do you want to explain what that's  
 23 about? It's self-explanatory, I think, but this is who  
 24 we used before?  
 25 MS. MULLINS: Yes, last year was the first year we

1 obtained them. They did a very good job. I have spoken  
2 with them, and they would be interested in doing it again  
3 this year. I just wanted approval from the Board if they  
4 wanted to do that again this year or not, do you want to  
5 retain them.

6 MR. MAUCK: Okay.

7 MR. LEWIS: Yes, RSM McGladrey is an auditing and  
8 accounting company that specializes in this kind of work.  
9 They're an independent third party not affiliated with  
10 anyone, anybody, anything, within the District.

11 And, yes, I think probably staff believes it's a  
12 good idea to have an independent third party in charge  
13 of verifying the ballots as they come in.

14 MR. MAUCK: Okay. I know a question that I've been  
15 asked which I couldn't speak to, related to this, is:  
16 Is there an option to use Orange County's Supervisor of  
17 Elections?

18 MS. MULLINS: I don't believe so.

19 MR. LEWIS: I think we tried that, and they  
20 declined. That's entirely up to the Supervisor of  
21 Elections. If they would send somebody, that's  
22 acceptable. We do represent one other district in Palm  
23 Beach County who uses the Supervisor of Elections.

24 MR. MAUCK: But that would be a cost; correct?

25 MR. LEWIS: That would be a cost, too; I'm sure

1 cost savings?

2 MR. LEWIS: If I could make a suggestion, perhaps  
3 maybe the motion could be to direct our secretary to  
4 check with the Supervisor of Elections, and if they can  
5 do this for less or do it for free, give them the  
6 authorization to retain them to do it; if not, allow us  
7 to go to McGladrey and retain them. That way, we could  
8 do it between now and the landowners meeting.

9 MR. McCORMICK: Do I need to repeat all of that, or  
10 just --

11 (Laughter)

12 MR. LEWIS: I can tell her what I said.

13 MR. McCORMICK: I'll make a motion that we check  
14 with the Supervisor of Elections to see if there would  
15 be a cost savings; and, if not, then we would approve  
16 McGladrey to retain them to do it.

17 MS. MULLINS: Okay.

18 MR. DESAUTELS: I'll second it.

19 MR. LEWIS: That was as good as me.

20 MR. MAUCK: I agree, too, so that's unanimous as  
21 well. And it's not just if there's a cost savings, but  
22 even if they would be willing to do it, as Terry pointed  
23 out.

24 Okay, I guess also related to the Annual Landowner  
25 Meeting, the next item of New Business is hiring of

1 they'll charge whatever their time and charges are.

2 MR. MAUCK: Right. I think the question came from  
3 the spirit of, would Orange County count our ballots at  
4 no cost because we pay county tax.

5 MR. LEWIS: No harm comes of asking.

6 MR. MAUCK: Right.

7 MR. McCORMICK: What was the cost?

8 MS. MULLINS: Last year it was \$2200 because there  
9 was so much. We had two candidates instead of one, like  
10 we do this time, or two positions. It was originally  
11 supposed to be only \$1400, but because of the time that  
12 it took her to do it, that's why the extra money, I  
13 think.

14 MR. MAUCK: Is this a fixed contract or time-and-  
15 materials or --

16 MS. MULLINS: Well, they do it on time. When I  
17 talked to them today, you just don't ever know; you don't  
18 know if you're going to get 50 or a thousand ballots.  
19 You just have no way of knowing. And so that's about  
20 the only thing we can do is maybe go by what we did last  
21 year and see how it goes.

22 I would highly recommend -- or I would like for us  
23 to obtain somebody to do them like we did last year.

24 MR. McCORMICK: Do you want to check in on the  
25 Supervisor of Elections first to see if it would be a

1 deputies for the Annual Landowner Meeting. Now, I think  
2 behind that is a feeling of what, helping with crowd  
3 control and things like that?

4 MS. MULLINS: Yes.

5 MR. LEWIS: Yes.

6 MR. DAVIS: And last time we had to have one who  
7 stayed overnight with the ballots.

8 MS. MULLINS: We spent \$1500 last year in deputies  
9 for the election.

10 MR. McCORMICK: How much?

11 MS. MULLINS: \$1500.

12 MR. DAVIS: That's just for deputies.

13 MR. LEWIS: But you could -- again, I hate to  
14 intrude, but I don't think it will be anywhere near that.  
15 I mean, the only reason we held over and took the next  
16 day to count the ballots was because there were just so  
17 many, so many that both the auditor and sheriff's office  
18 ended up spending a lot more time than we estimated.

19 But since we only have two candidates running for  
20 one office, I would at least hope that we could have the  
21 ballot and do what you normally do, which is count the  
22 ballots right then, so we know what's been done that day.  
23 That's normally the way we've done it in the past. We  
24 were just overwhelmed last year.

25 MR. McCORMICK: If no one has to guard them, do you

1 see the need to have them? I think the crowd -- I don't  
 2 see the reason myself; I don't the crowd is going to  
 3 be --  
 4 MR. DESAUTELS: I don't think we're going to have a  
 5 problem like we did last year.  
 6 MR. McCORMICK: No.  
 7 MR. MAUCK: Well, let me ask -- Cecil and Dawn, is  
 8 it your recommendation that we have deputies or not? I  
 9 guess, let me ask, is this just a proposal or --  
 10 MR. DAVIS: Well, if by chance it has to go over  
 11 and you don't have one, you won't have nobody in the  
 12 office if people complain. That was the argument last  
 13 year.  
 14 MS. MULLINS: What was that?  
 15 MR. DAVIS: About the ballots being in the office  
 16 by themselves.  
 17 MS. MULLINS: Oh, overnight.  
 18 MR. MAUCK: If you're hiring a forensic third  
 19 party, aren't they really warranting and providing an  
 20 affidavit that the ballots have been in their care and  
 21 custody?  
 22 MS. MULLINS: But they won't do that.  
 23 MR. LEWIS: They won't take the ballots. They'll  
 24 warrant that they've been accurately tabulated. I mean,  
 25 there is that. What I'm thinking, though, if we have a

1 loud and got out of hand, and having the deputy there  
 2 just protects everybody in case somebody gets emotional.  
 3 You know, so four hours to cover the meeting, you know,  
 4 I don't know that that's a bad idea, for safety.  
 5 MR. McCORMICK: Do you want to have one deputy  
 6 there for presence? Then if they have to stay over, they  
 7 can do it?  
 8 MR. MAUCK: I guess my thinking is that what's  
 9 unique is that it is an election, so...  
 10 MR. MIKE: It's also a landowners' meeting, and  
 11 that's what got out of hand, not the actual election  
 12 itself.  
 13 MR. MAUCK: Where are you at on this, Gus?  
 14 MR. DESAUTELS: I'm open, if we need to get it.  
 15 One thing about it, if you hire a deputy, if he needs  
 16 help, he knows how to call them.  
 17 MR. McCORMICK: Personally, I didn't think we would  
 18 need them, but we hire people that do this more than us,  
 19 and if they're recommending it, I think we maybe should  
 20 make a motion to have one.  
 21 MR. MAUCK: So are you making a motion?  
 22 MR. McCORMICK: Yes.  
 23 MR. DESAUTELS: I'll second it.  
 24 MS. MULLINS: For how long? Just that night for  
 25 four hours?

1 typical landowners meeting, where it's conducted in a  
 2 fairly orderly fashion, quickly, and then count the  
 3 ballots -- I think the deputies work on a hourly rate;  
 4 don't they?  
 5 MR. MAUCK: Correct.  
 6 MR. DAVIS: Yes.  
 7 MR. LEWIS: They'd only be here a few hours. It  
 8 wouldn't be all one long meeting and then one person all  
 9 night, then somebody there the next day, too. We had at  
 10 least one policeman there for over 24 hours.  
 11 MR. MAUCK: And I think Dawn was about to say there  
 12 is a minimum.  
 13 MS. MULLINS: I think four hours.  
 14 MR. MAUCK: I think I've looked at that, and I  
 15 think it's four hours from the sheriff's pool. You're  
 16 not going to get by with less than that.  
 17 MR. McCORMICK: There's only two candidates  
 18 running. I'm guessing, Gary, if they want, and Gus --  
 19 ask Gus and Gary if they want them.  
 20 MR. LEWIS: I think I would recommend it.  
 21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: last year we brought the  
 22 deputy, and really it's not a position to look at the  
 23 ballots. There was a concern about the interaction at  
 24 the landowners meeting, and I think that that's really  
 25 what it was. You know, there were a few people that got

1 MR. McCORMICK: Four hours.  
 2 MS. MULLINS: Terry, do you anticipate getting  
 3 everything done that night so McGladrey would need to be  
 4 here?  
 5 MR. LEWIS: It depends. We can make that decision  
 6 when we get to that point.  
 7 MS. MULLINS: Because I had originally told her  
 8 that the next morning is when she would need to come.  
 9 I just need to clarify if you want her here that night.  
 10 MR. LEWIS: I thought we were going to have her  
 11 here for the landowners meeting.  
 12 MS. MULLINS: Well, last year they came in the next  
 13 day, in the morning time, and worked all day. When I did  
 14 them, I did them that night.  
 15 MR. LEWIS: I'm inclined to think that if we need  
 16 someone to establish order, you know, it will be during  
 17 the landowners meeting and the balloting. The next day,  
 18 I mean, the counting was done in a secure place, and I  
 19 didn't -- I think we were okay with that. But I would  
 20 hope this would be a one-day event this time.  
 21 MS. MULLINS: Okay, her or the Supervisor of  
 22 Election of Orange County or whoever.  
 23 MR. MAUCK: Okay. All right, so we have a motion  
 24 and we had a second. And I agree also, let's go ahead  
 25 and bring her in, same person, or whoever it is, out of

1 Orange County Deputy Sheriff's pool.  
 2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm not concerned personally  
 3 over the safety of the ballots, but I would hate if there  
 4 were allegations made against the District staff or  
 5 anyone on the Board or the candidates that the ballots  
 6 were tampered with. And I don't like the idea of an  
 7 expense, but I just want to -- I don't think it's  
 8 unreasonable to have someone guard those ballots  
 9 overnight to avoid starting out a new year in a negative  
 10 way. And I just offer that.  
 11 MR. McCORMICK: I agree.  
 12 MR. MAUCK: And I think what we're saying is we're  
 13 not anticipating that it's going to be the same turnout  
 14 as it was last year. And if it is -- I hope that it is a  
 15 good had turnout, but that maybe they can get through it  
 16 a little bit quicker.  
 17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I meant having a deputy there  
 18 all night so that no one alleges that the ballots were  
 19 tampered with.  
 20 MR. LEWIS: But if it's orderly and we can actually  
 21 count the ballots at the landowners meeting there won't  
 22 be a next day.  
 23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, I gotcha.  
 24 MR. LEWIS: I mean, we can make a contingency for  
 25 that. If it looks as though we have to do that, we can

1 his position that night.  
 2 MR. LEWIS: Yes, it would work that way.  
 3 MR. MAUCK: Okay. I'm going to go a little bit  
 4 out of order from the agenda, and I'm going to ask for  
 5 landowners' comments right now that are relative to  
 6 the monthly meeting, if you will, before we start the  
 7 continuation of the public hearing. So I'm kind of  
 8 inserting landowners' comments up to this point.  
 9 And again, I'll leave it open. There's three  
 10 people who have signed up for comments, Tom Zimmer, Mark  
 11 Hewitt and Dario. If you guys have anything relative to  
 12 the first part of the meeting, you can ask it now. If  
 13 your question is for the second part of the meeting, I  
 14 would ask you to provide those comments in the second  
 15 part.  
 16 So I guess I'll just go in order. Dario?  
 17 MR. JIMINEZ: (inaudible) -- about the fixtures  
 18 that have to be fixed -- (inaudible) -- and I wait to  
 19 speak later.  
 20 MR. MAUCK: Okay, later we'll get to that.  
 21 Mark?  
 22 MR. HEWITT: I don't have anything.  
 23 MR. MAUCK: Okay. Tom?  
 24 MR. ZIMMER: Just a quick question: Is this the  
 25 public hearing for the -- (inaudible) -- or whatever,

1 seal the ballot box. If you maybe tell the lady we're  
 2 talking to, we can do it before, but we may conceivably  
 3 need someone to stay the evening in the event we have to  
 4 come back and count the ballots the next day. That's  
 5 another one of those --  
 6 MR. MAUCK: So we would amend the motion to reflect  
 7 the contingency plan that we may need to go the next  
 8 morning. Okay? Rick and Gus?  
 9 MR. McCORMICK: I'll second it.  
 10 MR. LEWIS: You know, Bill points out and makes  
 11 a good point as well, in the case that we had in Palm  
 12 Beach County where the Supervisor of Elections does the  
 13 counting, they actually come at the close of the election  
 14 and take the ballot box, and they take possession of the  
 15 it, then come back and tell us the result after that.  
 16 In that case, we'd be fine; there would be a chain  
 17 of custody that wouldn't implicate anybody.  
 18 MR. MAUCK: Okay.  
 19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Terry, if we count the ballots  
 20 the night of the election, then we can actually swear in  
 21 the new board member that evening.  
 22 MR. LEWIS: Sure.  
 23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The way we have in the past.  
 24 Only last year was the first time that we -- we usually  
 25 get the ballots counted, and the new board member takes

1 right, that's coming up? Is this the last hearing?  
 2 MR. MAUCK: Yes.  
 3 MR. ZIMMER: Second to the last one?  
 4 MR. MAUCK: Yes.  
 5 MR. ZIMMER: If I have any other questions, I'll  
 6 ask later.  
 7 MR. MAUCK: Okay. All right, so with that -- I'm  
 8 sorry. Yes, Gary?  
 9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was wondering if we can get  
 10 an update on the status of the Canal 3 slope rebanking  
 11 project. It's been underway now I think for three  
 12 months.  
 13 MR. MAUCK: You want to provide an update?  
 14 MR. DAVIS: Yeah. We have first starting at the  
 15 west end, the first three sections are ready to go.  
 16 We're waiting to decide what type of pipe we're going to  
 17 put in, if we're going to put any pipe in, and I can't  
 18 discharge any water until it clears up.  
 19 Therefore, we got to put the water that's in the  
 20 section from Dallas over into those other sections.  
 21 And I can't pump any in there right now until it clears.  
 22 Hopefully, next week we'll be able to discharge it and  
 23 then we can refill with water between Dallas and the  
 24 first crossover.  
 25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you have an estimate as to

1 how long it's likely going to be before that canal is  
 2 finished?  
 3 MR. DAVIS: I wouldn't have any idea right now.  
 4 It's going to depend on the weather. We're getting  
 5 closer to the first of June; when the rain comes, I have  
 6 to hold up.  
 7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. What's the status of  
 8 the Canal 6 brush-clearing project?  
 9 MR. DAVIS: The man is working on it very slowly.  
 10 But he's working on it. He's had some machines that he's  
 11 said was supposed to be here; they've not shown up, so  
 12 he's informed me today that he is calling someone else.  
 13 He's still within the bounds of his contract.  
 14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How long does he have to  
 15 complete the project? I thought it was somewhere early  
 16 in June.  
 17 MR. DAVIS: He has 90 days, a total of 90 days.  
 18 His second 30 days is not up yet; won't be up till the  
 19 17th of May. Then he's got 30 days past that; then it's  
 20 over.  
 21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Cecil, in your conversations  
 22 with Public Works, they have the big trucks that go  
 23 around and pick up the bulk trash in the regular  
 24 neighborhoods in Orange County. Any possibility that you  
 25 could talk to them about picking up that stuff that was

1 comments related to the Third Amended Water Control Plan  
 2 that we've been talking about bits and pieces of since  
 3 last August -- or July, yeah.  
 4 MR. LEWIS: Maybe to go through the procedure here,  
 5 we've actually been, believe it or not, we've been in  
 6 this process since November of 2007.  
 7 MR. MAUCK: Right.  
 8 MR. LEWIS: Just to give you kind of the context  
 9 for it. Would be procedurally, or will be procedurally  
 10 under Chapter 298, the final hearing, final public  
 11 hearing on consideration of the Third Amended Water  
 12 Control Plan Amendment and the Engineer's Report, which  
 13 proposes an apportionment and an amount for what I will  
 14 call capital improvements assessments, to be paid for by  
 15 benefitted properties.  
 16 The procedure for the public hearing is to open the  
 17 public hearing to take all public testimony of anybody  
 18 that wants to speak, and we will listen to anything  
 19 everyone has to say on that topic. At that point, the  
 20 public hearing is closed, and then we go to discussion  
 21 by the Board of whether to approve the Water Control  
 22 Plan and Engineer's Report, whether to approve the Water  
 23 Control Plan and Engineer's Report with amendments, or  
 24 whether to reject it.  
 25 And at that point, you know, we will have a final

1 dumped at the end of Reynolds?  
 2 MR. DAVIS: I haven't asked them, but I will.  
 3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or maybe they would lend us  
 4 the truck and we could do it.  
 5 MR. DAVIS: Yeah, well, good luck.  
 6 MR. MAUCK: Which end, Mike?  
 7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At the west end of Dallas,  
 8 somebody has dumped a water system out there. And that  
 9 seems to be the major dumping ground for the lawn  
 10 services.  
 11 MR. DAVIS: We've got a boat out there if anybody  
 12 wants one.  
 13 (Laughter)  
 14 MR. DAVIS: Doesn't have a bottom in it, the  
 15 trailer is all apart and the backend is gone, the transom  
 16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But it's there.  
 17 MR. DAVIS: But it's there, that we got delivered  
 18 to us.  
 19 MR. MAUCK: Any other questions or comments?  
 20 All right, with that, I guess we'll conclude the  
 21 regular monthly meeting, and I guess we will move into  
 22 the continuation of the public hearing, the last public  
 23 hearing that is related to the Proposed Third Amended  
 24 Water Control Plan.  
 25 And I guess we would begin with public questions or

1 decision on whether we're going to have an Amended Water  
 2 Control Plan and Engineer's Report with which to work.  
 3 For the record, again, if anyone that is  
 4 interested, under Chapter 298, once the Board takes a  
 5 final act on this, any affected citizen, any landowner,  
 6 has the right to challenge that action in Circuit Court  
 7 in Orange County. That challenge must occur and a  
 8 petition has to be filed no later than 30 days after the  
 9 date of the act, that would be counting 30 days starting  
 10 tomorrow. And that would be your jurisdictional  
 11 statutory deadline for challenging any aspect of the  
 12 assessment.  
 13 If there are no challenges at that point, the Plan,  
 14 the Engineer's Report and all that goes with it becomes  
 15 final and unappealable.  
 16 So that is what we do. But like I said, step one  
 17 is opening the hearing and inviting any and all public  
 18 comment.  
 19 MR. MAUCK: And the hearing procedurally tonight,  
 20 Terry, would you please speak to the question that I'm  
 21 sure will be raised, because I've already heard it once  
 22 tonight, about a bond. Please take it from there.  
 23 MR. LEWIS: Okay. This act tonight, I mean, the  
 24 action by the Board does not approve, does not, you know,  
 25 direct anyone to go about all of the things necessary to

1 issue a bond to borrow the money to build what needs to  
2 be built. That is a decision that will be made at some  
3 later date, if ever, on that.

4 But I'll repeat it as clearly as I can: There is  
5 nothing in the Engineer's Report, there is nothing in the  
6 Water Control Plan Amendment that says this project  
7 should be bonded and we should borrow money over a period  
8 of years. It simply identifies how the Plan is to be  
9 amended. It identifies the costs for amending the Plan,  
10 and it recommends an apportionment of the assessments  
11 that would need to be levied to take care of the cost of  
12 the project. That's all it does.

13 MR. MAUCK: And to be excruciatingly clear, it  
14 means that the cost that would get levied in accordance  
15 with the recommendation from the Burton report would be  
16 based on what the costs come in actually. So while we  
17 are projecting costs for budgetary purposes, the  
18 objective is to come in significantly less than that,  
19 and that the cost that would be levied would be the  
20 actual cost levied, not that there would not be cost  
21 savings that then get set aside to go do other work.  
22 It is only to perform the work that's identified in  
23 the Third Amended Water Control Plan.

24 MR. LEWIS: That is correct. The schedule of  
25 assessments that are in the Engineer's Report are a cap.

1 portion of water that was in that area being discharged  
2 into Canal 5 and will in fact redirect that water up  
3 to Canal 6, which is not carrying nearly the load that  
4 Canal 5 is.

5 So we were very thrilled. In fact, it couldn't  
6 have been more dramatic. We got the news between lunch  
7 time and the meeting time at the last monthly meeting.

8 So that's actually money coming in, as I had put up  
9 in my presentation, which I recognize a lot of you were  
10 there that evening. We are still pursuing other sources  
11 of funding.

12 Another item of other money, Terry and Bill, along  
13 with Rick, our engineer, have been working with the  
14 Governor's office and everyone in between us and the  
15 Governor's office in going after securing whatever  
16 funds we can that are related to stimulus money that  
17 is coming from the federal government to the State of  
18 Florida and would be disbursed through the Department  
19 of Transportation in the State of Florida.

20 How much people get, who gets what, is all yet  
21 to be seen. Terry challenged me to write a letter and  
22 helped me get started on a letter that went to the  
23 Governor's office and a set of other offices in  
24 Tallahassee, which he and his office personally  
25 delivered. And that was to make a case for the

1 I mean, an assessment can't go legally beyond what is in  
2 there. Legally it can, however, be half of that amount,  
3 or less, whatever it is. You tie it to the cost of the  
4 project. So it is a cap beyond which the Board cannot  
5 proceed without having to go back through this process  
6 again.

7 MR. MAUCK: Right.

8 MR. McCORMICK: And also some of the pipes that  
9 still need to be lamped, looked at inside with a camera,  
10 if they turn out to be good, that doesn't mean that we  
11 have to do them.

12 MR. MAUCK: Correct. So I guess I feel as maybe a  
13 matter of maybe heading off some questions, I do welcome  
14 questions, but just to provide a little update, we  
15 announced at the last meeting that in spite of the  
16 economy, what Cecil and others initiated a few years ago  
17 actually came about, and FEMA did indicate that they are  
18 going to be able to come up with about \$800,000 of money  
19 to take care of a chunk of work that's up here towards  
20 the front, which will do two very important things.

21 One is it will address a deficiency in the design  
22 of the current system that results in flooding in this  
23 area that people who live in that area have been dealing  
24 with for years.

25 Number two, it will principally take a large

1 landowners and taxpayers in RDD District to receive  
2 some stimulus money.

3 So, again, just to recap, tonight's meeting is  
4 to, as Terry said, to approve as is, approve with  
5 modifications, or reject this Third Amended Water  
6 Control Plan that's been worked on for quite a while  
7 now.

8 And what that is, is to identify what work needs to  
9 be done, what improvements need to be made to the system,  
10 and to assess what the maximum costs would be, meaning  
11 that they can't be any more.

12 So in terms of assigning numbers to these tasks,  
13 we've had to be conservative, because they can't cost any  
14 more than that, and again the objective is that the costs  
15 are kept to an absolute minimum for the landowners in the  
16 District, but we still have to get the work done.

17 So we're looking and will need to look in the  
18 future on what projects need to be paid for out of our  
19 pocket or out of the current operating budget versus what  
20 projects are we going to hopefully get other people's  
21 money for, or what projects do we have to come up with  
22 other means to finance it altogether. And those are all  
23 questions for a later date in terms of how to pay for it.

24 We're trying to deal with the issue of the "whats":  
25 What is it that needs to be addressed? What engineering

1 upgrades need to be made to the system to stay current  
2 with St. Johns permit?

3 And, again, some of those things, as we have  
4 discussed ad nauseam, are related to meeting new  
5 provisions in the permit based on certain densities of  
6 build-out and population in Wedgefield. So that is  
7 actually the trigger for other work to be done, which  
8 causes us to go back to the drawing board, so to speak,  
9 with engineering.

10 Also, as I mentioned, this project that's been  
11 identified as a FEMA project gets into actual fixing  
12 deficiencies in the system. While we all talk about how  
13 the system has seen big storms and things like that, we  
14 can all say that people sandbagging their garage doors  
15 and actually having flooding going on, it's not the news  
16 that we want as landowners and investors out here to make  
17 it around. Right?

18 So, again, that's kind a recap of where we are  
19 tonight, what tonight is all about, what this hearing  
20 is all about. So we don't need to use the word "bond"  
21 tonight because we're not talking about bonds, because  
22 we're not even to that point of financing it yet. We  
23 could pay for all of this out of our pocket; we could --  
24 we could do a number of things to pay for it.

25 But it's just a matter of do you agree that work

1 MR. JIMINEZ: Yes, I do.

2 MR. MAUCK: So by passing the Third Amended Water  
3 Control Plan, it doesn't mean that the District staff  
4 has to do anything different. It just means that the  
5 District staff has the ability to go repair those things  
6 in accordance with the Plan.

7 Now, we all know as practical and intelligent folks  
8 that work does need to be done, that we have two reasons  
9 why. One, I don't know what maintenance provision could  
10 exist to keep steel pipes from corroding after 30-some-  
11 odd years with fertilizers and nutrients and everything  
12 else going into the water.

13 And, secondly, I don't know how you get around  
14 renegotiating a permit with St. Johns Water Management,  
15 whose inception was back in the early 1970s and get a  
16 better deal in 2009 than you got back in the early '70s,  
17 you know, when there weren't as many environmental  
18 conditions and things like that.

19 So we all know, practically speaking, that work  
20 does need to be done. But, you know, there's been a  
21 lot of lively debate just amongst the three of us Board  
22 members as to do we pay it out of our pocket or --  
23 because if we pay it out of our pocket year over year,  
24 then the only way to assess that cost back to everybody  
25 is through the current maintenance budget, okay. And we

1 needs to be done? Do you agree that we need to address  
2 these things in our system? And, quite frankly, some  
3 of those things you can't disagree with because they  
4 come straight out of our permit with St. Johns, and the  
5 argument isn't with RDD; the argument is with St. Johns,  
6 you know, the permit.

7 So, anyway, with that, I'm going to go out to the  
8 public comments portion. And, again, I'll invite the  
9 three people who signed up to go first if they have any  
10 comments or questions.

11 I'll begin with you Mr. Dario.

12 MR. JIMINEZ: Am I supposed to understand that the  
13 only thing that is supposed to be approved today is the  
14 fixing of the structures that are not viable to function?  
15 But I don't understand how can we approve that without  
16 knowing what is the source of the value for that  
17 particular job.

18 I mean, those two things, in my opinion, have to  
19 be together, because if you approve a plan and you don't  
20 have the way to subsidize or finance that particular job,  
21 there's no -- (inaudible)

22 MR. MAUCK: You understand, and maybe you don't,  
23 that we can propose and move forward with the Third  
24 Amended Water Control Plan and actually not do anything.  
25 Do you understand that?

1 could go back to the record on how we all talked about  
2 the pros and cons of that.

3 We talked about ways to perhaps find other people's  
4 money, as I refer to it, whether it be FEMA, federal  
5 government stimulus money, whatever it might be, to pay  
6 for that as well, where it wouldn't cost the District  
7 anything. That's our objective.

8 Or, third is to come up with some other means to  
9 finance it. All the while, we are trying to make sure  
10 that what we put forward is not going to be a curse for  
11 people in the future, so we're looking at everything from  
12 materials and processes and skill sets and experience to  
13 get the cheapest price, all the while still maintaining  
14 the integrity of the system.

15 And part of that is we have to, through our  
16 engineering arm, we have to write that stuff down and  
17 propose it and put it in front of St. Johns for their  
18 approval.

19 So tonight, what we're doing is taking the  
20 Engineer's Report, which includes some preliminary  
21 engineering to show how we would go about solving the  
22 problems as we would begin to take on some of these  
23 tasks.

24 But I'm also here to tell you tonight that some of  
25 things identified in the Third Amended Water Control Plan

1 we need to hit right now, and in fact are in the process  
 2 of doing right now, all under the maintenance budget  
 3 heading that we're currently dealing with.  
 4 There are also some things that aren't immediate  
 5 that we can address sometime down the road. So it's a  
 6 longwinded answer, but there are things that we do need,  
 7 to your point, that we do need to figure out how to pay  
 8 for, and we need to deal with those pretty straightaway,  
 9 because the work does need to go, and some people are  
 10 holding a time clock to us, saying you met this condition  
 11 of the permit on this date; you've got three years to be  
 12 complete, and "complete" means complete, meaning it's  
 13 been through and signed off and approved by them as well.  
 14 And we're somewhere in the middle on some of that.  
 15 But in terms of how we pay for everything that's  
 16 contained in the Third Amended Water Control Plan  
 17 proposal, we don't need to know that tonight.  
 18 MR. JIMINEZ: I accede to the fact that that job  
 19 has to be done; I have know quarrel with that. I  
 20 understand and accept and approve that.  
 21 MR. MAUCK: Yep.  
 22 MR. JIMINEZ: But tell me, how many more occasions  
 23 to discuss ways to budget that particular job, or today  
 24 is the last?  
 25 MR. MAUCK: I'm sorry, I was with you till the very

1 new engineering drawings for going beyond -- you know,  
 2 it's like a degree of remodeling, if you will. Right?  
 3 When you go beyond a simple repair, in my opinion,  
 4 it becomes something that looks more like an  
 5 infrastructure repair.  
 6 Now, we have to be careful about using the term  
 7 "capital improvement", because that has other legal  
 8 connotations to it, which this doesn't necessarily fit.  
 9 But a repair to the infrastructure, a major repair  
 10 to the infrastructure, is not maintenance, in my book.  
 11 And I think one of things that's been blurry is,  
 12 I had asked the District staff to prepare for our budget  
 13 workshop some trends on what the maintenance costs have  
 14 been, and as I started to look beyond just the surface  
 15 and started looking at the details of what's driving  
 16 these costs going up so much, the fact is there was a  
 17 lot of money that we were spending on doing major  
 18 infrastructure repairs which had nothing to do with  
 19 maintenance.  
 20 So as the arrows come flying at the District staff  
 21 about being inefficient in maintenance, what I actually  
 22 found was that some of maintenance costs were going down  
 23 year over year, but some of the infrastructure repair  
 24 costs were going up and up and up. But we only have one  
 25 bucket, so we can't sort the costs, so the outside of the

1 end. Could you ask me the question one more time?  
 2 MR. JIMINEZ: Okay. I approve the fact that the  
 3 job has to be done in accordance with the provisions of  
 4 the St. Johns River Water. I understand that, and I have  
 5 no problem.  
 6 My only problem is, would there be another occasion  
 7 to discuss how the community or the Board is going to  
 8 budget that particular job?  
 9 MR. MAUCK: Yes, there is.  
 10 MR. JIMINEZ: Okay, thank you.  
 11 MR. MAUCK: Yes, we actually discussed that at our  
 12 budget workshop, which was held a couple of weeks ago,  
 13 was the first budget workshop meeting. And there are  
 14 several. And one of the issues that came up at the  
 15 budget workshop is that for a number of years now,  
 16 everything that the District does, we call maintenance.  
 17 And there really has not been a good way of going in and  
 18 identifying those things which are truly maintenance or  
 19 those things which are repairing the infrastructure,  
 20 which -- and let me give you an example of what I think  
 21 the differences are.  
 22 If you have a pipe and the pipe is rusted, and you  
 23 go back in and put a patch on the pipe, I call that  
 24 maintenance. If you go in and extract that pipe entirely  
 25 and do a major dig and you have to go back in and provide

1 bucket is labeled "maintenance", and the accusation that  
 2 our maintenance costs are going up was a fair one.  
 3 But, again, to me it doesn't give anyone here  
 4 as landowners -- I'm a landowner, Rick and Gus are  
 5 landowners -- it doesn't give a landowner enough insight  
 6 as to the why. Right? Why?  
 7 And that's one of the things that we talked about  
 8 at, again, the lively session at the budget workshop. We  
 9 talked a lot about -- and I know that you attended. We  
 10 certainly talked about a lot of things there that night,  
 11 and it was a good discussion, but trying to provide a  
 12 little bit more insight as to what's maintenance and  
 13 what's not.  
 14 So, as you know from the budget workshop, because  
 15 I remember you were there, we did discuss that we have  
 16 to start figuring out are we going to start setting  
 17 money aside, how much are we currently spending on  
 18 infrastructure repairs and can we use that money towards  
 19 some of these things in the Third Amended Water Control  
 20 Plan or not.  
 21 Those are all things that we still need to continue  
 22 to work on.  
 23 Mark, did you -- I'm just going down the list here.  
 24 MR. HEWITT: What is the total cost of your new  
 25 Amended Water Control Plan, compared to the first one



1 you had out, which I think was what, \$8-1/2 million?  
 2 How have you cut costs and what's the difference?  
 3 MR. WOHLFARTH: There's \$12 million additionally,  
 4 and it's down to eight, still waiting for --  
 5 (Simultaneous discussion.)  
 6 MR. HEWITT: (inaudible)  
 7 MR. WOHLFARTH: No, still eight; we haven't changed  
 8 that. Now, keep in mind it's not that we're going to  
 9 float \$8 million in a budget; we can't go above it, but  
 10 we can sure go below it. What's happening is, as an  
 11 example --  
 12 MR. MAUCK: Rick, I don't think everybody can hear  
 13 you. Pass this mike down.  
 14 MR. WOHLFARTH: Canal 3 is a good example. If you  
 15 go to the budget, you'll see there's three, four or  
 16 \$500,000 for Canal 3. The reality of what's happening  
 17 is, because of some work you saw that's being done on the  
 18 expressway, we had somebody come grind up the stumps, and  
 19 now the District staff is actually shaping, and the cost  
 20 is much, much less.  
 21 And, quite frankly, I think -- Cecil, the cost for  
 22 the grinding was how much?  
 23 MR. DAVIS: \$16,000.  
 24 MR. WOHLFARTH: And staff is now doing the rest  
 25 of the shaping. Well, there's three or \$400,000 in the

1 seven systems or seven pipes we had initially planned,  
 2 but we're now going to be doing two of the major canal  
 3 processes on Canal No. 1, which was in the Canal No. 1  
 4 budget for control structures.  
 5 That pipe work will be lined by the County.  
 6 Cecil's group will then come in and put the control  
 7 structures at the end, and we have another contractor,  
 8 county contractor, doing the fiber form. We believe  
 9 there's savings there.  
 10 So we're continually looking to see where we can  
 11 cut the \$8 million, so that when the bond meeting is held  
 12 and the decision as to the exact amount, we will then  
 13 re-evaluate it downward. We have a budget set up; the  
 14 State will approve it, but during the bonding process,  
 15 we will then go ahead and --  
 16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Shouldn't you do that first?  
 17 Why are we -- because Terry just told us, once we go  
 18 forward with this Amended Water Plan, then the Board has  
 19 the authority to make a decision, we have the right to  
 20 appeal it -- he just asked the question, will we have  
 21 time to discuss this later, I guess if we want to go to  
 22 court and have a hearing on it --  
 23 MR. WOHLFARTH: No, sir, that's not what was said.  
 24 What's happening is that tonight the plan itself gets  
 25 amended. The plan is responding to a permit through

1 budget that we'll never get to.  
 2 Secondly, through all this work done by the group  
 3 here, we looked at HDPE pipe in lieu of using concrete  
 4 pipe in a meeting with suppliers over the last month, and  
 5 the County is is now getting a new contract, and we're  
 6 looking at the potential, while the water is drained out,  
 7 to put the pipe in now, again using staff.  
 8 Now, the real savings is that we have the  
 9 equipment. We can dig it out, we can put the pipe in,  
 10 we've worked out a structure that we can put at the end;  
 11 it's riprap at the end or fiber form.  
 12 So that can have savings. So all those things,  
 13 we're looking at each one.  
 14 In addition, I think we mentioned two meetings ago  
 15 that we have a \$250,000 line item from the County that is  
 16 an ongoing process. There's 160 pipes within the right-  
 17 of-way that still need to be replaced. We've been doing  
 18 five, ten of those a year the last five or six years.  
 19 We're now in the seventh amendment to that.  
 20 They gave us 250 grand. We went down to the County  
 21 and worked out, using the county's project -- they have  
 22 a lining process. So instead of tearing up the road and  
 23 putting in concrete pipes, there's a lining process that  
 24 has the same life as concrete pipe or HDPE pipe.  
 25 By doing that, we're able to include not only the

1 St. Johns River Water Management District. That plan is  
 2 to get the third amendment -- there's the original, two  
 3 amendments, now this is the fourth.  
 4 Once it gets adopted, that's the guideline; that  
 5 tells us what we believe needs to be done to get the  
 6 system to meet all the criteria of the permit and to  
 7 function the way it's supposed to. That's all it's  
 8 doing.  
 9 Subsequent to this point, there will be other  
 10 meetings, and the same type of thing will be out here.  
 11 We will go back into the budgets and look at them. Once  
 12 we file this, we set a ceiling of \$8 million. We can't  
 13 go to nine, can't go to ten; it's eight. If, as time  
 14 goes on, we're able to do some of these other  
 15 improvements, that \$8 million can go down, down, down.  
 16 And the final bond amount will be decided here once we  
 17 get ready to do it.  
 18 Now, keep in mind we're not going to take you down  
 19 to the nearest dollar, because we're not bidding this  
 20 work out until after we know we have the money. Once we  
 21 float that bond, that sets the second cap down. If it's  
 22 \$6 million at that point and the bids come in at seven,  
 23 we have a problem. So we want to keep the number in the  
 24 bond.  
 25 The third element of it is, when we finally go and

1 do the bidding and get the work done, if you only spent  
2 \$5 million, then you only spent \$5 million.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're basically saying then  
4 this is like a step to get it ready for bond --  
5 (Simultaneous discussion.)

6 MR. MAUCK: Absolutely, absolutely. There's one  
7 more thing I wanted to --  
8 (Simultaneous discussion.)

9 MR. McCORMICK: That's not what he meant to say.  
10 Hold on.

11 MR. LEWIS: Well, he used that, you know, he used  
12 "bond" as an example. I mean, there are a lot of things  
13 you can do. You can borrow money for two or three or  
14 four years, the same as you can issue a long-term bond.

15 What I can tell you is that this Water Control  
16 Plan, it's not in a budget, you know, your Board isn't  
17 approving this as a budgetary item that's going to come  
18 back and you're going to have to pay for it either year  
19 over year, or in a bond, if there ever was one.

20 But what I did say, and said very clearly, there's  
21 been no decision made by the board or any of the  
22 individuals as to whether money will ever be borrowed.  
23 If there is --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But that decision can be made  
25 once we approve the Water Plan.

1 The other challenge is a financial challenge, you  
2 know, where you look at the Engineer's Report and the  
3 apportionment of the proposed assessments and you  
4 conclude that those are not fair as to me, you know,  
5 you're not apportioning it right, they ought to be paying  
6 more, I should be paying less.

7 And you see those kinds of challenges as well. In  
8 fact, I a challenge of a city's assessment on exactly  
9 those grounds two weeks ago, but there the landowner  
10 was claiming that they didn't get the benefit that  
11 the consultant said they were going to get from the  
12 improvement that the city was going to put in.

13 That's an example of the kind of legal challenge  
14 you could make.

15 But, truthfully, the Plan won't drive what Ranger's  
16 annual budget year to year will be. I mean, it will be a  
17 consideration of it, but the Board has to make that  
18 decision every year.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just think the eight or  
20 \$8-1/2 million -- we already know with the canal we saved  
21 a significant amount of money, right? That's what we  
22 were told. So why don't we go ahead and adjust this Plan  
23 at least for things we know for certain, because it looks  
24 like --

25 MR. McCORMICK: All right, here's the thing,

1 MR. LEWIS: Well, only as part of -- that's the  
2 other part to go to. Separate this Water Control  
3 Plan and Engineer's Report from the authority and the  
4 responsibility that the Board has to annually adopt a  
5 budget. Now, what I took the gentleman's question back  
6 there to mean, are there going to be more discussions  
7 about the budget, where the money's going to come from  
8 annually and whatnot.

9 And the answer to that is, yes, there is. You're  
10 in the budget-making process part of the fiscal year of  
11 the District right now, and you will have opportunity on  
12 that.

13 That has nothing to do with what I said about  
14 challenging the Plan. If there is an item in the Plan  
15 that is a flaw, that is wrong, that affects you or your  
16 property in some negative way --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If can you give me an example,  
18 I'm not sure what you're --

19 MR. LEWIS: Well, anytime there's a challenge in  
20 a plan or a plan amendment like that, it's one of two  
21 things, either something technical, there's something  
22 being proposed that either you don't need or you need it  
23 in a different way and it's going to negatively impact  
24 somebody's land, like flooding, now, that's one basis  
25 for a challenge.

1 though. We've set a number; we've got it down to what we  
2 think we can do it for; we've saved money on this canal  
3 and that one; but it might be a little higher on  
4 something else. Then we'd be out.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't see how.

6 MR. McCORMICK: And we wouldn't know what the next  
7 job is going to be, anyway, so when we get the next bid  
8 in, then it's low, so do we re-amend it then?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That doesn't make sense.  
10 We've got a professional engineer who's already  
11 calculated --

12 (Simultaneous discussion.)

13 MR. McCORMICK: Martin, he can't tell you how --  
14 (Simultaneous discussion.)

15 MR. McCORMICK: -- deep someone is going to dig a  
16 ditch.

17 MR. WOHLFARTH: Martin, there are two issues here.  
18 Yes, it will be less. The Plan is not just a plan. The  
19 Plan has Burton's analysis, taking the \$8 million and  
20 prorating it.

21 Now, let's say it's now \$7 million. I would have  
22 to have rewrite the Plan, he would have to rerun all his  
23 numbers, reproduce the whole document, bring it back over  
24 here again. And all it's doing is taking a number that  
25 may never get achieved from eight to seven.

1 So it's an ongoing movement, and a reasonable cost,  
 2 but if he has to totally rerun the model again and I have  
 3 to totally rewrite it and we have to go through this  
 4 process again for another filing and --  
 5 (Simultaneous discussion.)  
 6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Easier just to take it like it  
 7 is and adjust it as we go.  
 8 MR. McCORMICK: We would to have send out another  
 9 mailer for about \$6,000 and let everyone know that we're  
 10 going to have another meeting --  
 11 MR. MAUCK: Mark, I want to get to the heart of  
 12 what I think you're poking at, and I actually agree with  
 13 you.  
 14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I'm just --  
 15 MR. MAUCK: No, no, hold on. I agree with you.  
 16 (Laughter)  
 17 MR. MAUCK: That's your queue. That's your sign.  
 18 (Laughter)  
 19 Okay, listen, Mark, here's what you're getting at,  
 20 I think. You're getting at that we don't want to commit  
 21 to more money, and just for approval's sake, approve more  
 22 money than we need. Is that the heart of it? Because if  
 23 that's the heart of it, I agree with you.  
 24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, not really. In a way,  
 25 but what I'm concerned about right now is, for instance,

1 to, number one, take a look at all of our permits and  
 2 make sure we're in good standing, so identify any work  
 3 that needs to be done.  
 4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You mean St. Johns?  
 5 MR. MAUCK: Yes, that's exactly right, St. Johns.  
 6 Number two is, there are state regulations that  
 7 you always have to meet, which are just kind of above  
 8 and beyond the specifics that are called for under the  
 9 St. Johns permit, so make sure we're not in any trouble  
 10 there either, Rick and IBI.  
 11 And number three is, we want to address any (a)  
 12 design deficiencies that currently exist, or (b) we have  
 13 to deal with kind of a new phenomenon, which is the fact  
 14 that a lot of things are starting to fail now because  
 15 they're at the end of their life.  
 16 So let's just put his shoes on for a second and  
 17 walk a mile. If we were the District engineers, we would  
 18 come out here with those sort of marching orders and say,  
 19 okay, well, we've studied the St. Johns permit and we  
 20 understand everything in it and what it says. And we  
 21 also, because we're professional engineers, understand  
 22 the gravity of how bad it can be if we get that wrong.  
 23 Right?  
 24 Number two is, this District has asked me to make  
 25 sure that I address any deficiencies that we have out

1 Gary is talking about running, and he's got a lot of  
 2 things that he wants to look at and maybe we can look at  
 3 efficiency and more ways to save money, and so I just --  
 4 I don't know if we're going a little too fast. It looks  
 5 like we still have a lot of work to do and ways to save  
 6 money and the people will feel more comfortable if they  
 7 can get all that information and have input and we can  
 8 look at the whole package, and maybe there doesn't need  
 9 to be a bond. I still say that, but people are --  
 10 MR. MAUCK: Don't say "bond", don't say "bond".  
 11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, but that was just his  
 12 exact words.  
 13 (Simultaneous discussion.)  
 14 MR. MAUCK: Bond is a way of financing. And we  
 15 can take short-term loans, we can pay for it out of our  
 16 pocket; it has to do with how much the work costs and  
 17 when the work needs to be done.  
 18 Now, let me kind of go back to what I was about to  
 19 say to you. First is that, on the one hand, I personally  
 20 don't want my name attached to any more money than is  
 21 needed just to have more money.  
 22 On the other hand, if you think about what we've  
 23 asked our District engineer to do, IBI Group, what we've  
 24 said to them is we're getting ready to go stand in front  
 25 of the authorities who govern what we do, and we want you

1 there and the best way to, you know, the best way to  
 2 address them in the most cost-effective manner.  
 3 You know, after working with Rick, and we've had a  
 4 lot of community involvement working with Rick, I haven't  
 5 found a guy yet that gets really excited about finding  
 6 the most expensive way to do it.  
 7 In fact, one of the things I've found, on the  
 8 contrary, is being very open and, you know, kind of  
 9 questioning and helping us question, well, why are we  
 10 always using concrete pipe? I mean, that's the bullet  
 11 proof, and if you think about my pendulum theory of the  
 12 entire world is we started out all steel, so, of course,  
 13 what are you going to do? You're going to respond with  
 14 all concrete. Then what we're going to end up with in  
 15 the middle is a good hybrid of modern materials, you  
 16 know, plastic pipe, HDPE pipe, and concrete structures,  
 17 which are robust, and riprap to keep the turbidity down,  
 18 you know, as works when we experience heavy rain that's  
 19 what gets mixed up and that's we get fined on when that  
 20 gets discharged to the Econ.  
 21 So, you know, if you really want to turn Rick on,  
 22 listen to when he starts talking about finding better  
 23 ways to things and seeing how somebody else might do it  
 24 in a district or talking to someone about the latest and  
 25 greatest product and ways to save money, bring work

1 in-house, as opposed to relying on outside contractors.  
 2 And also hear what he just talked about with Orange  
 3 County. Orange County gives us a set amount of money,  
 4 but they say to Cecil, before I give you a set amount of  
 5 money, you've got to tell me what you're going to do with  
 6 it. So Cecil says, well, okay, we've identified, based  
 7 on the dollars per crossing, if you will, we're going to  
 8 do seven of these crossings out here at Ranger Drainage  
 9 District. So the County looks at it and says, okay,  
 10 that's reasonable; here, we're going to go ahead and  
 11 give you the money.  
 12 Well, Rick and Cecil met with Orange County, and we  
 13 can use their contractor who they've already negotiated  
 14 the cheapest price with to do slip-lining, and we've gone  
 15 back to them and say, what if we don't use the \$250,000  
 16 on those seven crossings doing concrete? What if we use  
 17 that amount of money and allowed us to do more slip-  
 18 lining crossings, including a major crossing at Canal 1,  
 19 and the County says, yeah, sure that would be great.  
 20 You know, that would be a good use of your money  
 21 and a good job, because then when you come back the next  
 22 year for money, for a contribution, which they've been  
 23 doing -- and they have no obligation to do, I might add,  
 24 too -- they see it as us being responsible with their  
 25 money, just like the Board and the District is trying to

1 looks like we're going back to a lot of that. That's  
 2 kind of why I had an issue. I just --  
 3 (Simultaneous discussion.)  
 4 MR. MAUCK: Can I go on record as --  
 5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- more open and exploring  
 6 more opportunities --  
 7 MR. McCORMICK: Hey, Mark, the thing about it is,  
 8 Rick already presented us with the new Amended Water  
 9 Control Plan before we knew the savings we were going to  
 10 get on Canals 3 and 6.  
 11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- (inaudible)  
 12 (Simultaneous discussion.)  
 13 MR. DAVIS: Dave, I'd like to say one thing about  
 14 the road cover crossings with the County.  
 15 MR. MAUCK: Sure.  
 16 MR. DAVIS: This is the first time they've allowed  
 17 us to do slip-lining. And it was their suggestion that  
 18 we use their contractor, because they have a \$8 million  
 19 contract with him, so they just take the two-fifty  
 20 portion and they do that for us.  
 21 And instead of getting seven crossings or seven  
 22 individual pipes, we're going to wind up with 18.  
 23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry, I have to know,  
 24 what is slip-lining?  
 25 MR. DAVIS: That's where they pull a lining through

1 be responsible with the landowners' money. I mean, the  
 2 County is looking over our shoulder and we're going to  
 3 spend what they're going to give us, too.  
 4 I mean, all that said, if you think about it in  
 5 terms of setting the budget on what this work is going  
 6 to cost, Rick -- and Rick and Rick made exactly the same  
 7 point, and it's a good one -- you know, all of the work  
 8 is not done yet in identifying what's got to be done.  
 9 And what if we're a little bit short on something? You  
 10 know, right now is not the time, in my opinion, to hang  
 11 it out and bet that everything is going to go perfectly  
 12 as planned. We just don't want to come up short.  
 13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I understand. That make  
 14 sense, and I see where you're coming from. You have a  
 15 lot of good points. If you can go on record as saying --  
 16 MR. MAUCK: I just did.  
 17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But I'm just saying that you  
 18 allow time for discussion and people's input before you  
 19 make any major decisions on how work is to be done,  
 20 that's all. Because it seems like when all this started,  
 21 it was more of, you know, we're going to do it this way,  
 22 and ideas that were proposed were kind of going up  
 23 against a brick wall. And it looks like now a lot of the  
 24 things that I talked about doing, which people said, you  
 25 know, forget it, it won't work, we're not doing it, it

1 the pipe and fill it with fiberglass; it's hot.  
 2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now I can sleep tonight. I  
 3 sort of knew.  
 4 (Laughter)  
 5 MR. DAVIS: That's what they call slip-lining.  
 6 MR. MAUCK: Tom, did you have any questions? Go  
 7 ahead.  
 8 MR. ZIMMER: Yes. I don't need real long answers,  
 9 just short answers; then we can move on. I don't want to  
 10 take up a lot of time.  
 11 So I'll just kind of start with, the apportionment  
 12 at one time the Burton report -- was it revised? I think  
 13 I saw it on the Web site. I'll either ask you how much  
 14 the apportionment was per area, per basin, or do you guys  
 15 have a copy of that?  
 16 MR. MAUCK: Yes, we have a copy up here if you want  
 17 to check it out after the meeting, sure.  
 18 MR. ZIMMER: On the amendment to the Plan, is there  
 19 a time limit by which you have to execute on that?  
 20 MR. WOHLFARTH: Not specifically on the Plan, but  
 21 we have permit conditions that the Plan supports. And on  
 22 the permit conditions we do have some time limits.  
 23 MR. MAUCK: Correct.  
 24 MR. LEWIS: In Chapter 298 there's no deadline for  
 25 what I'll call implementing the plan; you can do that

1 over many years. And I've see districts do it exactly  
 2 that way, over many years.  
 3 But in this case, some at least of what we have  
 4 to do is going to be driven by St. Johns River Water  
 5 Management District.  
 6 MR. ZIMMER: I think some of the time elements  
 7 discussed before had to do with how you finance it versus  
 8 the amendment to the plan, and that's what we talked  
 9 about --  
 10 MR. WOHLFARTH: No, strictly St. Johns permit. In  
 11 our permit conditions, once we hit a threshold, we have  
 12 two years to do certain things. We're now -- Cecil,  
 13 what are we on now?  
 14 MR. DAVIS: We have three years, and we're on the  
 15 first year.  
 16 MR. WOHLFARTH: So we have time.  
 17 MR. MAUCK: We're coming up to the end of the first  
 18 year.  
 19 MR. WOHLFARTH: We're coming up to the end of the  
 20 first year.  
 21 MR. ZIMMER: We're in the first year of three for  
 22 some of the stuff we need for the permit, and we're doing  
 23 it under the maintenance budget -- (inaudible).  
 24 Are you going to -- if the Plan is amended and  
 25 you decide how you're going to finance it, the Plan is

1 helping the people in the back now, to separate you at  
 2 the end.  
 3 So we want to work on that more to be able to, as  
 4 we're putting it in the maintenance budget, to let people  
 5 pay their fair share of where the work is being done.  
 6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Try to track it.  
 7 MR. McCORMICK: Yeah.  
 8 MR. MAUCK: And, Tom, back to the point, again one  
 9 of the objectives in the budget meeting is to be able  
 10 to -- right now, it's all being thrown into one bucket,  
 11 because there's only bucket created in order to do that,  
 12 and it's called maintenance. It gets apportioned that  
 13 way forever and forever.  
 14 What we are proposing is that we have more than one  
 15 bucket so that maintenance can go one way, and if it's so  
 16 decided in the future, you could have the other bucket or  
 17 buckets go however. You know, that's decided as well.  
 18 But you can actually segregate it so that you can deal  
 19 with one, one way, and another, another way.  
 20 MR. ZIMMER: So by amending the Plan, you think you  
 21 have the ability to maintain those two buckets; is that  
 22 the -- (inaudible)  
 23 MR. MAUCK: But the amended plan doesn't provide  
 24 the mechanism for us to have new buckets; it provides to  
 25 identify through the Burton report who gets what benefit?

1 amended, are we going to reapportion that so that it's  
 2 paid for according to the Burton report -- (inaudible) --  
 3 basin plan allocating, or just leave it at what's been  
 4 done under the maintenance? Or is that just going to  
 5 stay under the maintenance?  
 6 MR. MAUCK: That's a great question, Tom.  
 7 MR. McCORMICK: I spoke with Terry about that  
 8 tonight before the meeting started, because we discussed  
 9 it at the budget meeting. Actually, at the budget  
 10 meeting we looked at putting money into the budget we  
 11 thought we were going to need to chip into the FEMA  
 12 project, because they're giving us the money and also a  
 13 time line to do it in. Even though we're going to be  
 14 getting money back, we're going to have to pay the bills  
 15 ourselves.  
 16 So we came up with a number we felt comfortable  
 17 with to start and it's going to probably go into the  
 18 budget for the next year. And we discussed how we can  
 19 do it at that meeting, if it could be proportioned up.  
 20 And we weren't sure.  
 21 And I spoke to Terry tonight, and he felt we would  
 22 be able to separate the costs with a little help from  
 23 Burton and himself to where if, say, we don't do a bond  
 24 and we have to keep putting it in the budget; we know we  
 25 can always separate it out at the end, but that isn't

1 So it gives us the framework to then act on creating  
 2 buckets, but procedurally it's a different process.  
 3 MR. LEWIS: Yeah, and the Water Control Plan and  
 4 the Burton report, the engineering report, together  
 5 authorize the levy of what I'll call capital improvements  
 6 assessment. I guess you could think of that as a bucket  
 7 separate from the maintenance assessment, which is what  
 8 you've always lived on.  
 9 If something has been paid for out of the  
 10 maintenance assessment that can be handled here, at some  
 11 point you can true it up and credit whoever is carrying  
 12 an inordinate burden at that point.  
 13 But our maintenance assessment is set up as a  
 14 uniform assessment. We can't vary that; it's just  
 15 uniform per acre. So we have to figure that out, and  
 16 that's going to take some work with me and Burton and  
 17 your staff and whatnot. But I think it can be done.  
 18 MR. ZIMMER: Okay. How much do we have to --  
 19 (inaudible) -- we're getting \$800,000 from FEMA, which  
 20 is really good. Is it like a 50/50 --  
 21 MR. DAVIS: 75/25, 75 percent from FEMA and 25  
 22 percent from the District.  
 23 MR. ZIMMER: That's a real good deal.  
 24 Okay, you guys had a budget workshop. I think I  
 25 saw the sign couple of weeks ago. What are the dates for

1 that? Do you have other ones planned out through May?  
 2 MR. MAUCK: They're not set yet. That was just the  
 3 preliminary one.  
 4 MR. ZIMMER: Do you have them at night? When you  
 5 had the one in April, was it at night?  
 6 MR. MAUCK: Yes.  
 7 MR. McCORMICK: We did have the workshop meeting at  
 8 the District office because we weren't anticipating a big  
 9 crowd.  
 10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are they on your Web site?  
 11 MR. MAUCK: Yes.  
 12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think there's also an e-mail  
 13 list for people signed up. We wrote one down at the  
 14 meeting, where everybody put their e-mails down.  
 15 MS. MULLINS: No, it wasn't anything from me. I  
 16 think somebody in the audience had agreed that they would  
 17 do it, but it wasn't anything that I have. I don't know  
 18 who it was, though.  
 19 MR. ZIMMER: So the one thing you were saying, when  
 20 you went back at the budget workshop and looked that our  
 21 assessment has been going up rather than -- I'm talking  
 22 about maintenance -- a lot of that is what you call  
 23 improvements. Do you have a plan going forward for  
 24 identifying what's done to identify it as a maintenance  
 25 rather than an improvement? Because that's kind of what

1 know, what's what.  
 2 MR. ZIMMER: Okay.  
 3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So let me clarify this. The  
 4 assessments are going to be applied to the different  
 5 basins; is that correct?  
 6 MR. MAUCK: Right now, there's only one assessment,  
 7 and that assessment is a maintenance assessment. There  
 8 is no mechanism right now to change it.  
 9 Now, our intent is to address that going forward,  
 10 but there is no -- it would require an action by the  
 11 Board, and actually an action with Terry, to change the  
 12 way things are levied.  
 13 MR. LEWIS: Again, by law we are in the middle of a  
 14 fiscal year. It would be too late this year to get this  
 15 capital improvements assessment on the tax roll.  
 16 You end up having to go -- you have to go to the  
 17 Property Appraiser and the Tax Collector and work out an  
 18 agreement with them. That again takes some work with  
 19 Burton to actually set the roll up with the basins, just  
 20 as you -- so you're correct on that.  
 21 So, having said that, if there is a capital  
 22 improvements assessment, that will not appear on  
 23 anybody's tax bill this year. It would begin on the tax  
 24 bill that you get for year 2010-2011.  
 25 MR. JIMINEZ: We go back to the same problem of

1 you found in the past, that you were doing improvements  
 2 under the maintenance budget.  
 3 MR. MAUCK: Yes, I mean, we have a plan to come up  
 4 with a good plan and be able to segregate it. But what  
 5 we did decide unanimously was that it was agreed, you  
 6 know, if you look at costs and the costs keep rising,  
 7 what's really going on is you have one curve, which is  
 8 maintenance, which is really going up only by fuel  
 9 surcharge, increase in fuel costs, and by incremental  
 10 costs in labor.  
 11 But, in fact, in some cases we've become more  
 12 efficient, so that curve is actually pretty flat. What's  
 13 actually going up is the curve that gets built on top of  
 14 it, which is the incremental upcharge of improvements,  
 15 of starting to get beyond the threshold of, you know, I  
 16 changed the wiper blades and changed the oil filter, to,  
 17 I changed the transmission and the rear-end, if you let  
 18 me use a car analogy.  
 19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If you can better identify  
 20 where they fit in all that --  
 21 MR. MAUCK: Right.  
 22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- is the plan to move into  
 23 maintenance -- (inaudible)  
 24 MR. MAUCK: The answer is yes. We've got to begin  
 25 by trying to segregate it, trying to figure out, you

1 what is maintenance and what is capital improvement.  
 2 I think all the ideas that have come about in the  
 3 last meetings, I see no capital improvement. Capital  
 4 improvement is when you enlarge a house, you add a room  
 5 or you add a porch; that is capital improvement. But if  
 6 you change a pipe in your faucet, that is not capital  
 7 improvement; that is a maintenance job. If you make a  
 8 major maintenance job, like changing the roof, that is  
 9 not capital improvement; that is a maintenance job.  
 10 So I see no capital improvement in all these things  
 11 that you're talking about.  
 12 MR. McCORMICK: Kind of like changing the faucet or  
 13 ripping concrete out and doing a re-pipe.  
 14 MR. JIMINEZ: It's a maintenance job.  
 15 MR. MAUCK: Well, you've got to be careful; it's  
 16 doesn't track exactly to remodeling, because what ends up  
 17 happening is, when you get into addressing, let's say, a  
 18 failed pipe, the folks that we would have to go permit  
 19 with would consider that a major improvement. They would  
 20 not consider that as a -- you know, by their definition;  
 21 it's not really our definition; it's their definition.  
 22 And there are things that -- believe me, there's no  
 23 advantage -- Rick will tell you, there's no advantage to  
 24 making a bigger fuss about something contractually or  
 25 from a permit standpoint than it really is.

1 However, the St. Johns, who Rick works with  
2 regularly, the Orange County folks, they ultimately help  
3 determine to what extent we have to provide backup and  
4 analysis as part of our permitting process. We can't  
5 just go do this work without permits and without asking  
6 for permission and informing the people who we report to  
7 from a permit standpoint what we're doing.

8 MR. JIMINEZ: The implication is great. If you  
9 talk about capital improvements, then you can ask the  
10 landowners to finance that with "X" amount of money or  
11 taxing or whatever. But if it's a maintenance job, the  
12 maintenance, whether small or big, has to come from the  
13 budget.

14 So the implication is great. So the budget has to  
15 face minor and major repairs and make the structure you  
16 are talking about what these water plans are just major  
17 repairs that have been faced in the past by previous  
18 boards.

19 MR. MAUCK: I'm sorry, what was your last comment?  
20 I want to understand that.

21 MR. JIMINEZ: Previous boards didn't put the money  
22 in, which is true, because the landowners never wanted to  
23 spend money to do it.

24 MR. MAUCK: Yeah, and I --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But it's all going to be

1 (inaudible) -- think of maintenance, this guy's may not  
2 be the same as what I go by that says you have to treat  
3 it this way and that way.

4 MR. MAUCK: And I've run into, even in commercial  
5 settings, commercial business settings, where capital  
6 improvements, something that is declared a capital  
7 improvement from an asset and depreciation standpoint  
8 with them, if the cost of the maintenance exceeds a  
9 certain value or a certain percentage of either the  
10 initial buy, so if we're working on a job and the  
11 original piece that we're working on from doing some  
12 maintenance and repair on was, say, a million dollars,  
13 and the repair is going to cost \$600,000, they'd say,  
14 that's 60 percent of what we paid for it originally;  
15 we're going to declare it a capital improvement. And  
16 then they're going to treat it accordingly in their  
17 internal accounting system.

18 So, good point.

19 Yes?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The pipe, he talked about the  
21 canal pump down. Are you talking about possibly going  
22 down there while the water was down? Is there going to  
23 be something -- (inaudible) -- who's going to do that?

24 MR. MAUCK: There's no decision yet on who's going  
25 to do the work. What's being proposed right now and

1 assessed to us. One way or the other, we're going to pay  
2 for it, so I'm not sure I understand your point.

3 MR. MAUCK: Here's what I would say to that: I  
4 could probably spend a lot of time and energy getting  
5 upset about it, and whoever sold property and got out  
6 before this came due, they're the ones that made out?

7 But I feel our job now is, being the ones here now,  
8 we have to address and deal with it now and we have to  
9 come up with a good plan going forward and trying to get  
10 the best work done.

11 If there was some way to back-charge them, I would  
12 have already thought about that, and I can't figure it  
13 out.

14 I appreciate your comment, though. We are trying  
15 our best to keep costs down. I don't know what more to  
16 say, and to protect the neighborhood.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There is one thing he said.  
18 I have a rental condominium, so I've never added anything  
19 to it, and when I file my federal income tax, the air  
20 conditioner or the carpet or appliances, I can't declare  
21 that as maintenance on my tax return; that's a capital  
22 improvement that I have to depreciate every time.

23 (Inaudible) -- generally, if I haven't added a room --  
24 there are just certain things the federal government  
25 lets you depreciate over the years. And they --

1 explored is that the District would do it, would self-  
2 perform that.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In-house?

4 MR. MAUCK: In-house, correct.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (inaudible) -- do this now?  
6 Or I know you talked about bringing in somebody to help  
7 solve that.

8 MR. MAUCK: Well, we're looking right now. We  
9 haven't found the person yet, but I think they're  
10 beginning to go out, right, for that?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How do you handle this process  
12 as far as hiring somebody to do that work? I guess put  
13 them on the payroll of Ranger Drainage?

14 MR. MAUCK: What would happen is, as the procedure  
15 goes, I guess Dawn would take care of the job postings,  
16 and the person would be interviewed by Cecil and Dawn,  
17 and I'm sure the person would be interviewed by the Board  
18 as well; then a final decision will be made.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Where are you at on that  
20 process?

21 MR. MAUCK: We're either getting ready to post it  
22 or it's posted.

23 MR. DAVIS: It will be posted this week or first of  
24 next week.

25 MR. MAUCK: Yes?

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hey, Dave. First of all, you  
2 guys are doing a great job. We at least have a voice,  
3 you know, at the end of the day. You turn it over to  
4 somebody down in Orange County, they're going to tell  
5 you what taxes you're going to pay and you're not going  
6 to have a voice. So this is good.

7 Is the St. Johns permit process driven by density  
8 or the time or --

9 MR. DAVIS: Density.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If the density platform is now  
11 changing -- I'm just going to go ahead and bring up the  
12 Orange County Public Schools. They're acquiring or have  
13 acquired about a hundred acres, 88 acres, which is going  
14 to change the District. I think we've got 5600 acres?  
15 How does that come into play, knowing what's happening  
16 with the school, when it comes to density, if that  
17 density is going to change dramatically?

18 MR. WOHLFARTH: The term "density" has a few  
19 definitions, as is. It's not density; it's the  
20 percentage of completion of what was planned for, when  
21 we hit 40 percent of the buildings being completed. So  
22 on a canal, if that hit 40 percent, that's what triggers  
23 it.

24 The fact that we're taking units out of where the  
25 schools are going does not affect that at all.

1 I think, had everything been figured out -- my  
2 personal take on it, had everything been figured out  
3 back then, we'd be like everybody else in the State of  
4 Florida, with two or three other exceptions, and we would  
5 have had a term limit, an expiration date on our permit,  
6 just like the South Florida districts that Terry works  
7 with. They have to go back to the drawing board at the  
8 expiration of their term, which is what, seven or ten  
9 years?

10 MR. DAVIS: Most of them are five.

11 MR. LEWIS: Five.

12 MR. MAUCK: Five years? Okay.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we're pretty fortunate.

14 MR. MAUCK: Absolutely. That's why, you know, I  
15 think the difference between Dave Mauck -- and I think I  
16 speak for Rick and Gus too -- sitting on that side of the  
17 table, when you're on this side of the table, you're in  
18 possession to protect this golden ticket.

19 And it's something you take very -- it becomes very  
20 humbling on this side. It's easy to say there are things  
21 that you don't have to do, but when you're actually in  
22 possession of it on this side of the table, you realize,  
23 I don't want to be the one to go down in Wedgfield  
24 history as the one who screwed it up.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

1 MR. MAUCK: And we just hit 40. And there's  
2 another one that's coming in the future, and that's when  
3 we hit 70. There's a 40/70 number. So you don't have to  
4 do anything up to 40, except if your pipes are rusted,  
5 you have to take care of them. But then at 40 you have  
6 to then go back and revise your plan. And there's  
7 another one again that's in the future, and that's going  
8 to be at 70.

9 So, you know, as the build-out goes on in  
10 Wedgfield, there will be a time in the future, with the  
11 canals and with other things, that once you reach future  
12 conditions, that you have to act also.

13 So the St. Johns permit is an interesting one. I  
14 found it interesting to read because it was kind of --  
15 my takeaway from it was, it was kind of a semi-good/bad  
16 compromise, that they couldn't figure out everything  
17 right then, so they just put it off. So, okay, this is  
18 what you have to do now, but when you hit 40 percent,  
19 talk to us again in the future, and when you hit 70  
20 percent, talk to us again in the future even later than  
21 that, and we'll tell you what you have to do.

22 So there's a lot of provisions like that in this.  
23 It's a living, breathing permit, which we kind of  
24 accidentally backed into and doesn't have an expiration  
25 date.

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

2 MR. MAUCK: Questions? Comments? Observations?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What are the other dates for  
4 the budget meetings?

5 MR. MAUCK: They haven't been established yet, no,  
6 ma'am.

7 Do you have a question? No?

8 MR. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, it would be appropriate  
9 to close the public hearing at this point and just go  
10 ahead and officially declare it closed. Then at this  
11 point the question is for the members of the Board to  
12 consider adoption of a resolution that in effect recites  
13 the procedural history of all that we've done so far and  
14 then approves the Water Control Plan Amendment and  
15 Engineer's Report.

16 MR. MAUCK: Okay.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Comment. I've been talking  
18 to a lot of people, house by house, door to door, and  
19 they've been telling me those eight or \$10 million, that  
20 bond that we're going to get, how we going to pay that?  
21 If we're going to pay that, that's going to be, say,  
22 eight or \$10 million going to be maybe 20 years, 30  
23 years?

24 And also they've been telling me how, if we pay  
25 tax, how do we pay Ranger Drainage? How do we pay FEMA



1 and we pay the other things that we have that you people  
2 have to battle, and pay on a mortgage on our house and  
3 mortgage on our land? People are afraid, a lot of  
4 people are afraid, you know, of that mortgage. It is  
5 a mortgage, it's a bond; it's the same thing, like if  
6 you're going to borrow some money.

7 My question is: If you're going to approve it, so  
8 how many people that are going to say yes? Or how many  
9 people are going to say no? Because I know from the  
10 bottom of my heart that more than 90 percent of the  
11 people that live right here in Wedgefield, they don't  
12 want that bond.

13 So now it's not time to talk about getting money,  
14 to get any money, because the economy is down. I got a  
15 house, I got a -- I can't afford it, to pay tax and pay  
16 the Ranger Drainage.

17 So, right now, I don't know what to do, if I'm  
18 going to sell my place. If I want to sell my place,  
19 who's going to buy it? Because the way I see it, there's  
20 going to be another mortgage on my own house, on my own  
21 land.

22 So a lot of people, most of the people that I've  
23 been talking to say, Jerry, let's stop that, because if  
24 we have to do that, okay, maintain it, do the job, clean  
25 the canal, the pipe, or whatever, we have to do that. I

1 So trying to find the best solution going forward  
2 so that it doesn't put undue burden on the landowners,  
3 this is not easy and it's not something I take lightly.  
4 I think I'm trying very hard personally to find the  
5 balance between -- on one hand, I have people saying to  
6 me, we don't want to be DeLand, we don't want to be on  
7 the news from a flooding standpoint. And, quite frankly,  
8 during Tropical Storm Fay there have been some impressive  
9 television moments that could have been on the news, and  
10 we're going to address those here with this FEMA money.

11 And, on the other hand, you know, I have people  
12 that, as I said, I have people, as I said, too, make sure  
13 you don't jeopardize our permit. On the other hand, I  
14 know how many foreclosures are out here; I know how  
15 people are on fixed incomes and how hard it is right now.  
16 I do. And it just makes everything more difficult.

17 And I just tell you humbly, that's how I approach  
18 this, is trying to find that balance in between. And  
19 I'd like to believe that I was voted up here to do my  
20 job and to understand fully what I'm getting into and to  
21 understand the facts and the details and to be entrusted  
22 with trying to make any best decisions.

23 And I'll just tell you, I'm speaking personally now  
24 to you, that that's how I approach it. I am aware how  
25 hard it is. I do know that it's tough. And I also know

1 agree with that; I know we have to do that.

2 But, now, to get eight or \$10 million, eight or  
3 \$10 million, it's going to come out \$20 million, because  
4 we have to pay it back little by little.

5 So a lot of people are afraid.

6 MR. MAUCK: I can tell you this, the timing that  
7 no one could have predicted, that in 2009 and 2008 that  
8 the economy would go to the bottom at the same time that  
9 we have the conditions of a permit that have to be met  
10 that require us to go do other things at the same time  
11 that we have had, you know, overlooked infrastructure  
12 repair work that had to be done to the extent now that  
13 there are some things that just really seriously need to  
14 be done because we are in fear that we have put our  
15 permit in jeopardy, like these riser barrels out there,  
16 if we don't maintain certain amounts of water in certain  
17 sections of canals, we're in violation of our permit.

18 So just for me, personally, and I'm speaking  
19 personally, that sitting here as a Board member and also  
20 as a person that pays taxes out here, too, by the way, to  
21 have all these things come together at all the wrong time  
22 is something that -- as you know, I don't get paid a lot  
23 of money to sit up here; I don't get paid a lot of money  
24 to research and read and talk to these guys, meaning the  
25 engineers, and so forth, I do all that on my own time.

1 the situation that we're in, and navigating out of here  
2 is not easy.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Also, also, there's so many  
4 people, when they knock on the door of the house, there's  
5 nobody in it. The people is out. So the people -- I'm a  
6 builder; I build houses. I bought land here to build,  
7 but I don't be able to build because who's going to buy  
8 the house? When I bought my piece of property, only I  
9 was paying \$600. So now you know how much I pay? Almost  
10 or over \$2,600. For a piece of land? Do you know how  
11 much I pay for my house? \$10,000.

12 Ranger, if we bond the eight or \$10 million, hey,  
13 I have to pay more. So a lot of people, they bought  
14 the land over here, they don't want to build over here  
15 anymore. They want to sell, but who's going to buy that  
16 land?

17 MR. MAUCK: Right, I understand.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now we're talking about money  
19 and bond, money and bond. But, listen, we have to do  
20 something. We have to cut that one down. We have to  
21 get -- the County, we already got more than three or \$400  
22 we're going to send to Tallahassee to see what they're  
23 going to do for us. And people, they want to move what's  
24 going around --

25 MR. MAUCK: Well, I want to tell you that people

1 have asked me what can they do. I mean, people feel  
2 outraged that they pay Orange County tax and they pay  
3 RDD on top of that.

4 And while I may feel the way I feel about it, it  
5 was the deal that I signed up to when I bought property  
6 out in Wedgefield. I mean, that hasn't changed. It  
7 wasn't that RDD came into existence after with respect  
8 out here and there was no RDD.

9 You know, instead of -- the District is trying  
10 very hard to balance all these issues and find the best  
11 solution for landowners. And instead of, what I'd like  
12 to see happen I'd like to see the community and the  
13 District work together to go to the Governor's office  
14 and other places.

15 I'd ask if you'd read my letter that's on the Web  
16 site. I tried to reach for everything I could possibly  
17 reach for on behalf of the landowners out here in  
18 pointing out that we discharge water to one of the  
19 pristine waters of Florida, that there's an environmental  
20 benefit, you know, there's a hell of a lot of taxpayers  
21 and voters that live out here.

22 And any letters of support to the Governor's office  
23 or to anyone, Orange County, EPD, in support of RDD and  
24 in support our efforts to get funding from other places  
25 would be of benefit.

1 What I run into more often, though, is, in spite  
2 of us trying to figure out the best ways to move forward,  
3 to find that there are letters to Tallahassee which call  
4 everything into question that we're doing. And, you  
5 know, it causes people to second-guess, well, what's  
6 RDD all about? And that's tough. It's tough.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Also -- excuse me. Also, what  
8 we got right here in Wedgefield? Alligators? Snakes?  
9 Now they raise it up and down to pay -- how they call  
10 it -- the path, you know, it was \$1.25, now it's \$1.50.  
11 Gas is even going up.

12 VOICE: The toll?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The toll, they raise the toll.  
14 So now I've been lots of times to the County, Orlando  
15 county, and they say, why does Ranger, why they don't  
16 make like, you know, ten, twelve, 20 people and come  
17 together and discuss all of that. They say, we got lots  
18 of things we can do down in the county. But I don't see  
19 Dave and Richard, I don't see any letters you joining the  
20 way. We have to go to the County and see what we can do  
21 about it.

22 Can you please do that for us? And we can go,  
23 maybe ten, 25 people over there, together, and have a  
24 meeting, talk to those people and tell them what is going  
25 on in Wedgefield.

1 MR. MAUCK: Well, I'll tell you that -- Rick, how  
2 recently were you at the county

3 MR. WOHLFARTH: Last week.

4 MR. MAUCK: I mean, we're down at the County trying  
5 to get everything we can possibly get. I just want you  
6 to know there's a lot more going on than just the monthly  
7 meetings. We're trying very hard to, you know, to --  
8 again, I call it other people's money.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I heard this gentleman talk  
10 about twenty or \$30,000, if I understood him, as  
11 potential assessment. Can we get some reality about, in  
12 the worst-case scenario, if all this work were to be done  
13 in one year and was not financed, just for discussion  
14 purposes, what's the ballpark figure on a per-acre basis  
15 on the Burton report?

16 Because did I understand you correctly to talk  
17 about twenty or \$30,000, that people thought this was  
18 going to cost individually?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I didn't talk about twenty  
20 or \$30,000. I talk about eight or \$10 million maybe go  
21 up to twenty or \$30 million.

22 MR. MAUCK: Well, he just said it can ever go  
23 beyond -- don't say ten and don't say thirty. It can  
24 never go beyond eight. It can't go beyond what's in the  
25 current Water Control Plan. It can't. I mean, the only

1 way that that could happen is if someone initiated a  
2 Fourth Amended Water Control Plan, because that's what  
3 would have to happen.

4 This Water Control Amendment Plan amendment process  
5 is the only process which consists of a series of public  
6 meetings, engineer's reports, feasibility studies,  
7 assessment reports like Burton has done for us, that's  
8 the only way that it could come about.

9 Once this -- I should say if this plan is amended,  
10 the cap is \$8 million, and that's it. It can't go to  
11 thirty.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What he means is, to  
13 explain to us, once that you -- if you got the eight or  
14 \$10 million and, you know, you would have to pay interest  
15 on it, and through the years it would turn into twenty or  
16 \$30 million, is what he's trying to say, not that it's --  
17 (inaudible) going to become twenty or \$30 million.

18 He's trying to say for you to explain to us that if  
19 you get the bond, it's going to be paid in a time span of  
20 maybe twenty or thirty years and it's going to become  
21 like \$30 million because of the interest that's going  
22 to be paid on it. That's what he's talking about.

23 MR. MAUCK: Yeah, I understand that.

24 (Simultaneous discussion.)

25 MR. MAUCK: I understand that. And, in fact, the

Page 73

1 only way that the bond folks or any financier would work  
2 is, first of all, they would look at the useful life of  
3 everything. Just like you can't finance a car for 15  
4 years, you're lucky if you get five or even six, but  
5 because of the useful life of it, you can't finance it  
6 over 30 years.

7 So there are a number of things that are in there,  
8 which I can tell you right now I'd have a hard time, from  
9 a credibility standpoint, sitting in front of anyone  
10 asking them to finance it over 30 years. I mean, the  
11 work we're doing on the canals, the tree-grinding, that  
12 sort of thing, you know, useful life, two, three years  
13 maybe, tops.

14 So there's a whole mix of things that are in there.

15 I will tell you this: If the objective is to keep  
16 the costs per year to a minimum, you think about how  
17 you're going to buy a car, right? In one year, if I'm  
18 going to pay for that car all in one year, my cost this  
19 year might be \$25,000. The next year I'm only paying  
20 maintenance. But if my objective is to walk into the  
21 dealership and get out of there for the least cost per  
22 month, it's going to be very different. You're going to  
23 finance it. That's the way it is.

24 You know, you can't have both. You can't pay no  
25 interest and keep the funds low. If there was a way to

Page 74

1 do that, I'd love to know, but I don't know of a way to  
2 do that.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I understand that. I was just  
4 trying to explain to you what he was saying.

5 (Simultaneous discussion.)

6 MR. MAUCK: And I do understand. At the end of the  
7 day, we would only be able to finance, if we went down a  
8 finance path, the actual amount of the work, the actual  
9 amount of the work. So if we're right and we can get  
10 \$8-1/2 million done for \$5-1/2 million or \$5 million,  
11 then that would actually be the cost that would go into  
12 a financing bucket.

13 And, again, that would be for a future time to talk  
14 about how we would take care of all that.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I've got a question, Dave,  
16 because you confused me that 40/70 percent. I know the  
17 job's got to be done. I've seen on TV, people with water  
18 up to their roof, so we've got to take care of the  
19 problem. The money you guys are asking for, is that  
20 going to cover everything that we need to do in  
21 Wedgefield? Or do we need to just cover the 40 percent  
22 and later on in a couple of years when we have another  
23 problem like this -- what do you mean by the 40 and 70  
24 percent?

25 MR. MAUCK: That's a great question, and I'm going

Page 75

1 to answer that. This is not covering everything that  
2 would need to be built out in Wedgefield. If you think  
3 about it, there have been -- there's the First Amended  
4 Water Control Plan, the Second Amended Water Control  
5 Plan, the Third Amended Water Control Plan, all  
6 implemented between approximately 1970 and 2009. Now  
7 we're looking at the Third Amended Water Control Plan.  
8 So there's been the original, first and second, and then  
9 this is potentially the third in 30 years. Right? Yeah,  
10 more than 30 years.

11 So the next time that when we meet 70 percent, it's  
12 going to be a function of how quickly some of this stuff  
13 gets built out. Right now in a poor economy and housing  
14 slump, it's not going to be any time soon.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Another question: Considering  
16 what he says about going to Orange County, we do pay a  
17 lot of money to Orange County --

18 MR. MAUCK: I know.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- in taxes. And I don't know  
20 what they're doing -- I'm going to find out what they are  
21 doing with that money, because we do go to Orange County,  
22 we all vote here. We have to go in a big group, and I  
23 mean everybody that lives here. That's what he is  
24 talking about, go to Orange County and ask why, if this  
25 is a District, why we got to fix our own problems here,

Page 76

1 why we have to pay Orange County so much.

2 I pay almost \$5,000 in taxes for four acres. I'm  
3 waiting to see what's going to happen, because I've got  
4 the money to build, and I ain't going to build with these  
5 problems, because I can't afford \$12,000 in taxes every  
6 year. I can't.

7 MR. MAUCK: Right.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I'm willing to sell and  
9 move someplace else.

10 But we have to go to Orange County and maybe you  
11 guys could do something as a member, organize something,  
12 and go to Orange County and talk to them or talk to the  
13 guy who's responsible for this area here in Orange County  
14 and demand why.

15 They've got to cut our taxes down, because we're  
16 here by ourselves. We fix our problems. I know the  
17 job's got to be done. If you need an extra hand, I will  
18 come on my days off and help you guys do anything you  
19 need me to, because the job's got to be done. There's  
20 no question about it.

21 We see that we're paying so much money to Orange  
22 County, then on top of that we have to pay Ranger  
23 Drainage. I know when I bought my property I knew that  
24 we had to pay Ranger Drainage and we were responsible for  
25 this and that, but it wasn't that much money, you know.

1 But if we go together to Orange County and then  
 2 demand from them to lower our taxes, or something.  
 3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Dave, do you agree a lot of --  
 4 (inaudible) -- we don't have to pay -- (inaudible).  
 5 MR. DAVIS: The State is going to dish it out. We  
 6 sent seven copies for the \$8 million to Tallahassee.  
 7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pardon me?  
 8 MR. DAVIS: We sent a package to Tallahassee for  
 9 the \$8 million, if they share will share with us.  
 10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Some of us support what you've  
 11 done, but I don't know who exactly I'd write to.  
 12 MR. MAUCK: It's all in the letter.  
 13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pardon me?  
 14 MR. MAUCK: Those folks that are copied on the  
 15 letter.  
 16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So if I look on the letter,  
 17 I'll see like my senator or whoever is responsible for  
 18 this and --  
 19 MR. MAUCK: Well, it went to --  
 20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- and I could write a letter  
 21 supporting what you sent? Do we have the addresses?  
 22 MR. MAUCK: Do you care to comment on the letter,  
 23 Terry?  
 24 MR. LEWIS: Yes. The addresses won't be on the  
 25 "cc's", but the names of the people will. It was the

1 Yes, ma'am?  
 2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd like to write in support.  
 3 I think it's a good idea. As long as we're talking about  
 4 money, I have to put my two cents in.  
 5 (Laughter)  
 6 MR. MAUCK: We'll take it, we'll take it, in the  
 7 budget.  
 8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If you decide, and I know this  
 9 is premature, but if you decide to pay for everything in  
 10 one or two years, that's going to put an undue burden on  
 11 people who are retired, and you're talking about me,  
 12 that particular money out of our savings, which we have  
 13 no way of putting back in.  
 14 But if you finance it, we can afford that over  
 15 time. So that's another thing to keep in mind.  
 16 MR. McCORMICK: I think that's something a lot of  
 17 people don't understand. They think they know what  
 18 everybody wants, but everybody wants something different.  
 19 And we're trying to find a balancing act to please  
 20 everyone.  
 21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it's important that we  
 22 share the facts and try to not share frightening things.  
 23 MR. McCORMICK: When people go door to door and  
 24 tell people stuff when they don't have the information  
 25 correctly themselves, they scare people to death. And

1 Governor, your state representative, I believe, your  
 2 state senator, your two your congressmen, and then --  
 3 (Simultaneous discussion.)  
 4 MR. LEWIS: -- then your two U.S. senators, Nelson  
 5 and Martinez.  
 6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Take a look at the Wedgefield  
 7 Homeowners Association website. Some of that information  
 8 is there. And Commissioner Segal is our Orange County  
 9 commissioner.  
 10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The County really doesn't  
 11 have -- (inaudible) You're better off going to the  
 12 State.  
 13 MR. MAUCK: It depends on what you're after.  
 14 You know, there's been a lot of discussion about shovel-  
 15 ready projects, and what I tried to point out in the  
 16 letter is, you know, we're not a "Johnny-come-lately",  
 17 so to speak. We've actually been working on this a  
 18 couple of years, and we really do have things that are  
 19 ready to go, and the amount of work we have puts an undue  
 20 burden on the 10,000 or so people who live and vote out  
 21 here.  
 22 Anyway, I have a copy of it here if anyone wants to  
 23 read it over after the meeting.  
 24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's on Web site.  
 25 MR. MAUCK: Yes, it is.

1 when you go to somebody's door and talk about \$8 million,  
 2 they don't want it, even when they don't know what it's  
 3 for.  
 4 It's like saying you can't do it, but like in your  
 5 car analogy, you can't go borrow money for oil when  
 6 there's nothing in the motor, but you've got to go to  
 7 work, because we've got stuff we've got to do, and we've  
 8 got too try to do it the best way we can at the least  
 9 cost to the people.  
 10 MR. HEWITT: I think, too, when this process  
 11 started, I see a different atmosphere here now. And I  
 12 have to say -- don't fall out of your chair, Dave --  
 13 (Laughter)  
 14 MR. HEWITT: -- but I see a lot of positive things  
 15 happening, and I hope it's genuine. Seems you're really  
 16 concerned about the people, because everybody wants the  
 17 same thing, but we're stretched for money.  
 18 MR. MAUCK: I agree with you, Mark.  
 19 MR. HEWITT: I see you guys working hard, and I see  
 20 positive things happening. I hope we can just explore  
 21 every option.  
 22 MR. MAUCK: I think at the end of the day you're  
 23 right, everyone wants the same thing. They don't want  
 24 to pay for any waste, and they want to pay the least cost  
 25 that they actually have to.

1 MR. HEWITT: At first there was a lot of friction,  
 2 and people, you know -- that's one reason I haven't -- i  
 3 should be at more meetings, I can't, but, you know, I  
 4 think that's important for a lot of people.  
 5 MR. MAUCK: Thank you.  
 6 Yes, sir?  
 7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We've got to think about the  
 8 the senior citizens and retired people. This place is  
 9 like 70 percent senior citizens, all the people. They  
 10 live on a fixed income, and we cannot afford to pay more.  
 11 We already pay enough. I think we should go maintenance  
 12 as needed, not to try to do everything one, two, three.  
 13 Nobody did nothing for 25 years. I've been here  
 14 for 17 years. Now I see a lot of growth, I see a lot of  
 15 work come, I see the water come and the next day go away.  
 16 The houses built 18 inches above the crown of the  
 17 road, and if the house is 18 inches above the crown of  
 18 the road, I never see a crown of road flood. That means  
 19 we have no water rise like you say before. The houses  
 20 built 18 inches by the code, above the crown of the road.  
 21 MR. MAUCK: Why would I make that up?  
 22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You say a lot of people got  
 23 stuck in their garage.  
 24 MR. McCORMICK: Fernando, you don't have to wait  
 25 for a storm. I thought the same thing. I thought --

1 what I did. I spend about \$20,000. I brought my house  
 2 way up, and my driveway is higher. So what happens is,  
 3 this guy, he don't want to spend no money on the  
 4 driveway. He don't want to spend no money to buy door.  
 5 So that's the reason there's water there. But that's not  
 6 my problem. I don't have to pay for that --  
 7 (Simultaneous discussion.)  
 8 MR. McCORMICK: No, that's not true. We're talking  
 9 about houses that were built 20 years ago-plus. They  
 10 were built to code. There's a deficiency in the  
 11 drainage, and it needs to be fixed. That's what we're  
 12 talking about, not somebody that didn't put enough dirt  
 13 in their yard.  
 14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I've been here for quite a  
 15 while, too. Who didn't -- (inaudible) -- I don't see no  
 16 water.  
 17 (Simultaneous discussion.)  
 18 MR. LEWIS: I think we've probably reached the end  
 19 of the comments here. I'd go ahead and close the hearing  
 20 at this point.  
 21 MR. MAUCK: I appreciate all the comments, and I  
 22 will close the public comments portion of the meeting  
 23 right now. And I guess we will deliberate on this  
 24 resolution.  
 25 MR. McCORMICK: Isn't the last year long enough?

1 FERNANDO: I've been here for 18 years.  
 2 MR. McCORMICK: Wait, let me finish. We got  
 3 elected. I was out driving in the rain, and who did I  
 4 bump into but Dave out driving in the rain. We both  
 5 bumped into each other over on Baker while we had a guy  
 6 standing out there in his garage, with his garage door  
 7 up, the water's halfway up to his garage. It wasn't a  
 8 super-hard rain, but it was a quick one that came.  
 9 And I said, man, this is pretty bad. And he said,  
 10 this is what i get every time it rains.  
 11 FERNANDO: He broke the law; he don't build the  
 12 house 18 inches above the crown of the road.  
 13 MR. DAVIS: It is.  
 14 MR. McCORMICK: It is. You know, you're talking  
 15 about that. And capital improvements, with capital  
 16 improvements they're going to rip the side of Bancroft up  
 17 and re-route pipe from 5 to 6.  
 18 FERNANDO: We live on fixed income; we got nobody  
 19 to buy the house. We got every penny invested here in  
 20 Wedgefield. We need some help. Please.  
 21 MR. MAUCK: i hear you. I do.  
 22 FERNANDO: Have a conscience. Don't throw our  
 23 money away.  
 24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know what happens over  
 25 there? Those people who build a house, they don't did

1 (Laughter)  
 2 MR. McCORMICK: We don't need to deliberate  
 3 anymore.  
 4 MR. MAUCK: Well, we have three options. We have  
 5 the option to approve as is, we have an option to approve  
 6 with modifications, and we have an option to reject this  
 7 Third Amended Water Control Plan.  
 8 So I guess if we took a straw vote --  
 9 MR. McCORMICK: I make a motion -- straw vote, I  
 10 accept it as is.  
 11 MR. DESAUFELS: Yes.  
 12 MR. MAUCK: I would agree.  
 13 MR. McCORMICK: So I make a motion that we accept  
 14 the Amended -- the Third Amended Water Control Plan.  
 15 MR. LEWIS: The motion should be to approve the  
 16 Third Amended Water Control Plan and Engineer's Report  
 17 as specified in the resolution.  
 18 Dawn, is it 2009-3?  
 19 MS. MULLINS: Yes, it is.  
 20 MR. McCORMICK: It's no longer the Amended --  
 21 MR. LEWIS: Yes, it should be the Third Amended  
 22 Water Control Plan and Engineer's Report, approve them as  
 23 recommended or as stated in Resolution 2009-3.  
 24 MR. McCORMICK: Do I have to repeat it?  
 25 (Laughter)

1 MR. LEWIS: You can just --  
 2 MR. McCORMICK: Do I need to say all that again?  
 3 MR. LEWIS: No, if you move the motion as I stated  
 4 it.  
 5 MR. McCORMICK: Okay, I move that we accept it as  
 6 Terry stated.  
 7 MR. DESAUTELS: Second.  
 8 MR. MAUCK: I would also agree.  
 9 MR. McCORMICK: And I make a motion we adjourn.  
 10 (Laughter )  
 11 MR. MAUCK: Do I hear a second to adjourn?  
 12 MR. DESAUTELS: Adjourn.  
 13 (Applause)  
 14 MR. MAUCK: Thank you very much.  
 15 (Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded at 8:10  
 16 o'clock p.m.)

17 \* \* \* \* \*

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER  
 2 STATE OF FLORIDA:  
 3 COUNTY OF LAKE:  
 4 I, BEVERLY HEFFELFINGER, Stenograph Shorthand Reporter,  
 5 Notary Public, State of Florida at Large, certify that I was  
 6 authorized to and did stenographically report the above and  
 7 foregoing proceedings, and that thereafter my stenotype notes  
 8 were reduced to typewritten form with the aid of computerized  
 9 transcription; and I further certify that the foregoing pages,  
 10 numbered 4 through 85, inclusive, contain a full, true and  
 11 accurate transcription of my stenotype notes taken therein.  
 12 I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I am not of counsel for, nor  
 13 related to, any party herein or attorney involved herein,  
 14 nor am I financially interested in these proceedings.

15  
16 Dated this 29th day of May, 2009.

17  
18  
19 *Beverly Heffelfinger*  
 20 Beverly Heffelfinger, Notary Public  
 State of Florida at Large

