

**MINUTES OF MEETING
VISTA LAKES
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT**

The regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of the Vista Lakes Community Development District was held on Thursday, November 11, 2010 at 10:00 A.M. at the Vista Lakes Clubhouse, 8841 Lee Vista Boulevard, Orlando, Florida.

Present and constituting a quorum were:

John Rose	Chairman
Randy Holihan	Vice Chairman
James Shelton	Assistant Secretary
Ron Cumello	Assistant Secretary
Dr. Harold G. Banks	Assistant Secretary

Also present were:

Gary L. Moyer	Manager: Moyer Management Group
Scott Clark	Clark & Albaugh, LLP.
Barry Roy	Engineer: Bowyer-Singleton
Lee Smith	Holland & Knight
Gary van der Laan	Leland Management

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. Moyer called the meeting to order and stated that Supervisors Rose, Cumello and Shelton were present at roll call, constituting a quorum of the Board.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of the Minutes of the August 12, 2010 Meeting

Mr. Moyer stated that each Board member received a copy of the minutes of the August 12, 2010 meeting and requested any additions, corrections or deletions.

There not being any,

On MOTION by Mr. Shelton seconded by Mr. Rose with all in favor the minutes of the August 12, 2010 meeting were approved.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Manager's Report

A. Financial Statements

Mr. Moyer stated we provided the financial statements in your agenda package through September 30, 2010, which is the end of our fiscal year. It will be adjusted somewhat, but will

serve as the final document for the Auditors purpose, when they Audit your books shortly. To the credit of the Vista Lakes community, for all practical purposes, we are 100% collected on our non-ad valorem assessments. Under the Interlocal Agreement, thanks to the hard work of our Chairman, the City of Orlando has paid \$44,845, which they promised to pay under the Street Lighting Agreement, which is good news. On the operations and maintenance side, under administrative expenses, the District was \$18,000 under budget. Field expenditures were \$76,000 under budget, but we are slightly over budget for landscaping by \$23,000 due to mulch and tree trimming. Overall, there are reserves of \$100,000, which can be used towards the overage for landscaping. Our total expenditures, compared to the revenues is \$172,000 to the good. We added \$157,000 to the Fund Balance for a total Fund Balance of \$515,000. Of that \$515,000, \$300,000 is encumbered for reserves pursuant to our Reserve Study. Overall, we did a good job in terms of operating funds in the District from a financial point of view.

Mr. Cumello stated it looks like we have an unreserved/undesignated balance of over \$200,000.

Mr. Moyer stated correct.

Mr. Cumello stated if it grows during this fiscal year, we have a decision to make for the next budget because we have a lot of cash available.

Mr. Moyer stated we probably should keep \$150,000 of this money as working capital, because we have a \$1,200,000 budget that calculates to \$100,000 per month and we do not collect any monies between now and the middle of December. However, you make a good point. Going forward next year, if we bring the budget in under budget and still fund our reserves, if there is any money left, we could adjust the assessments or apply them to capital projects or whatever the Board desires.

B. Check Register and Invoices

Mr. Moyer stated the check registers were provided to the Board. After the Board's review, I would ask for a motion to approve.

Mr. Rose asked what is a gang box?

Mr. van der Laan responded it is a mailbox kiosk that the CDD is responsible for in Gentry Park.

Mr. Rose asked did we replace it?

Mr. van der Laan responded yes.

Mr. Rose asked why?

Mr. van der Laan responded there have been having ongoing issues with break-ins. This is a high quality box and multiple repairs were made, which did not work out. We are now working with the Post Office to try to get them to take responsibility for future maintenance. The reason they were not responsible for it was because it did not conform to their standards, but the new one does.

Mr. Rose stated so we should not be receiving further bills.

Mr. van der Laan stated correct, once they accept responsibility. They are going to change the locks and retain the keys.

Mr. Rose asked is this something you are working on with them?

Mr. van der Laan responded yes.

Mr. Shelton asked have we had any problems with any other mailboxes?

Mr. van der Laan responded no. All of the others were approved by the Post Office when they were installed and they are responsible for them. They are aluminum and hard to break into. Occasionally we receive a report that the one in Gentry was broken into because they are flimsy.

Mr. Cumello stated there was an invoice for \$5,294 for a Government Insurance Trust Premium. What was that for?

Mr. Moyer responded our liability insurance.

Mr. Cumello stated we do not carry liability insurance.

Mr. Moyer stated yes we do. We are granted sovereign immunity up to \$200,000 per occurrence/\$300,000 per aggregate. This change was made in the last session of the legislature. Even with that, we insure up to \$1,000,000.

Mr. Cumello stated there was an invoice from Servello & Son for \$2,700 to install gravel on the sides of buildings. What buildings?

Mr. van der Laan responded buildings in Gentry Park.

Mr. Cumello stated I assume there are proposals associated with these Servello & Son invoices, but all we receive in our agenda packages are the invoices.

Mr. Moyer stated correct.

Mr. Cumello asked can we get further information on a going forward basis? For example, we had \$9,800 to install trees and plans as per the contract.

Mr. Moyer stated we will get that to you.

Mr. Rose stated especially since we are over budget on landscaping. There is an old invoice from Leland Management for \$3,761 from June. I would think we would want to resolve this.

Mr. Moyer stated we will check on this.

On MOTION by Mr. Rose seconded by Mr. Shelton with all in favor the check registers for the period September 1, 2010 to September 30, 2010 in the amount of \$80,778.86 were approved.

C. Consideration of Engagement Letter with Grau & Associates to Perform the Audit for Fiscal Year 2010

Mr. Moyer stated a copy of the Engagement Letter for the fiscal year that ended September 30, 2010 was provided to the Board in the agenda package. This is a standard form letter, which identifies the scope of their audit services. What is noteworthy, is the fee was under what was anticipated as it will not exceed \$6,500 and we budgeted \$9,300 for fiscal year 2011.

On MOTION by Mr. Shelton seconded by Mr. Cumello with all in favor Engagement Letter with Grau & Associates to Perform the Audit for Fiscal Year 2010 was approved.

D. Acceptance of AMTEC Arbitrage Rebate Report for Series 2007A-1 and 2007A-2 Capital Improvement Revenue Refunding Bonds

Mr. Moyer stated the purpose of this item is to enter into the record the results of our arbitrage rebate analysis, which is a requirement under the 1986 Tax Reform Act. When we sell bonds, we agree to look at our investment earnings on funds related to the sale of bonds over the life of the bonds. To the degree that the District earns more in investment earnings than we are paying on the bond, we have to rebate this money to the Federal Treasury every five years. AMTEC specializes in these analyses. They noted that our bond yield is 5.22% and our investment portfolio yields 5.01%. This means, we do not need to send money to the Federal Treasury since there is no positive arbitrage. Usually the delta I have been seeing in other Districts is a lot more than this as investments for new bond issues were at 2.5% to 3%. We are just about breaking even in terms of our investments versus what we are paying on our bonds, which is good. The Board does not need to take any action on this item as I just wanted to enter it into the record.

Mr. Cumello stated we seem to be paying a high interest rate of 5%. Is there any way that we can go through a refinancing to lower the interest rate?

Mr. Moyer responded we did that in 2007. When you do bond issues, in order to get bondholders to buy in, you have “call protection”, which means we cannot call out the bonds for a certain number of years; generally 10 years. I will check to see what our call protection is, but I believe it is more than the three years we are currently into. If you did an advanced refunding, from the time you issue to when you call them, you have to put that money into treasuries and defease the lien. This is virtually impossible to do because you would earn 1.5% in treasuries and still have to pay the 5.2% on the bonds for the seven years.

Mr. Clark stated you would have to buy enough treasuries at 1.2% to pay the yield based on the 5% for a number of years.

Mr. Rose stated we are still on the call period from the original bonds and will be coming out of it fairly shortly, but we are still paying the bondholders.

Mr. Cumello stated yes, but we flipped those bonds to a lower rate.

Mr. Rose stated it does not matter. We have to pay the bondholders until the call period is done and then they will be flipped, but we are still holding the old bonds. This was reflected in our proposal.

Mr. Moyer stated that is right.

Mr. Cumello asked can you ask AMTEC to see if there is any opportunity for us to look at the bonds to see if the interest rate can be lowered since rates are so low today.

Mr. Moyer responded sure. I will find out what those rates are for you and whether there is any way to refinance, but I would be surprised.

Mr. Cumello asked do you need to go to a third party or do you have this expertise within your organization?

Mr. Moyer responded I would go back to the company that worked on our 2007 issue. They are in the market all the time and are more than willing to do that analysis for us.

Mr. Cumello asked will there be any cost associated with that?

Mr. Moyer responded no.

Mr. Cumello stated that would save us \$6,000 to \$7,000.

E. Discussion of Action Item List

Mr. Moyer stated the Action item List was provided to the Board. Most items were addressed, but there are still some pending items.

Mr. Rose stated in regards to the pending items, since we do not meet monthly, I expect some movement on these items.

Mr. Cumello asked what is the status of item three?

Mr. Moyer responded we received confirmation from Mr. Paul Grifoni that he did not recommend seal coating for the Gentry Park roads.

Mr. Cumello stated we received the same recommendation from our District Engineer so this item is now closed. Item four is closed because we received \$44,000.

Mr. Rose stated correct. As a follow-up, we have procedures in place in order to collect the information we need to submit because it has to be done in January, which is before we meet again. Is there any action that the Board needs to take to make sure this occurs when it needs to occur?

Mr. Moyer responded I do not think the Board needs to take any action, but I will follow-up.

Mr. Cumello stated item five is closed because the Board is going to stand by its position not to do anything.

Mr. Moyer stated that is correct.

Mr. Rose asked did staff speak to the Warwick homeowner and is he happy or going to come before the Board?

Mr. Moyer responded I do not know what is going to happen.

Mr. Cumello stated item six is closed because the homeowner removed the fill and mulch.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Attorney's Report

Mr. Clark stated an ongoing item is the administrative action with the Super Stop. There have been some updates since the last meeting. The Water Management District is still in discussions with other parties that are involved. I do not know if the District Engineer has had any further communication on the Super Stop matter from the Water Management District.

Mr. Roy stated our office has been dealing with the City of Orlando and the Water Management District to resolve all of the Narcoossee Super Stop issues.

Mr. Clark stated it sounds like their direction is still the same as last month, which is that they are trying to get the City of Orlando to step up and re-size the pipe or do whatever fix is necessary.

Mr. Roy stated they are looking more at re-sizing the pond than changing the pipe. However, since the water flows into Vista Lakes, they asked us to do some remodeling. We have done that and provided the original model showing that the original flows are accurate flows. The City of Orlando and Super Stop are working together to resolve what they need to do to their ponds.

Mr. Clark asked is anyone going to reimburse us for your fees?

Mr. Roy responded there have been discussions with the City of Orlando on this matter as far as the overall Super Stop Agreements and right-of-way acquisition leading into the final settlement.

Mr. Clark stated we took the position that we wanted to be cooperative, but the solution had to be the revenue and satisfying our Engineers that there was no ill effect on our stormwater system. That seems to be what they are working on right now.

Mr. Roy stated part of it is that they have to come to the CDD and request permission to discharge into our system and we have an application set up for reimbursement of costs.

Mr. Clark stated when they get to the end of the process; we will have an opportunity to enter into an agreement to make sure our needs are being met, including the payment of engineering fees.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Engineer's Report

Mr. Roy stated I have no report.

Mr. Rose asked there is an invoice from September 4, 2010 for \$2,000 for a Senior Construction Coordinator and printing costs of \$200. What project was this for?

Mr. Roy responded I believe that was for services during the month of August, but I will check on that and get back to you.

Mr. Moyer asked could that have been the water control structure issue with the City of Orlando?

Mr. Roy responded I believe that was part of it. I think it also covered letters to the City of Orlando and sketches. I believed that we generated some complete sets of plans, which could be the printing costs.

Mr. Rose stated I was curious about the printing costs because it is not usually shown on your invoices. I wanted to make sure that was an appropriate charge.

Mr. Cumello stated the water level is low in the pond in Newport at the north end of Florence Harbor. Since the ponds are all interconnected, this should not happen. Is it possible that there is a blockage in the flow?

Mr. Roy responded this pond is right next to the City of Orlando's property and discharges to the conservation area to the north. It is not connected to the major lake system in Vista Lakes.

Mr. Cumello asked is there any way for us to correct the fact that the water level is low and the fish are sticking their heads out of the water?

Mr. Roy responded I do not think there is any irrigation well to supplement the flow. We have been in a severe drought and I am sure that the water table in the conservation area is also low.

Mr. Cumello asked can we look at some solution such using a tanker truck?

Mr. Roy responded we generally are not allowed to discharge reuse water to fill up a pond and need a special permit. However, we can use potable water.

Mr. Cumello asked can you figure out if there is anything we can do?

Mr. Roy responded yes.

Pastor Banks asked is that the only pond that is not passive?

Mr. Roy responded the lakes within Vista Lakes are all connected. The small individual retention ponds have a control structure that discharges to the lake. There is one pond connected to the system that has an outfall structure preventing water from the lakes to get into the pond. The water actually goes over the outfall structure and into the outfall.

Mr. Cumello stated I read in the minutes from the last meeting that a structure was going to be installed in Odyssey Lake to ensure that the outfall does not get blocked again. Has that been completed because it is not on the Action Item List?

Mr. Roy responded at the last meeting, I was directed to obtain a quote from a contractor for no more than \$2,500. I think they estimated \$2,200, but the work was not authorized. They need the signed proposal back in order to start the installation. Now is a good time to do this because the area is dry.

Mr. Cumello asked can we place this on the Action Item List so it is not forgotten?

Mr. Moyer responded sure.

Mr. Cumello stated I do not want the City of Orlando to come back to us again because of water flooding the street.

Mr. Rose asked who has the proposal?

Mr. Moyer responded Mr. van der Laan and I are working on this. It should be authorized by Monday of next week.

Mr. Rose stated I hope so because I expected the work to already be completed.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Community Association Manager

A. Activity Report

B. Agronomist Report

Mr. van der Laan stated copies of the monthly Activity and Agronomist Reports were provided to the Board in the agenda package. I have some items to add to the Action Item List. The first is the fishing dock on Vista Lake, which has a washout. Some work was done two and a half years ago, but it has not solved the problem. Mr. Roy scheduled someone to come out to look at it today to see what we can do to repair the dock.

Mr. Cumello asked is this the community dock or the fishing dock?

Mr. van der Laan responded the fishing dock. The second item is the landscaping proposals for the feature fountain areas. I have some concept drawings if you are interested in looking at them. We plan to start on some of the preliminary work next month. Once we get through the cold weather, we will complete the remainder of the plantings. The third item is maintenance of the ponds. As stated in my report, we tried several different things. We have issues on ponds eight through ten. Ponds nine and ten have the most problems and are the ones we were authorized the installation of fountains.

Mr. Shelton asked which ponds are these?

Mr. van der Laan responded the small pond inside of Carlisle and Vista Lake towards the community dock. There is a fountain on the Warwick side, but this has not been affected. Those fountains have been ordered and should be installed in the next 30 days. They will also be stocked with Carp, as much as St. Johns County allows us to have according to the permits. The cold weather has helped. It is not an issue at this point, but those changes should help us through to next summer.

Mr. Cumello stated we are paying Aquatic Systems \$1,200 per month to maintain the lakes.

Mr. van der Laan stated correct.

Mr. Cumello stated we have had problems with a number of ponds including this one. Recently they came out and sprayed. Why are we paying them every month to maintain the ponds if they are not being maintained? Did they make a recommendation for spraying and is this an additional cost or part of the \$1,200?

Mr. van der Laan responded there is an additional cost for additional sprayings and treatments. The lakes by the clubhouse are unique because there are two different water levels. We do not have any issues with the deeper side, which was originally dug out, but the pond by the clubhouse is fairly shallow.

Mr. Cumello stated we had an aerator in one of these ponds, which did not help.

Mr. van der Laan stated it is helping, but not enough. The flow comes up to the sway. When the temperature changes from hot to cold or vice versa, we get algae blooms. Aquatic Systems needs to be more aggressive when they are treating the ponds, but this depends on the timing of their schedule. We met with them a couple of times in the past two months about what they can do and how they can be more proactive. I expect that the condition of the lakes will improve.

Mr. Cumello stated if it does not improve, I suggest looking for another company because they are not doing their job. We are paying them on a monthly basis and the reports published to the Board do not indicate that we need to spray. They do not even indicate the condition of the individual lakes. I am not sure we are getting our monies worth as we are getting complaints from the residents. The other point I want to make is if putting additional aerators in the ponds are going to help the situation, we should do it now as we have enough money.

Mr. van der Laan stated the plan we discussed a year and a half ago was to install two aerators each year in order to stay within our existing budget. With two aerators being installed now, we will have a total of eight of fourteen ponds covered. According to the schedule, it will be another two years before all of the ponds have aerators.

Mr. Cumello stated I understand, but what I am suggesting to the Board is that we eliminate this schedule. How much is the cost for each aerator?

Mr. van der Laan responded approximately \$6,000.

Mr. Cumello stated so we are talking about six additional aerators.

Mr. van der Laan stated correct.

Mr. Cumello asked do you think we have enough money in our budget for six additional aerators?

Mr. Moyer responded I think we can allocate \$36,000 towards this expenditure.

Mr. Cumello stated if we have another performance problem coming into the new season, we can eliminate this as being part of the problem.

Mr. Cumello MOVED to authorize the allocation of \$36,000 to cover six additional aerators for the remaining ponds and Mr. Shelton seconded the motion.

Mr. Shelton asked how confident are we that the aerators are helping?

Mr. van der Laan responded my suggestion is to look at the ponds that have aerators such as Avon. There are two aerators in this pond and we do not have any problems with algae growth. We recently installed one in Pembroke, which eliminated any such problems. Moving the water around seems to have a huge effect.

Mr. Shelton asked are they confident that there is not a difference between the two ponds that could account for the algae?

Mr. van der Laan responded actually, the order to put them in was based on the oxygen levels. That is what is going to end up causing the algae. We have been working our way down to the worst locations. Avon was one of the ponds that was the worst and we have not had any further issues.

Mr. Roy asked are we installing aerators or fountains?

Mr. van der Laan responded we installed fountains on the ponds on Vista Lakes Boulevard for aesthetic purposes, but all of the interior ponds have aerators.

Mr. Rose asked are the fountains just as effective?

Mr. van der Laan responded the aerators move slightly more water, but it is not significant.

Mr. Roy stated I would think you would run into some problems because if you are spraying water in the smaller ponds and you get a heavy wind, you will get water on the houses. Surface aerators work well.

Mr. Shelton asked are we talking about the six additional aerators beyond the total budget?

Mr. Moyer responded yes.

Mr. van der Laan stated there are two on order right now and this motion would be for six more.

On VOICE VOTE with all in favor, the prior motion to authorize the allocation of \$36,000 to cover six aerators for the remaining ponds was approved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisors' Requests

Mr. Cumello stated I distributed a copy of the Reserve Study. There are some recommendations for 2011 such as asphalt pavement, crack repair/patch and sealing. We already discussed the sealing, which will cost \$8,000. They also recommended pond aerator replacement at \$17,000. It sounds like we can use this money to offset the \$36,000.

Mr. Rose asked do we need to replace existing aerators?

Mr. Cumello responded no. There was \$14,000 in the 2010 budget for towers, fountains, pump and capital repairs. Since we have this money in reserves, I think we need to decide what to do with this reserve money and whether the money should be spent on these activities or delay the activity. There are three recommends, one for 2010 and two for 2011. The Board needs to decide whether or not to do these items.

Mr. Moyer stated I will get with Mr. van der Laan and we will come back with a recommendation. Since none of them are critical in terms of the continual operation and maintenance of the District, the way to get the maximum useful like is to let them run until they break and then replace them, using reserve funds rather than taking a pump that is currently working and replacing it, because it is on a schedule. I am not sure that this makes a lot of sense. Let me talk with Mr. van der Laan and get his opinion.

Mr. Rose stated we have been doing repairs to the various towers, but usually we take the funds from the operating until we run out of money and then fund it from reserves.

Mr. Moyer stated that is correct.

Mr. Rose stated I assume that we did all of the necessary repairs on the tower last year. However, we only allocated "x" number of dollars for two reserves, but only spent a certain amount of money. Does this money keep accruing?

Mr. Moyer responded the difference is if you took the money out of reserves, it would lower your reserve balance and increase your unallocated fund balance. The other way, which we are currently doing, is to lower your unallocated fund balance and leave the reserves alone. The money should either be taken from reserves or the fund balance.

Mr. Cumello stated if we did not use the money out of reserves, the next time we updated the Reserve Study, they would look at the amount of dollars and lower the amount that you would have to put into reserves.

Mr. Moyer stated that is right.

Mr. Cumello stated the money will always be there. However, I think we need an ongoing action item for someone to look at the Reserve Study and make a determination on whether we want to pull out the dollars to do the work. As an example, in 2012, we have \$79,000 for wall, masonry, inspection and repairs. We normally do this anyway under expenses.

Mr. Rose stated yes, but we go by the philosophy that we take the money out of the operating funds until we need the money. It is not automatically taken care of.

Mr. Moyer stated what we have done in the past is if there is a problem with the wall, we repair the wall, but we have not hired an Engineer to do a structural analysis of all of the walls and identify what we need to do.

Mr. Rose stated I understand, but we just approved \$36,000 for new aerators. This year we are going to be over budget in that category so we would certainly pull out the \$17,000 allocated from reserves to cover that expenditure. With the tower repairs we did last year, we were not over budget so the money stayed in reserves. I would like it would be the same thing going forward. In all likelihood that is probably going to deplete our budget and we will probably have to use reserves. That is just going to be a natural outcome of knowing that we need to take care of the walls in 2012.

Mr. Cumello stated that is a good point. But suppose something comes up that we need to do earlier than what the Reserve Study calls for. If you did not spend the money on the walls, then we can apply the difference to fix something else. One example is the fishing pier. When looking at the fishing pier from a distance, you can see that it is starting to sag in the middle. The question is whether or not the pilings are starting to sink. According to the Reserve Study, we are looking at spending \$48,000 in 2016 to repair the docks. I do not know if they will last another five to six years. I suggest looking at the Reserve Study to see when and if we need to

spend the money. In regards to the Army Corps. Of Engineers matter, since the last meeting, they issued their Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study. They had recommendations based on different areas with different alternatives. They divided the area into four munitions response sites or MRS'. The demonstration in the north range covers Tivoli Gardens, Lee Vista Square, Odyssey Middle School and three wetlands. We are concerned about the wetlands from a CDD standpoint. In their plan, they allocated \$5.4 million to continue to remove munitions and explosives in that area. My expectation is that they will come back to us in 2011 and ask for an Access Agreement to get access into those wetlands. Their initial approach was to level the wetlands in order to do this. Therefore, we still have the issue on whether or not to do that. The other major expense they have is \$16.3 million for the Mockingbird property, which is south of the wetlands where they will continue to remove contaminated soils. They have another \$2.6 million allocated for East of U.S. 417. The bottom line is their recommendation is \$25 million to continue the investigation. The action right now is to determine the funding for 2011 and whether or not they will be asking for permission to come into the wetlands at this point in time.

Mr. Shelton stated I am wondering whether we should buffer them.

Mr. Rose asked do we need to start researching that now or wait until they ask?

Mr. Clark responded I communicated with both the Army Corps. Of Engineer and St. Johns County when this issue first came up as we did not want to get into a position where they were doing things that violated our permits without St. Johns County knowing about it and approving it. I told St. Johns County that they need to be aware of what the Army Corps. Of Engineers is planning. They are somewhat aware of their plans and are watching what is going on. Their attitude was "We are going to have a discussion, but if they can convince us that this is what they need to do, then we will probably approve it". However, when we are in the position of being asked to sign a right of entry, then we are going to ask them to demonstrate to us that they have approval from the Water Management District.

Mr. Rose stated I assume if they are at the level where they are going to do what they need to do, they may provide us with a proposal to do some replanting.

Mr. Clark stated that is the next question. Mr. Cumello is correct. At some point in this next year we are going to be approached by the Army Corps. Of Engineers for a right of entry. Instead of routinely approving them like we have in the past, we are going to tell them that we need a comprehensive agreement about what they plan to do.

Mr. Cumello stated there was supposed to be a decision document that the Army Corps. Of Engineers said would be available at the end of September of this year, but this has not happened yet. I recently sent them an email asking about the status of this document. I understand that Commissioner Diamond sent an email to the Army Corps. Of Engineers saying that the City of Orlando was not happy with the amount of sampling they did and believe that they should do additional water and soil sampling. I have not received any response from the Army Corps. Of Engineers.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Audience Comments

There not being any, the next item followed

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

There being no further business,

On MOTION by Mr. Rose seconded by Mr. Cumello with all in favor, the meeting was adjourned.

Gary L. Moyer
Secretary

John Rose
Chairman